

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



**FILED**

09-27-10  
04:59 PM

Rulemaking Regarding Whether, or Subject to  
What Conditions, the Suspension of Direct Access  
May Be Lifted Consistent with Assembly Bill 1X  
and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 07-05-025  
(Filed May 24, 2007)

**MOTION OF COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA  
REQUESTING AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Michael B. Day  
Suzy Hong  
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI,  
DAY & LAMPREY, LLP  
505 Sansome Street, Suite 900  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415-392-7900  
Facsimile: 415-398-4321  
Email: [mday@goodinmacbride.com](mailto:mday@goodinmacbride.com)

For Commercial Energy of California

September 27, 2010

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Rulemaking Regarding Whether, or Subject to  
What Conditions, the Suspension of Direct Access  
May Be Lifted Consistent with Assembly Bill 1X  
and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 07-05-025  
(Filed May 24, 2007)

**MOTION OF COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA  
REQUESTING AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Commercial Energy of California (“Commercial Energy”)<sup>1</sup> hereby submits this Motion Requesting an Order Requiring Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) to Show Cause why it should not be deemed out of compliance with the Commission’s Decision (“D.”) 10-03-022, regarding implementation of the reopening of Direct Access (“DA”). Specifically, PG&E has not complied with D.10-03-022 by: (1) improperly allowing DA-eligible customers to submit 6-month notices to switch to DA between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the DA Open Enrollment Window (“OEW”); and (2) incorrectly calculating the amount of DA available for 2010. PG&E should therefore be ordered to: (a) disclose the number of customers allowed to enroll between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the OEW and the amount of GWHs associated with each such customer; (b) disallow the 6-month notices to switch received between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the OEW; (c) recalculate the amount of DA available for 2010; (d) restore the DA queue created pursuant to D.10-03-022 and distribute expanded DA capacity to those entities who would have been entitled to enroll during the

---

<sup>1</sup> Commercial Energy is a privately held Montana corporation marketing energy and energy services to businesses since 1997. Commercial Energy sold electricity to clients in Montana from 1998 through 2004, then opened its Oakland, California office in December, 2004. Today, Commercial Energy supplies natural gas to over 2,000 businesses at over 6,000 locations, primarily in California.

OEW under the reconfigured queue; and reconfigure the queue for 2011 in a manner consistent with the revised OEW for 2010.

**I. BACKGROUND**

**A. SB 695**

SB 695 added a new section 365.1 of the Public Utilities Code.<sup>2</sup> In relevant part, section 365.1 provides that:

(a) Except as expressly authorized by this section, and subject to the limitations in subdivisions (b) and (c), the right of retail end-use customers pursuant to this chapter to acquire service from other providers is suspended until the Legislature, by statute, lifts the suspension or otherwise authorizes direct transactions. . . .

(b) The commission shall allow individual retail nonresidential end-use customers to acquire electric service from other providers in each electrical corporation's distribution service territory, up to a maximum allowable total kilowatthours annual limit.

**B. D.10-03-022**

The Commission implemented this new statute in D.10-03-022. In that Decision, the Commission noted that “SB 695 *repealed* the prior statutory provisions regarding the suspension of DA which had been in effect since 2001, *and replaced* those provisions with a new statute, Public Utilities Code section 365.1.”<sup>3</sup> In Appendix 2 of D.10-03-022, *Adopted Enrollment Procedures for the Phase-In Period*, the Commission stated that “[t]he same switching rules will apply to all customers eligible to switch to DA service under SB 695 (“DA-eligible customers”).”<sup>4</sup> The Commission thus defined “DA-eligible customers” as *all* customers eligible to switch to DA *under SB 695*, which would be *all* “individual retail nonresidential end-use customers.”<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the Decision found that “[t]he provisions for new enrollments of DA customers under SB 695 should be based upon a first-come, first-served principle, without special set-asides for DA-eligible customers

---

<sup>2</sup> All statutory references are to the California Public Utilities Code, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>3</sup> D.10-03-022, p. 22 (emphasis added).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, Appendix 2, p. 1.

who have exercised the right to take DA previously.”<sup>6</sup> Instead, “an equal opportunity to enroll in DA shall apply to all eligible customers.”<sup>7</sup> Finally, D.10-03-022 states that the annual limit for the DA load increase for 2010 is “35% of the current room available under the DA cap.”<sup>8</sup>

