



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**FILED**

11-04-10  
02:36 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the )  
Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program )  
Refinements, and Establish Annual Local )  
Procurement Obligations. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

R.09-10-032  
(Filed October 29, 2009)

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E) OPPOSITION**  
**TO JOINT MOTION OF THE CITY OF OXNARD AND THE UTILITY REFORM**  
**NETWORK FOR CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN PHASE 2 OF**  
**THE PROCEEDING**

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA  
JONI A. TEMPLETON

Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-6210  
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935  
E-mail: Joni.Templeton@sce.com

Dated: November 4, 2010

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the )  
Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program )  
Refinements, and Establish Annual Local )  
Procurement Obligations. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

R.09-10-032  
(Filed October 29, 2009)

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY’S (U 338-E) OPPOSITION  
TO JOINT MOTION OF THE CITY OF OXNARD AND THE UTILITY REFORM  
NETWORK FOR CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN PHASE 2 OF  
THE PROCEEDING**

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) hereby opposes the Joint Motion of the City of Oxnard (the City) and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) (together, Moving Parties) for Consideration of Issues to be Addressed in Phase 2 of the Proceeding (the Motion).

**I.**

**INTRODUCTION**

In its Motion, the Moving Parties seek a ruling determining that Phase 2 of this proceeding will include consideration of the need for a proposed peaker plant to be located in Oxnard, California. This issue is outside the scope of this phase of the proceeding, which is intended to address Resource Adequacy (RA) issues and not to accommodate a request to revisit whether a peaker plant that has already been approved through the appropriate processes should be constructed. Furthermore, the Commission has already considered and denied the Moving Parties request to reconsider this issue. On January 21, 2010, Commissioner Peevey and

Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Wetzell issued a joint ruling denying a virtually identical motion by the City and TURN to vacate an August 15, 2006 Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR) that directed SCE to pursue immediately the development of up to five SCE-owned, black-starting peaker units, of up to 250 megawatts (MW) total generating capacity. As in the current Motion, the City and TURN's joint motion to vacate the ACR argued that the Commission should assess the need for the Oxnard peaker because of changed conditions since the 2006 ACR. The Commission denied that motion, finding that the Commission had already granted the authority to construct the peaker. The Commission also found that granting the motion would set poor public policy:

[G]ranteeing the relief sought by Moving Parties would set an improper precedent, "as it would imply that any energy project can be second-guessed and halted, even after the developer has committed a large investment, if load forecasts have temporarily changed downwards, if the developer encounters delay beyond its reasonable control, or if the project is overtaken by another generation project coming online in the interim."<sup>1</sup>

As discussed further below, given that the Commission denied a virtually identical motion by the Moving Parties earlier this year and that the Oxnard peaker has already been approved through the appropriate processes, the Commission should not revisit the authority to construct the peaker. Therefore, the Motion should be denied.

## II.

### **THE MOTION IS AN ABUSE OF THE COMMISSION'S PROCESS BECAUSE THE OXNARD PEAKER HAS ALREADY BEEN EXAMINED THROUGH AN EXTENSIVE APPROVAL PROCESS**

In response to the extreme heat event and power demands of Summer 2006, Commission President Peevey issued an Assigned Commissioner Ruling (ACR) dated August 15, 2006 that directed SCE to pursue immediately the development of up to five SCE-owned, black-starting

---

<sup>1</sup> Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Joint Ruling on (1) Motion for Party Status and (2) Motion to Vacate Portions of Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Dated August 15, 2006, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated January 21, 2010 at 8 (quoting SCE's Response at p. 8).

peaker units, of up to 250 megawatts (MW) total generating capacity. In response to the ACR, SCE submitted Advice Letter 2031-E, in which it requested Commission approval to establish a memorandum account to record the acquisition and installation costs of these five peakers. No protests to the Advice Letter were filed. After considering SCE's Advice Letter, the full Commission approved and confirmed the ACR on November 9, 2006 in Resolution E-4031, which stated:

SCE is authorized to develop utility-owned peaker units, consistent with the requirements of the ACR and this Resolution, without using a competitive solicitation process to procure such units as required by D.04-12-048.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, SCE set out permitting, constructing, and installing five peaker generation units across southern California (totaling approximately 250 megawatts). Four came on-line by the Summer of 2007. SCE is confident the fifth would have as well, except that it was sited in the City of Oxnard in the Coastal Zone, requiring a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) from the City. From early 2007, the City has done whatever it can to block the CDP and construction of the peaker without regard to its merit.

