

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA



FILED
08-27-10
04:59 PM

Application of PACIFIC GAS AND
ELECTRIC COMPANY (U-39-E) for
Authority to Increase Revenue
Requirements to Recover the Costs to
Upgrade its SmartMeter™ Program

Application No. 07-12-009
(Filed December 12, 2007)

**RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S SUBMISSION OF DATA ON
THE ESTIMATED COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH SUSPENSION OF
SMARTMETER TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT**

I. INTRODUCTION

On June 17, 2010, the City and County of San Francisco ("City") filed a Petition to Modify Decision 09-03-026. In its petition, the City asked the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") to temporarily suspend the further installation of SmartMeters by Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") until the Commission concludes its investigation into the significant problems created by PG&E's deployment of its SmartMeters. The City understands that the Commission expects to release the results of that investigation sometime next week.

At a prehearing conference on August 18, 2010, Administrative Law Judge Timothy Sullivan ordered PG&E to file with the Commission cost data supporting PG&E's claim that "it would be extremely costly to order a moratorium."¹ According to PG&E, these costs are an important issue for the Commission to consider when deciding whether to grant the City's petition. Despite this position, PG&E failed to provide the relevant cost data in either its response to the City's petition or in its

¹ Transcript of August 18, 2010 Prehearing Conference, p.30, lines 6-8.

prehearing conference statement.² Furthermore, the cost data that PG&E has now filed with the Commission and provided to the parties in response to ALJ Sullivan's order is speculative and incomplete.

Moreover, as the City previously showed, there are a number of other important factors that the Commission must weigh in deciding whether to grant the City's petition. PG&E customers in San Francisco and other counties should not be forced to continue to bear the risk of excessive bills and other problems that have followed PG&E into every county where it has deployed SmartMeters. The Commission must act now in order to prevent any further harm to ratepayers, and to assuage increasing customer concern over the accuracy and safety of SmartMeters.

II. PG&E'S COST DATA PROVIDES NO BASIS FOR DENYING THE CITY'S PETITION

PG&E claims that it would either lose benefits or incur costs ranging from \$17 to \$87 million if the Commission were to temporarily suspend its SmartMeter deployment. According to PG&E, the actual amount of the lost benefits or costs would depend on a number of variables including the length of the suspension and whether PG&E decides to allow its contractor to retain its employees during the suspension. The low figure would be for a three-month suspension, while high figure would be for a nine-month suspension. Missing from PG&E's data, however, is an analysis or estimate of the costs that PG&E has already incurred, or might incur in the future, to rectify problems with PG&E's SmartMeter deployment.³

² One of PG&E's calculations also takes into account lost demand respond and energy conservation benefits. PG&E's own filings with the Commission demonstrate that few of those benefits are accruing at this time. (*See Revised Compliance Filing of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Pursuant to Decision 09-03-026 (May 27, 2010).*)

³ The cost data PG&E filed on August 27, 2010 has been available to PG&E for quite some time. PG&E compiled this data in response to a data request that DRA made on April 30, 2010, and provided the data to DRA in two separate data responses dated June 9, 2010 and June 23, 2010.

In its response to the City's petition, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates ("DRA") made it clear that this is a critical issue for the Commission to consider:

DRA acknowledges the potential seriousness of these [past] problems [with PG&E's SmartMeter deployment], and shares the City's concern that similar problems may continue to arise as SmartMeter deployment continues. But, as stated above, the cost of rectifying these problems must be balanced against the cost of suspending a massive deployment. At this time only PG&E has all the information necessary to make that decision. And only PG&E can determine whether the nature of the problems is such that they can be addressed more cost-effectively by suspending deployment or by rectifying those difficulties as the deployment proceeds.⁴

In fact, the Commission should be well aware that it is quite expensive for PG&E to go back and replace or modify a previously installed meter. When PG&E filed this application to upgrade its automated metering infrastructure ("AMI") to SmartMeters, PG&E asked the Commission to approve the following expenditures: (i) \$38 million to retrofit 230,000 electromechanical AMI meters procured for its Kern County customers (123,000 of which PG&E had already installed); and (ii) \$32 million to retrofit the nearly 288,000 solid state SmartMeters that PG&E had installed in Kern County to add Home Area Network capability that was not available when PG&E installed those meters. PG&E's imprudent decision making resulted in its requesting an additional \$70 million of ratepayer money that could have been avoided had PG&E deployed fully functional SmartMeters in the first instance.