**C. Energy Division Status Report**

On August 2, 2010, the Commission’s Energy Division issued its *Status Report on the Results of Energy Division’s Review of the Utilities’ Senate Bill 695 Implementation for 2010 per D.10-03-022* (“Status Report”).<sup>9</sup> The Status Report revealed that the utilities had allowed “grandfathered” DA-eligible customers to submit six-month notices to switch to DA service prior to April 11, 2010, the effective date for the OEW. In addition, the Status Report indicated that “30 such customers in PG&E’s service territory exercised that option. The load associated with those customers reduced the amount of space available for new load under the 2010 Load Cap by approximately 569 GWH.”<sup>10</sup> The Status Report further indicated that “PG&E’s April 2010 Baseline DA Load was lower than the Existing Baseline DA Load reported in Appendix A of Decision 10-03-022 [5,574 GWH]. Consequently, PG&E states that it increased the 2010 Annual Limit to fully subscribe the 2010 Load Cap.”<sup>11</sup> The Status Report shows that PG&E enrolled only 1,008 GWH of DA load increases. D.10-03-022 had estimated that PG&E could enroll approximately 1,381 GWH of new load under the annual KWH cap set by SB 695 and the phase-in schedule established by the Decision.

---

<sup>5</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 365.1

<sup>6</sup> D.10-03-022, p. 33 (COL 9).

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 22.

<sup>8</sup> D. 10-03-022, Appendix 2, p. 1.

<sup>9</sup> The report was issued as required by a June 23, 2010 Assigned Commissioner Ruling directing Energy Division to produce a report on its review of the utilities’ compliance with the procedures adopted in D.10-03-022 for the management of the OEW process.

<sup>10</sup> Status Report, p. 3, fn. 3.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

**D. PG&E Rule 22.1**

PG&E filed a Tier 1 Advice Letter pursuant to D.10-03-022 on April 2, 2010 to implement the provisions of the Decision. Consistent with the requirements of the Decision, the Advice Letter became effective upon filing.<sup>12</sup> PG&E's Rule 22.1 states that the enrollment procedures for the phase-in of increased DA capacity adopted in D.10-03-022 do not apply to "eligible non-residential BPS [bundled portfolio service] customers who have submitted a Six Month Notice To Transfer To Direct Access Service form prior to April 11, 2010."<sup>13</sup>

**II. PG&E'S RULE 22.1 IS INCONSISTENT WITH D.10-03-022.**

The language in Rule 22.1 and PG&E's acceptance of six-month notices to switch to DA between the effective date of the Decision and April 11, 2010 are inconsistent with D.10-03-022. Under SB 695 there is no "grandfathered" right to switch to DA outside of the enrollment procedures established by D.10-03-022. Furthermore, D.10-03-022 explicitly requires that all eligible DA customers have an equal opportunity to enroll in DA. Therefore, PG&E should be ordered to restore the DA queue created pursuant to D.10-03-022 and re-distribute DA capacity to those who would have been able to enroll during the OEW if not for the continued acceptance of 6-month notices in contravention of D.10-03-022.

**A. D.10-03-022 Does Not Permit "Grandfathered" Switching Procedures for Previously DA-Eligible Customers.**

As stated in D.10-03-022, SB 695 repealed the prior version of section 365.1 and replaced it with a new statute. The new statute provides that the right to acquire DA is *suspended, except as expressly authorized* by section 365.1.<sup>14</sup> Section 365.1 authorizes "individual retail nonresidential end-use customers to acquire electric service from other providers in each electrical corporation's distribution service territory, up to a maximum allowable total kilowatthours annual

---

<sup>12</sup> D.10-03-022, p. 36 (OP 8).

<sup>13</sup> PG&E, Rule 22.1, section C.1. Southern California Edison's Rule 22.1 contains the same language.

limit.” As stated above, D.10-03-022 interpreted section 365.1 as providing DA eligibility for *all* “individual retail nonresidential end-use customers” on an equal basis. There was, therefore, no “grandfathered” eligibility to switch to DA prior to April 11, 2010.