SCE filed its CDP application with the City of Oxnard, which is the California Coastal Commission's (CCC) approved local designee for coastal projects located within City limits, in November of 2006. On July 24, 2007, the Oxnard City Council rejected SCE's CDP application for the sole stated reason that the plant was allegedly inconsistent with the City's Energy Coastal zoning designation because the project did not utilize once through cooling. SCE appealed this rejection to the CCC on August 9, 2007. On March 10, 2009, the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) reconfirmed the continuing need for the fifth peaker, urging the CCC "to approve the Oxnard peaker project as a necessary and important addition to the California electric system."<sup>3</sup> On April 9, 2009, after a lengthy twenty-month process in which both the City and TURN actively opposed the issuance of the project's environmental permit, the CCC

---

<sup>2</sup> Resolution E-4031, Ordering Paragraph 5.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix A to the Motion.

reversed the City's rejection of the CDP for the fifth peaker. Shortly thereafter, on April 28, 2009, SCE notified the Commission of its intent to begin pre-construction. The final CDP issued in August of 2009, and SCE promptly began its pre-construction activities.

On June 17, 2009, the City, TURN, and CAUSE<sup>4</sup> filed a motion for "clarification" of the ACR in Docket A.7-12-029 (the Peaker Cost Recovery docket), asking the Commission to perform a "need and siting" inquiry before the fifth peaker is completed. The Commission did not grant the City's "clarification" motion, and on August 20, 2009 and September 24, 2009, SCE informed Administrative Law Judge Long, President Peevey, and the full Commission that SCE intended to proceed with construction to achieve an on-line date prior to the summer of 2010.

Concurrent with the above, the City appealed the CCC decision to issue the CDP by a writ to the Los Angeles Superior Court. In a lengthy written opinion, Judge Yaffe rejected all of the City's arguments about alleged deficiencies in the CCC process. The City has filed a notice of appeal of that decision to the California Court of Appeals.

On December 1, 2009, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, the City and TURN filed a joint motion to vacate the ACR and "revisit the purported need for generation resources in this part of SCE's service territory."<sup>5</sup> The Commission denied the motion, finding that the Commission had already granted the authority to construct the peaker and that "granting the relief sought by Moving Parties would set an improper precedent, 'as it would imply that any energy project can be second-guessed.'"<sup>6</sup>

Now, through this Motion, the City is again attempting to use this docket to block SCE's authorized construction of the fifth peaker. As with its prior attempts, the Motion should be denied.

---

<sup>4</sup> CAUSE is a local Ventura group that also opposed the project during the environmental permitting process.

<sup>5</sup> Oxnard/TURN's Joint Motion to Vacate Portions of the August 15, 2006 Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and for Further Relief, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated December 1, 2009, at 2-3.

<sup>6</sup> Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Joint Ruling on (1) Motion for Party Status and (2) Motion to Vacate Portions of Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Dated August 15, 2006, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated January 21, 2010 at 8 (quoting SCE's Response at p. 8).

### III.

#### **THE MOTION HAS NO SUBSTANTIVE MERIT AND GRANTING THE MOTION WOULD SET POOR POLICY PRECEDENT**

As SCE explained in its response to the Moving Parties' joint motion on this same issue in December 2009,<sup>7</sup> the Motion is without any substantive merit. The fifth peaker is properly authorized, and contrary to the Motion's implications, there continues to be a very serious, unmet need for blackstart-capable peaking generation within the Ventura County-Santa Barbara County area of SCE's grid. Further, quick start peaking resources are needed for SCE to meet the Commission's renewable energy goal of 33% while maintaining grid reliability. Finally, granting the Motion would set a poor policy precedent for utility procurement practices.