PG&E has fared no better since the Commission approved its upgrade application in this proceeding. PG&E admits that it has had to replace 45,000 SmartMeters – 23,200 that were installed incorrectly, 12,376 that had data storage issues, and 9,000 that had wireless transmission problems. PG&E has obviously incurred substantial costs to replace these SmartMeters.⁵ Yet, PG&E has made no

⁴ DRA Response to the City's Petition dated July 19, 2010, p.3.

⁵ Baker, *PG&E SmartMeters' problems, and how to fix them*, San Francisco Chronicle (May 31, 2010).

attempt to quantify those costs, even though it is reasonable to assume that PG&E could easily do so. It is reasonable to assume that these additional expenditures could exceed the potential costs of suspending deployment for a short period.

Based on the nature and extent of other disclosed deployment problems, additional SmartMeters will likely have to be replaced, or at least repaired during a second visit from PG&E. As a result, PG&E will undoubtedly incur additional costs. Yet, without providing a relevant cost comparison, PG&E urges the Commission to find that continuing to deploy thousands of SmartMeters that eventually will have to be repaired or replaced is the most cost effective way to proceed.

The City understands that some of these costs may be difficult to quantify and would only be estimates. But that is no different than PG&E's cost estimates to temporarily suspend deployment. As PG&E readily admits, its analysis of those costs requires "multiple layers of simplifying assumptions" and "countless combinations of quantifiable and non-quantifiable variables."⁶ Despite the "significant uncertainty" that exists,⁷ PG&E was able to provide the Commission with an estimate of those costs. It is a telling failure on PG&E's part to omit from its cost calculations an estimate of the cost of forging ahead with its deployment despite the fact that thousands of additional SmartMeters might have to be replaced or repaired.

PG&E has also failed to consider the costs that PG&E has incurred to convince the public that there are no problems with its SmartMeter deployment. PG&E's television commercials touting its SmartMeter technology are clearly intended to diffuse mounting customer concern over PG&E's deployment. In addition, PG&E has been sending its representatives to places like the Town of Fairfax, the City of Watsonville, and the County of Santa Cruz to lobby local government officials and appear at public meetings to address those communities' support for a temporary

⁶ PG&E's Response in Compliance with ALJ's Ruling Requiring Cost Data, p.4.

⁷ PG&E's Response in Compliance with ALJ's Ruling Requiring Cost Data, p.4.

suspension of PG&E's SmartMeter deployment. These costs could have been avoided had the Commission acted on the City's petition when it was filed.

III. CONCLUSION

PG&E has failed to show that the costs of suspending deployment of SmartMeters would exceed the cost of replacing or repairing thousands of defective SmartMeters. For this reason, in deciding whether to grant the City's petition and temporarily suspend PG&E's SmartMeter deployment, the Commission should reject the assumption that a suspension would unreasonably costly to ratepayers. It in fact might save ratepayers money. There simply is not enough evidence for the Commission to make that determination.

The Commission should instead focus on the undisputed evidence that PG&E's SmartMeter deployment has been flawed from the outset, and that reining in that deployment now – while there are still millions of SmartMeters to be deployed – is the Commission's most prudent course of action. The City respectfully requests that the Commission grant its petition and temporarily suspend PG&E's SmartMeter deployment.

Dated: August 27, 2010

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
THERESA L. MUELLER
Chief Energy and Telecommunications Deputy
WILLIAM K. SANDERS
AUSTIN YANG
Deputy City Attorneys

By: _____ /S/
WILLIAM K. SANDERS

Attorneys for Petitioner
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
City Hall Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, California 94102-4682
Telephone: (415) 554-6771
Facsimile: (415) 554-4757
E-Mail: william.sanders@sfgov.org

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, **PAULA FERNANDEZ**, declare that:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is City Attorney's Office, City Hall, Room 234, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 554-4623.