The Commission’s determination with regard to residential customers underscores the conclusion that there was no “grandfathered” eligibility for previous DA customers. The Commission found that the new section 365.1 excludes residential customers. Therefore the Decision states that only an “existing DA-eligible residential customer on bundled service that has already given its six-month notice to return to DA *prior to the effective date of this decision* would still retain the right to return.”<sup>15</sup> Essentially, the Commission’s implementation of the new section 365.1 in D.10-03-022 cut off any pre-existing right to switch to DA service because any right to acquire DA could, at that point, only stem from SB 695. Thus, as of the date of D.10-03-022 (March 15, 2010) previously DA-eligible customers had no right to switch to DA under pre-existing switching rules.

**B. D.10-03-022 Provides An Equal Opportunity for All Eligible Customers to Enroll in DA.**

In D.10-03-022, the Commission considered and rejected granting preferential treatment to those customers who had previously enrolled in DA. In refusing to grant preferential treatment to previous DA customers, the Commission stated that it would “not grant a special preference or set-aside of load to existing DA-eligible customers. Instead, *an equal opportunity to enroll in DA shall apply to all eligible customers.*”<sup>16</sup> The Decision further states that “SB 695 contains no language granting any preference or special rights to DA-eligible customers who have

---

<sup>14</sup> Section 365.1

<sup>15</sup> D.10-03-022, p. 23 (emphasis added).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.* at p. 22.

exercised the right to take DA previously, and there is no basis for the Commission to impose special preferential treatment for such DA-eligible customers in implementing SB 695.”<sup>17</sup>

Although D.10-03-022 is very clear that “pre-existing” DA-eligible customers should not receive special or preferential treatment or any set-aside of load under the reopening of DA, PG&E effectively granted preferential treatment to such customers by allowing them to submit 6-month notices until the effective date of the OEW. Previous DA customers were allowed to take up available cap space while “new” customers had to wait until the OEW to enroll. Consistent with the Commission’s treatment of residential customers, the right of previously DA-eligible customers to switch should have been extinguished as of the effective date of D.10-03-022.

PG&E’s Rule 22.1 contains language permitting previously eligible DA customers who submitted 6-month notices prior to April 11, 2010 to switch to DA before the OEW. However, as discussed in detail above, this tariff language is inconsistent with D.10-03-022. In addition, while the Decision states that April 11, 2010 is the effective date of the reopening of DA, that date does not necessarily signify that the *status quo* regarding the switching of previously eligible DA customers should have been maintained until that time. As discussed in detail above, the pre-existing DA regime ended as of the *effective date of D.10-03-022*. Furthermore, the significance of the effective date of the reopening of DA must be viewed in the context of the clear intent of the Decision to provide *all* customers eligible for DA under SB 695 an equal opportunity to enroll. In order to effectuate that purpose and be consistent with SB 695 and D.10-03-022, customers submitting 6-month notices after the effective date of the Decision should have been required to wait until the OEW to enroll.

---

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at p. 34 (COL 11).

**III. PG&E’S CALCULATION OF THE ANNUAL LIMIT FOR 2010 IS INCONSISTENT WITH D.10-03-022.**

D.10-03-022 authorized PG&E to enroll approximately 1,381 GWH of increased DA load for 2010, which was 35% of the remaining space available for DA based on the data at the time of the Decision. According to Energy Division’s Status Report, PG&E only accepted approximately 1,008 GWH of new load. This is a significant reduction in the annual limit for 2010 despite the fact that according to the Status Report, “PG&E’s April 2010 Baseline DA Load was lower than the Existing Baseline DA Load reported in Appendix A of Decision 10-03-022”<sup>18</sup> so PG&E “increased the 2010 Annual Limit to fully subscribe the 2010 Load Cap.”<sup>19</sup> According to the Status Report, the annual limit for 2010 was reduced by approximately 569 GWH, the load of customers submitting 6-month notices through April 11, 2010. These figures indicate that PG&E calculated the load available for 2010 by simply subtracting the 569 GWH of customers submitting 6-month notices from its 2010 annual limit. This approach does not comply with the Decision’s requirement that for 2010 the load available would be *35% of the current room available under the cap*. Furthermore, this approach greatly diminished the space available in the OEW. See the table below:

	D.10-03-022	PG&E OEW	Proposed
Overall cap	9,520	9,520	9,520
Baseline	5,574	5,014 (baseline not including 569 GWH from 6-month notice submissions)	5,583 (5,014 plus 569 GWH)
Remaining cap	3,946	4,506 (9,520 minus 5,014)	3,937 (9,520 minus 5,583)
2010 cap	1,381 (35% of remaining cap space)	1,008 (1,577 minus 569 (35% of 4,506))	1,378 (35% of remaining cap space)

<sup>18</sup> Status Report, p. 3, fn. 3.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

Ordering Paragraph 1 of the Decision states that “[a]djustments to each utility’s baseline amount of direct access load as set forth in Appendix 1 shall be based on the same method used by the utilities to calculate direct access load in their Direct Access Implementation Activities Reports.”<sup>20</sup> The Decision further provides that information sufficient to inform customers and ESPs with regard to the space available under annual and overall limits of DA should be provided and updated on at least a *monthly basis*. *This information includes changes in usage to determine the DA load availability.*<sup>21</sup> This language indicates that rather than simply subtracting the GWHs associated with the 6-month notices submitted prior to the OEW, PG&E should have recalculated its base line, including the 569 GWHs associated with 6-month notices received prior to April 11th, and recalculated the available load for 2010 as 35% of the remaining available cap space (as set forth in the table above). This is the only approach that is consistent with the language in the Decision that a utility’s base line should be adjusted periodically and that the available space for 2010 should be 35% of the then-current overall remaining load for DA.

While it is true that at the end of the phase-in period there will only be one overall cap and that the issues described in this motion are limited to implementation of the phase-in, the Commission in D.10-03-022 carefully considered the phase-in period and the percentages of cap space available for each year of the phase-in period. PG&E’s calculation of available load for 2010 is incompatible with the Commission’s consideration of the various factors establishing 35% of the current room available under the cap as the appropriate limit for DA for 2010. Thus, the Commission should recalculate the amount of DA available for PG&E in 2010, restore the DA queue for PG&E customers as required by D.10-03-022, and distribute expanded DA capacity to those entities in the reconstituted PG&E queue that would otherwise have been able to enroll during

---

<sup>20</sup> D.10-03-022, p. 34, OP 1 (emphasis added).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at Appendix 2, pgs. 6-7 (emphasis added).

the OEW if not for PG&E's continued acceptance of 6-month notices in violation of D.10-03-022 and the miscalculation of available DA load for 2010.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, Commercial Energy respectfully requests that the Commission issue an Order requiring PG&E to Show Cause why it should not be ordered to:

- disclose the number of customers allowed to enroll between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the OEW and the amount of GWHs associated with those customers;
- disallow the 6-month notices to switch received between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the OEW;
- recalculate the amount of DA available for 2010;
- restore the DA queue consistent with the requirements of D.10-03-022 and distribute expanded DA capacity to those who would otherwise have been able to enroll during the OEW if not for PG&E's continued acceptance of 6-month notices in violation of D.10-03-022 and the miscalculation of available DA load for 2010; and
- reconfigure the enrollment queue for 2011 in a manner consistent with the revised OEW for 2010 and the requirements of D.10-03-022.

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of September, 2010 at San Francisco,  
California.

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI,  
DAY & LAMPREY, LLP  
Michael B. Day  
Suzy Hong  
505 Sansome Street, Suite 900  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 392-7900  
Facsimile: (415) 398-4321  
Email: mday@goodinmacbride.com

By /s/ Michael B. Day  
Michael B. Day

Attorneys for Commercial Energy of California

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Rulemaking Regarding Whether, or Subject to  
What Conditions, the Suspension of Direct Access  
May Be Lifted Consistent with Assembly Bill 1X  
and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 07-05-025  
(Filed May 24, 2007)

**DECLARATION OF RON PERRY**

**IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION OF  
COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA  
REQUESTING AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

I, Ron Perry, hereby declare:

I am the President and Chief Executive Officer of Commercial Energy of California (“Commercial Energy”). This declaration is submitted in support of Commercial Energy’s motion requesting an order requiring Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) to show cause why it has not complied with the Commission’s Decision (D.) 10-03-022, specifically, by: (i) improperly allowing customers who were previously eligible for Direct Access (“DA”) to submit 6-month notices to switch to DA between the effective date of D.10-03-022 and the effective date of the Open Enrollment Window (“OEW”); and (ii) incorrectly calculating the amount of DA available for 2010.