#### **A. The Fifth Peaker is Authorized**

The fifth peaker was authorized by the ACR and Resolution E-4031 in 2006. There has been **no** Commission direction to the contrary in the subsequent three years, despite numerous opportunities to do so if the Commission wished. **Nothing** in the ACR or Resolution E-4031 stated or even implied that construction authorization would expire in the absence of the Commission explicitly so stating.

The ACR and Resolution E-4031 indicated that SCE should "**pursue the development** and installation of up to 250 MW of black-start, dispatchable generation capacity within its service territory for summer 2007 operation" (emphasis added). It is indisputable that SCE has diligently pursued the development of this project, despite the unreasonable opposition of the City, which has directly caused the delay in its original schedule.

Further, it is also undisputed that the expenditure of funds to develop and construct the fifth peaker was properly authorized by the full Commission. SCE has relied on that authorization to procure equipment, and to design, engineer, site, and complete the

---

<sup>7</sup> See SCE's Response to Oxnard/TURN's Joint Motion to Vacate Portions of the August 15, 2006 Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and for Further Relief, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated December 14, 2009.

environmental review process for the project. To date, SCE has spent approximately \$40 million on the development of the fifth peaker, including pursuing the permitting process before the CCC and now the state courts as a result of the City's appeal.

**B. The Fifth Peaker is Needed**

SCE addressed the continuing need for the fifth peaker in its Response to the June 17, 2009 Motion for Clarification in the Peaker Cost Recovery Docket. To summarize briefly:

- All four of the installed peakers have been dispatched at various times since they became available in August 2007, most notably during the heat wave that hit southern California in the last week of August 2007, and during the late-October 2007 period of severe Santa Ana winds and widespread brush fires. In addition, in the vast majority of hours the peakers also benefit SCE ratepayers as part of SCE's non-spinning reserve portfolio.
- The CAISO recently confirmed a continuing need for the fifth peaker for grid reliability purposes.<sup>8</sup>
- The fifth peaker site is located in an area of the grid especially in need of black start capability, where it will provide valuable local reliability benefits to the entire Ventura County-Santa Barbara region of SCE's territory, and will bring ancillary reliability and transmission benefits to the overall system as directed by the ACR.
- As California moves towards increased reliance on intermittent renewable energy sources such as wind and solar power, there is an increasing need for quick-starting conventional generation to back-up these sources during periods when they are not available.

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix A to the Motion.

Moreover, the fifth peaker does not represent any bypassing or supplanting of SCE's competitive generation procurement process, since all five peakers developed pursuant to the ACR have all been developed in addition to, not instead of, SCE's Commission-authorized solicitations for generation. Further, SCE has already conducted a competitive bid that included a request for black start peaking resources. In its 2006 RFO process, SCE requested that Independent Power Producers bid black start peaking projects for consideration for construction by 2007, 2010, or 2013. SCE received no offers for black start peakers in response to that solicitation. Therefore, SCE has already conducted a competitive bid process to determine if an alternate resource authorized under SCE's Long Term Procurement Plan might exist that would fulfill SCE's need for black start peaking resources in the Ventura/Santa Barbara region.

**C. The Requested Relief Would Set a Poor Policy Precedent**

The Motion asks in effect that the Commission revisit and reconsider a prior Commission need determination even after the project developer, has already spent a very significant amount of capital – approximately \$40 million (out of a total estimated project cost of \$60 million) – pursuing the project in reliance upon the Commission's earlier determination. As SCE argued in its December 14, 2009 response to the Moving Parties' motion to vacate the ACR, this **“would set an extremely poor precedent, as it would imply that any energy project can be second-guessed and halted, even after the developer has committed a large investment, if load forecasts have temporarily changed downwards, if the project developer encounters delay beyond its reasonable control, or if the project is overtaken by another generation project coming online in the interim.”**<sup>2</sup> As SCE noted earlier, when ruling on the Moving Parties' December 1, 2009 motion to vacate the ACR, the Commission agreed with SCE that granting the

---

<sup>2</sup> SCE's Response to Oxnard/TURN's Joint Motion to Vacate Portions of the August 15, 2006 Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and for Further Relief, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated December 14, 2009, at 8 (emphasis added).

requested relief would set an improper precedent.<sup>10</sup> The same reasoning applies here. Moreover, as explained below, in this case, the delay is almost entirely attributable to the City's delaying actions.