On August 27, 2010, I served the foregoing **RESPONSE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TO PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S SUBMISSION OF DATA ON THE ESTIMATED COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH SUSPENSION OF SMARTMETER TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT** by electronic mail on the CPUC Service List, Proceeding No. A.07-12-009.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on August 27, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/
PAULA FERNANDEZ



CPUC Home

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

PROCEEDING: A0712009 - PG&E - TO INCREASE R
FILER: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LIST NAME: LIST
LAST CHANGED: AUGUST 25, 2010

DOWNLOAD THE COMMA-DELIMITED FILE
ABOUT COMMA-DELIMITED FILES

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Parties

STEVEN D. PATRICK
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
 555 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 1400
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1011
 FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

MARC JOSEPH
 ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
 601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000
 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
 FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
 EMPLOYEES

WILLIAM SANDERS
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 CITY HALL, RM. 234
 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
 FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

KAREN P. PAULL
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 LEGAL DIVISION,
 ROOM 4300
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DRA

PAUL ANGELOPULO
 CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
 LEGAL DIVISION
 ROOM 4107
 505 VAN NESS AVENUE
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
 FOR: DIVISION OF RATEPAYER'S ADVOCATES

JIM R. KARPIAK
 TOWN OF FAIRFAX
 44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 3800
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
 FOR: TOWN OF FAIRFAX

NINA SUETAKE
 THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
 115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
 FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

CHONDA J. NWAMU
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 77 BEALE STREET, B30A
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC

EDWARD G. POOLE

BRIAN K. CHERRY

ANDERSON & POOLE
 601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-2812
 FOR: WESTERN MANUFACTURED HOUSING COOM.
 ASSOC.

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
 77 BEALE ST., MC B10C, PO BOX 77000
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

DAVID J. BYERS
 MCCracken & BYERS, LLP
 1920 LESLIE STREET
 SAN MATEO, CA 94403-1325
 FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET
 LIGHT ASSOCIATION

KRISTEN M. POWELL
 CITY OF MONTE SERENO
 18041 SARATOGA-LOS GATOS ROAD
 MONTE SERENO, CA 95030
 FOR: CITY OF MONTE SERENO

CELESTIAL S.D. CASSMAN
 ATCHISON BARISONE CONDOTTI & KOVACEVICH
 333 CHURCH STREET
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: CITY OF CAPITOLA

DANA MCRAE
 COUNTY COUNSEL
 COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ
 701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 505
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

JOHN G. BARISONE
 CITY ATTORNEY
 ATCHISON BARISONE CONDOTTI & KOVACEVICH
 333 OCEAN STREET
 SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
 FOR: CITY OF SANTA CRUZ

KRISTEN M. POWELL
 CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY
 ONE CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
 SCOTTS VALLEY, CA 95066
 FOR: CITY SCOTTS VALLEY

JESSICA PEREYDA
 TECHNET
 1215 K STREET, SUITE 1900
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
 FOR: TECHNET

Information Only

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
 EMAIL ONLY
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
 FOR: MRW & ASSOCIATES

JULIE DUMOULIN-SMITH
 ASSOCIATE ANALYST
 NATURAL GAS & ELECTRIC UTILITIES GROUP
 1285 AVE. OF THE AMERICAS
 NEW YORK, NY 10019

ADAR ZANGO
 ANALYST
 ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS
 535 MADISON - 6TH FLOOR
 NEW YORK, NY 10022
 FOR: ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS

R.W. BAIRD & CO.
 2525 WEST END AVE
 NASHVILLE, TN 37203

WILLIAM HARRISON
 ROBERT W. BAIRD
 777 E. WISCONSIN AVE
 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

RASHA PRINCE
 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO
 555 WEST 5TH STREET, GT14D6
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

GREGORY KLATT
 ATTORNEY AT LAW
 DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

CASE ADMINISTRATION
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
 LAW DEPARTMENT, ROOM 370

411 E. HUNTINGTON DR., NO. 107-356
ARCADIA, CA 91006

2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 370
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

JANET S. COMBS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PO BOX 800
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

CAROL MANSON
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

REBECCA W. GILES
SDG&E AND SOCALGAS
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

ERIC P. DRESSELHUYS
SILVER SPRING NETWORKS
555 BROADWAY STREET
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

PATRICIA WYROD
SILVER SPRING NETWORKS
555 BROADWAY STREET
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

RACHAEL E. KOSS
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZA
601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

AUSTIN M. YANG
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, RM. 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GODDLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DENNIS J. HERRERA
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
FOR: INTERVENORS, CITY & COUNTY OF S.F.