1. In conjunction with my responsibilities at Commercial Energy, I oversee the marketing to and coordination of customers with regard to enrollment in DA with Commercial Energy. Commercial Energy communicated with potential customers regarding possible enrollment in DA under the reopening pursuant to SB 695. Commercial Energy submitted Notices of Intent on behalf of 1,300 customer Service Agreement

Identification Numbers (“SAIDs”) as part of the OEW. Commercial Energy was notified that only 27 of these SAIDs were accepted, which was less than 5% of the total submitted usage or SAIDs. Commercial opted not to make offers to any of the accepted customers because of the disproportionate cost of providing service to so few customers. On the other hand, for the 2011 DA enrollment, a much higher percentage of Commercial’s potential customers were accepted. Commercial is in the process of extending offers to all of its customers accepted for DA enrollment for 2011.

2. On August 2, 2010 the California Public Utilities Commission’s Energy Division issued a Status Report on the Results of Energy Division’s Review of the Utilities’ Senate Bill 695 Implementation for 2010 per D.10-03-022 (“Status Report”). The Status Report appears to indicate that PG&E followed enrollment procedures that were inconsistent with D.10-03-022.
3. Based on subsequent communication with a representative of PG&E (Calvin Yee), my understanding is that, as stated in the Status Report, PG&E allowed previously DA-eligible customers to submit 6-month notices to switch to DA until April 11, 2010. Furthermore, PG&E did not recalculate the base line amount of DA in calculating the available load for 2010. Instead, my understanding is that PG&E simply subtracted the GWHs associated with the 6-month notices submitted by previously eligible DA customers from the load available for 2010.
4. Based on my understanding, if PG&E had recalculated its base line amount of DA and recalculated the available load for 2010, there would have been more load available for 2010, which would have allowed more customers to enroll in DA during the OEW. Given the timing of Commercial’s submissions in the OEW, and assuming the fill rate remained constant, I believe that Commercial Energy would have been granted enough

queue space to justify making offers to Commercial's accepted customers for 2010, and therefore would be serving electricity load in California today.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing information is true and correct to the best of my personal knowledge and that this declaration was executed on September 27, 2010, at Oakland, California.



Ron Perry

3418/001/X122489.v1

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Melinda LaJaunie, certify that I have on this 27<sup>th</sup> day of September 2010 caused a copy of the foregoing

**MOTION OF COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA  
REQUESTING AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

to be served on all known parties to R.07-05-025 listed on the most recently updated service list available on the California Public Utilities Commission website, via email to those listed with email and via U.S. mail to those without email service. I also caused courtesy copies to be hand delivered as follows:

Commissioner President Michael R. Peevey  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 5218  
San Francisco, CA 94102

ALJ. Thomas R. Pulsifer  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 5005  
San Francisco, CA 94102

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 27<sup>th</sup> day of September 2010 at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Melinda LaJaunie  
Melinda LaJaunie

**Service List – R.07-05-025  
(Updated September 23, 2010)**

ANDREW B. BROWN  
abb@eslawfirm.com

AKBAR JAZAYERI  
AdviceTariffManager@sce.com

Andrew Kotch  
ako@cpuc.ca.gov

AMBER E. WYATT  
amber.wyatt@sce.com

ROBERT ANDERSON  
AndersonR@conedsolutions.com

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com

Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa  
ayk@cpuc.ca.gov

MATTHEW BARMACK  
barmackm@calpine.com

BRIAN T. CRAGG  
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com

RYAN BERNARDO  
bernardo@braunlegal.com

Brewster Fong  
bfs@cpuc.ca.gov

ROBERT L. HINES  
bhines@svlg.org

BRIAN K. CHERRY  
bk7@pge.com

BLAIR JACKSON  
blairj@mid.org

SCOTT BLAISING  
blaising@braunlegal.com

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH  
brbarkovich@earthlink.net