What the City would have the Commission do -- make a generation needs determination and then continuously reassess the need for such generation as each unit comes online based on other resources and load forecasts -- is impractical and inconsistent with well-established Commission procurement practice. Such a practice would deter generators from entering into contracts with utilities, because at any moment the "need" for the new generation could be reassessed and potentially disappear. No reasonable counter-party would begin permitting for generation under such circumstances or procure long-lead-time equipment, making the entire existing procurement regime commercially impractical. Moreover, if the City's motion is granted, it will cause generators to increase their required cost of capital to reflect this increased regulatory risk. SCE expects that generation projects would become extremely costly -- if not impossible -- to finance if the Commission creates this kind of project risk.

Such a rolling-needs-evaluation regime is particularly inappropriate under these circumstances. Although the City tries to divert the Commission's attention from why the fifth peaker was not completed for the 2007 summer season,<sup>11</sup> it is important to note that it is the **City's** obstructionism that has largely caused the delay. The City delayed and improperly denied the project's initial permit, specifically to prevent the project from coming on line in Summer 2007 in hopes they could ultimately block it. Then, during the appeal process before the CCC, the City further contributed to delay the process by, among other things, raising spurious last minute claims prior to and during hearings. This added significant time to the approval process. Now, after SCE has lawfully obtained the CDP, the City seeks to impose further delay by

---

<sup>10</sup> Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Joint Ruling on (1) Motion for Party Status and (2) Motion to Vacate Portions of Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Dated August 15, 2006, in Rulemaking 05-12-013, dated January 21, 2010 at 8 (quoting SCE's Response at p. 8).

<sup>11</sup> See Motion at 12, n.12.

refusing to issue SCE's ministerial permits.<sup>12</sup> Acceding to the City's demands in this Motion would reward entities for acting unlawfully to delay projects they do not like, and encourage local jurisdictions to ceaselessly oppose projects within their territory hoping that the "need" for such projects will ebb in the interim. For the Commission to conclude that the City's obstructionist tactics have now delayed the project long enough to kill it, would allow the City to do through its tactics what it has not been able to achieve through the proper regulatory and legal processes. This would effectively grant the City a veto right over an energy project, in contradiction with the California Constitution, the Commission's own policies and practices under GO 131-D, and other statewide law.<sup>13</sup>

#### IV.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons discussed above, the Motion is not appropriate and should be denied in its entirety.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA  
JONI TEMPLETON

/s/ Joni Templeton

By: Joni Templeton  
Attorneys for  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770  
Telephone: (626) 302-6210  
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935  
E-mail: Joni.Templeton@sce.com

November 4, 2010

---

<sup>12</sup> Not content to limit their baseless arguments to this PUC docket, the City and TURN also recently filed a protest to SCE's Advice Letter 2517-E filing. SCE's advice letter correctly claimed an exemption from the G.O. 131(d) permit-to-construct requirements for the transmission work associated with the construction of the fifth peaker.

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., Cal. Const. Art. XII, Section 8; P.U.C. § 761; Commission Decision 94-06-017 (June 8, 1994).

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY'S (U 338-E) OPPOSITION TO JOINT MOTION OF THE CITY OF OXNARD AND THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN PHASE 2 OF THE PROCEEDING** on all parties identified on the attached service list(s). Service was effected by one or more means indicated below:

Transmitting the copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an e-mail address. First class mail will be used if electronic service cannot be effectuated.

Executed this **4th day of November, 2010**, at Rosemead, California.