CHRISTOPHER DANFORTH
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA

THERESA L. MUELLER
CHIEF ENERGY & TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEPUTY
SAN FRANCISCO CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682

SANDRA ROVETTI
REGULATORY AFFAIRS MANAGER
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

THERESA BURKE
SAN FRANCISCO PUC
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

DIONNE ADAMS
OPERATION REVENUE REQUIREMENTS DEPT
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAREN FORSGARD
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MC B8Q
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

LAUREN ROHDE
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

RONALD HELGENS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
245 MARKET STREET, MC N12G
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

BENJAMIN J. KALLO
 VP - CLEAN TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH
 ROBERT W. BAIRD & CO.
 101 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 1350
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
 425 DIVISADERO ST., SUITE 303
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

CLIFF GLEICHER
 DIRECTOR - GENERAL LITIGATION
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 77 BEALE ST., MC B30A, PO BOX 7442
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

J. MICHAEL REIDENBACH
 LAW DEPARTMENT
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 PO BOX 7442
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.

SHIRLEY A. WOO
 ATTORNEY AT LAW
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 PO BOX 7442, MC B30A
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE COORDINATION
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 PO BOX 770000; MC B9A
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

ELAINE WONG
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 PO BOX 770000, MC B10B
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

STEVEN W. FRANK
 LAW DEPARTMENT
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B30A
 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
 FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

CHRIS KING
 CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER
 EMETER STRATEGIC CONSULTING
 2215 BIDGEPOINTE PARKWAY, STE 300
 SAN MATEO, CA 94404
 FOR: EMETER

MICHAEL ROCHMAN
 MANAGING DIRECTOR
 SCHOOL PROJECT UTILITY RATE REDUCTION
 1850 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 235
 CONCORD, CA 94520

REED V. SCHMIDT
 BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
 1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
 BERKELEY, CA 94703-2714
 FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET
 LIGHT ASSOCIATION

PATRICK J. FORKIN III, CPA
 VP-CORPORATE DEVELOPMENT
 DAYSTAR TECHNOLOGIES
 2972 STENDER WAY
 SANTA CLARA, CA 95054

JEFF FRANCETIC
 BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT MANAGER
 LANDIS+GYR, INC.
 14891 LAGO DRIVE
 RANCHO MURIETA, CA 95683

SANDI MAURER
 EMF SAFETY NETWORK
 PO BOX 1016
 SEBASTOPOL, CA 95743

ROGER LEVY
 LEVY AND ASSOCIATES
 2805 HUNTINGTON ROAD
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

BENJAMIN SCHUMAN
 PACIFIC CREST SECURITIES
 111 SW 5TH AVE, 42ND FLR
 PORTLAND, OR 97204

State Service

ALOKE GUPTA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ANDREW CAMPBELL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ROOM 5203
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

BRUCE KANESHIRO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRISTOPHER J. BLUNT
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA

CHRISTOPHER R VILLARREAL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
POLICY & PLANNING DIVISION
ROOM 5119
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOE COMO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DRA - ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH
ROOM 4101
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA

KARL MEEUSEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LEE-WHEI TAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
ROOM 4102
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MATTHEW DEAL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
POLICY & PLANNING DIVISION
ROOM 5119
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

RASHID A. RASHID
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

REBECCA TSAI-WEI LEE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA

SCARLETT LIANG-UEJIO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

THOMAS ROBERTS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY PRICING AND CUSTOMER PROGRAMS BRA
ROOM 4104
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 2106
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

WENDY AL-MUKDAD
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

[TOP OF PAGE](#)

[BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)