CATHIE ALLEN  
californiadockets@pacificcorp.com

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
case.admin@sce.com

CASSANDRA SWEET  
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com

CINDY L. CASSELMAN  
ccasselmann@pilotpowergroup.com

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS  
cem@newsdata.com

HILARY CORRIGAN  
cem@newsdata.com

CARLOS PENA  
CFPen@SempraUtilities.com

Charlyn A. Hook  
chh@cpuc.ca.gov

CHRISTOPHER A. HILEN  
chilen@nvenergy.com

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER  
cjw5@pge.com

CARLOS LAMAS-BABBINI  
clamasbabbini@comverge.com

Chloe Lukins  
clu@cpuc.ca.gov

CAROLYN KEHREIN  
cmkehrein@ems-ca.com

COLIN CUSHNIE  
colin.cushnie@sce.com

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF  
crmd@pge.com

Christopher R Villarreal  
crv@cpuc.ca.gov

DAVID OLIVER  
david.oliver@navigantconsulting.com

David Peck  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov

Donald J. Brooks  
dbr@cpuc.ca.gov

DEBORAH K. CURRIE  
dcurrie@rrienergy.com

DOUGLAS DAVIE  
ddavie@wellhead.com

DAVID DICKEY  
ddickey@tenaska.com

DEBORAH BERGER  
debeberger@cox.net

DEBRA S. GALLO  
debra.gallo@swgas.com

DOUGLAS M. GRANDY, P.E.  
dgrandy@caonsitegen.com

DHAVAL DAGLI  
dhaival.dagli@sce.com

DAVID L. HUARD  
dhuard@manatt.com

DIANE I. FELLMAN  
Diane.Fellman@nrgenergy.com

DAVID ORTH  
dorth@krcd.org

DANIEL DOUGLASS  
douglass@energyattorney.com

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS  
douglass@energyattorney.com

DONALD R. SCHOONOVER  
ds1957@att.com

DAVID VIDAVER  
dvidaver@energy.state.ca.us

Elizabeth Dorman  
edd@cpuc.ca.gov

EVELYN KAHL  
ek@a-klaw.com

ERIC A. ARTMAN  
eric.a.artman@gmail.com

EDWARD TOPPI  
etoppi@ces-ltd.com

EDWIN W. DUNCAN  
ewdlaw@sbcglobal.net

GURCHARAN BAWA  
gbawa@cityofpasadena.net

E. GARTH BLACK  
gblack@cwclaw.com

GINA M. DIXON  
GDixon@SempraUtilities.com

GEORGE WAIDELICH  
george.waidelich@safeway.com

GIFFORD JUNG  
gifford.jung@powerex.com

GREGG MORRIS  
gmorris@emf.net

GWENNETH O'HARA  
gohara@calplg.com

GURDIP REHAL  
grehal@water.ca.gov

HOWARD V. GOLUB  
hgolub@nixonpeabody.com

HARRY KINGERSKI  
HKingerski@mxenergy.com

INGER GOODMAN  
igoodman@commerceenergy.com

IGNACIO IBARGUREN  
iibarguren@tyrenergy.com

IRYNA KWASNY  
iryna.kwasny@doj.ca.gov

JAMES SCHICHTL  
james.schichtl@sce.com

JANET COMBS  
janet.combs@sce.com

**Service List – R.07-05-025  
(Updated September 23, 2010)**

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG  
jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com

JON M. CASADONT  
jcasadont@bluestarenergy.com

JACQUELINE DEROSA  
jderosa@ces-ltd.com

JEANNE M. SOLE  
jeanne.sole@sfgov.org

JEFF MALONE  
jeff.malone@calpeak.com

JEFFREY P. GRAY  
jeffgray@dwt.com

JENNIFER TSAO SHIGEKAWA  
jennifer.shigekawa@sce.com

GERALD L. LAHR  
JerryL@abag.ca.gov

JEDEDIAH J. GIBSON  
jig@eslawfirm.com

JOSEPH M. KARP  
jkarp@winston.com

JOHN W. LESLIE, ESQ.  
jleslie@luce.com

JAMES MCMAHON  
jmcmahon@8760energy.com

JAMES MCMAHON  
jmcmahon@8760energy.com

JOHN HOLTZ  
john.holtz@greenmountain.com

JOE DONOVAN  
joseph.donovan@constellation.com

JOSHUA DAVIDSON  
joshdavidson@dwt.com

JOY A. WARREN  
joyw@mid.org

JOHN PACHECO  
jpacheco@water.ca.gov

JANINE L. SCANCARELLI  
jscancarelli@crowell.com

JIM SPENCE  
jspence@water.ca.gov

JUDY PAU  
judypau@dwt.com

JULIE L. MARTIN  
julie.martin@bp.com

Jake Wise  
jw2@cpuc.ca.gov

Karin M. Hieta  
kar@cpuc.ca.gov

KAREN LINDH  
karen@klindh.com

KIMBERLY C. JONES  
Kcj5@pge.com

Kathryn Auriemma  
kdw@cpuc.ca.gov

KEITH R. MCCREA  
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com

KELLIE SMITH  
kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov

KEN BOHN  
ken@in-houseenergy.com

KENNY SWAIN  
kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com

KERRY HATTEVIK  
kerry.hattevik@nexteraenergy.com

KELLY M. FOLEY  
KFoley@SempraUtilities.com

KIM HASSAN  
khassan@semprautilities.com

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN  
kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com

KRISTIN JUEDES  
kjuedes@urmgroupp.com

KARI KLOBERDANZ  
KKloberdanz@SempraUtilities.com

Karl Meeusen  
kkm@cpuc.ca.gov

GREGORY S.G. KLATT  
klatt@energyattorney.com

KAREN NORENE MILLS  
kmills@cfbf.com

AVIS KOWALEWSKI  
kowalewskia@calpine.com

Karen P. Paull  
kpp@cpuc.ca.gov

ALEXIS WODTKE  
lex@consumercal.org

DONALD C. LIDDELL  
liddell@energyattorney.com

LISA WEINZIMER  
lisa\_weinzimer@platts.com

LISA ZYCHERMAN  
lisazycherman@dwt.com

LYNN MARSHALL  
lmarshall@energy.state.ca.us

LYNN M. HAUG  
lmh@eslawfirm.com

Louis M. Irwin  
lmi@cpuc.ca.gov

Carlos A. Velasquez  
los@cpuc.ca.gov

LEN PETTIS  
lpettis@calstate.edu

LON W. HOUSE, PH.D  
lwhouse@innercite.com

Lee-Whei Tan  
lwt@cpuc.ca.gov

MARY U. AKENS  
makens@water.ca.gov

MARCIE A. MILNER  
marcie.milner@shell.com

MARTIN HOMECEC  
martinhomecec@gmail.com

MARTIN HOMECEC  
martinhomecec@gmail.com

MARY LYNCH  
mary.lynych@constellation.com

MARY TUCKER  
mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov

MARY C. HOFFMAN  
mary@solutionsforutilities.com

MARK BYRON  
mbyron@gwfpower.com

MEGHAN K. COX  
mcox@calplg.com

MICHAEL B. DAY  
mday@goodinmacbride.com

MICHAEL B. DAY  
mday@goodinmacbride.com

MARC D. JOSEPH  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

MICHEL PETER FLORIO  
mflorio@turn.org

MICHAEL S. HINDUS  
michael.hindus@pillsburylaw.com

MICHAEL MCDONALD  
michael.mcdonald@ieee.org

MICHAEL E. BOYD  
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

**Service List – R.07-05-025  
(Updated September 23, 2010)**

MICHELLE R. MISHOE michelle.mishoe@pacificorp.com	PHILIPPE AUCLAIR phil@auclairconsulting.com	Steve Roscow scr@cpuc.ca.gov
MICHAEL D. MONTOYA mike.montoya@sce.com	PHILLIP MULLER philm@scdenergy.com	SETH D. HILTON sdhilton@stoel.com
MICHAEL LAMOND mike@alpinenaturalgas.com	PAUL KERKORIAN pk@utilitycostmanagement.com	SEAN P. BEATTY sean.beatty@mirant.com
RUSTY MILLS millsr@water.ca.gov	PATRICIA E. LOOK plook@rrienergy.com	MICHAEL ROCHMAN Service@spurr.org
MICHAEL R. JASKE mjaske@energy.state.ca.us	RANDALL W. KEEN pucservice@manatt.com	SHANNON MALONEY shannonrmaloney@msn.com
Matthew Deal mjd@cpuc.ca.gov	PAUL HOLTON pvh1@pge.com	SOPHIA PARK SJP@cpuc.ca.gov
MADELON A. KUCHERA mkuchera@bluestarenergy.com	JOHN DUTCHER ralf1241a@cs.com	STEVE LIU sliu@bear.com
MIKE MCCLENAHAN MMcclenahan@SempraUtilities.com	RALPH E. DENNIS ralphdennis@insightbb.com	STEVEN C. NELSON SNelson@SempraUtilities.com
MICHAEL G. NELSON, ESQ. mnelson@mccarthylaw.com	CASES ADMINISTRATION TEAM RegRelCpucCases@pge.com	J. STEVE RAHON SRahon@SempraUtilities.com
MANUEL RAMIREZ mramirez@sfgwater.org	ROGER GOLDSTEIN rfg2@pge.com	STACEY RANTALA srantala@energymarketers.com
MARK R. HUFFMAN mrh2@pge.com	Risa Hernandez rhh@cpuc.ca.gov	SARA STECK MYERS ssmyers@att.net
MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC mrw@mrwassoc.com	RONALD MOORE rkmoore@gswater.com	STEVEN F. GREENWALD stevegreenwald@dwt.com
MICHAEL SHAMES mshames@ucan.org	ROBERT RYNEARSON rob@teamryno.com	STEVEN HUHMAN steven.huhman@morganstanley.com
MONA TIERNEY-LLOYD mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com	ROGER VAN HOY rogerv@mid.org	STEVEN KELLY steven@iepa.com
MICHAEL WOFFORD mwofford@water.ca.gov	RONALD L. PERRY ron.perry@commercialenergy.net	SUE MARA sue.mara@rtoadvisors.com
MICHAEL A. YUFFEE myuffee@mwe.com	RYAN PISTOCHINI rpistoc@smud.org	STACY W. WALTER sww9@pge.com
NORMAN J. FURUTA norman.furuta@navy.mil	REED V. SCHMIDT rschmidt@bartlewells.com	STEPHEN ZAMINSKI szaminski@starwood.com
NAT TREADWAY ntreadway@defgllc.com	RANDY SHILLING rshilling@krccd.org	TAM HUNT tam.hunt@gmail.com
S. NANCY WHANG nwhang@manatt.com	SAEED FARROKHPAY Saeed.Farrokhpay@ferc.gov	THERESA BURKE tburke@sfgwater.org
Ourania M. Vlahos omv@cpuc.ca.gov	ANNIE STANGE sas@a-klaw.com	TRENT CARLSON tcarlson@rrienergy.com
ERNEST PASTERS pasteer@sbcglobal.net	C SUSIE BERLIN sberlin@mccarthylaw.com	TARYN CIARDELLA tciardella@nvenergy.com
FRANK J. PERDUE perdue@montaguederose.com	SARAH BESERRA sbeserra@sbcglobal.net	TOM CORR TCorr@SempraUtilities.com
PETER W. HANSCHEN phansch@mofo.com	SHERYL CARTER scarter@nrdc.org	TREVOR DILLARD tdillard@sppc.com

**Service List – R.07-05-025  
(Updated September 23, 2010)**

THOMAS R. DEL MONTE  
thomas.r.del.monte@gmail.com

TODD EDMISTER  
todd.edmister@bingham.com

THEODORE E. ROBERTS  
TRoberts@SempraUtilities.com

Thomas R. Pulsifer  
trp@cpuc.ca.gov

THOMAS W. SOLOMON  
tsolomon@winston.com

TOM WERTZ  
twertz@tyrenergy.com

WAYNE AMER  
wamer@kirkwood.com

WILLIAM H. BOOTH  
wbooth@booth-law.com

DAVE SMITH  
WDSmith@SempraUtilities.com

RAY CZA HAR  
westgas@aol.com

BRAD WETSTONE  
wetstone@alamedamp.com

WENDY KEILANI  
WKeilani@SempraUtilities.com

MIKE CADE  
wmc@a-klaw.com

Rebecca Tsai-Wei Lee  
wtr@cpuc.ca.gov

ZACH DAVIS  
zdavis@advantageiq.com

CLINT SANDIDGE  
MANAGER, POLICY & REGULATION  
RRI ENERGY, INC.  
1000 MAIN STREET  
HOUSTON, TX 77002

LES GULIASI  
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
RRI ENERGY, INC  
720 WILDCAT CANYON ROAD  
BERKELEY, CA 94708

MALCOLM REINHARDT  
ACCENT ENERGY  
1299 FOURTH STREET, SUITE 302  
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

PUC/X122494.v1