/s/ Cecilia R. Jones  
Cecilia R. Jones  
Project Analyst  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Post Office Box 800  
Rosemead, California 91770



California Public  
Utilities Commission

CPUC Home

## CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

### Service Lists

**PROCEEDING: R0910032 - CPUC - OIR TO OVERSE**

**FILER: CPUC**

**LIST NAME: LIST**

**LAST CHANGED: NOVEMBER 2, 2010**

**[DOWNLOAD THE COMMA-DELIMITED FILE](#)**  
**[ABOUT COMMA-DELIMITED FILES](#)**

**[Back to Service Lists Index](#)**

### Parties

ABRAHAM SILVERMAN  
SR. COUNSEL, REGULATORY  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
211 CARNEGIE CENTER DRIVE  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540  
FOR: NRG: NRG POWER MRKTNG LLC,  
CABRILLO POWER I LLC, CABRILLO POWER II  
LLC, EL SEGUNDO POWER LLC, LONG BEACH  
GENERATION LLC

JASON A. LEWIS  
VP, ASSIST GENERAL COUNSEL  
JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.  
245 PARK AVENUE 11TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10167  
FOR: JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.

KEITH MCCREA  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SUTHERLAND ASHILL & BRENNAN  
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2415  
FOR: CALIFORNIA MANUFACTURERS &  
TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION

MICHAEL A. YUFFEE  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
600 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096  
FOR: MORGAN STANLEY CAPITAL GROUP, INC.

JOSEPH M. PAUL  
SR. CORPORATE COUNSEL  
DYNEGY INC.  
1000 LOUISIANA, STE. 5800  
HOUSTON, TX 77002  
FOR: DYNEGY MORRO BAY, LLC, DYNEGY MOSS  
LANDING, LLC, DYNEGY OAKLAND, LLC AND  
DYNEGY SOUTH BAY, LLC

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030  
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367-8102  
FOR: SEMPRA ENERGY/ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL  
ENERGY MARKETS/WESTERN POWER TRADING  
FORUM

JONI A. TEMPLETON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, PO BOX 800  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

DONALD P. GARBER  
SEMPRA ENERGY  
101 ASH STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

GREG BASS  
SEMPRA ENERGY SOLUTIONS LLC  
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 500  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
FOR: SEMPRA ENERGY SOLUTIONS LLC

THOMAS CORR  
SEMPRA GLOBAL  
101 ASH STREET, HQ 08 C  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3017  
FOR: SEMPRA GENERATION

MARCIE A. MILNER  
(1374)  
SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA (US), L.P.  
4445 EASTGATE MALL, STE. 100  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121  
FOR: SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA (US) LP

MONA TIERNEY-LLOYD  
SENIOR MANAGER WESTERN REG. AFFAIRS  
ENERNOC, INC.  
PO BOX 378  
CAYUCOS, CA 93430  
FOR: ENERNOC, INC.

CHARLYN A. HOOK  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 4107  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FOR: DRA

MICHEL PETER FLORIO  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104  
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

EVELYN KAHL  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS & USERS COALITION

MARK R. HUFFMAN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET / PO BOX 7442 (B30A)  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

MICHAEL P. ALCANTAR  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FOR: COGENERATION ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA

BRIAN T. CRAGG  
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY & LAMPREY  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION

MARLO A. GO  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: NORTH AMERICA POWER PARTNERS

LISA A. COTTLE  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, 39TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114  
FOR: MIRANT CALIFORNIA, LLC/MIRANT DELTA, LLC

SARA STECK MYERS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
122 28TH AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121  
FOR: CENTER FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE TECHNOLOGIES/ENERNOC, INC.

BETH VAUGHAN  
CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL  
4391 NORTH MARSH ELDER CT.  
CONCORD, CA 94521  
FOR: CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL

CRAIG MARTIN  
CALPINE POWERAMERICA - CA, LLC  
4160 DUBLIN BLVD., SUITE 100  
DUBLIN, CA 94568  
FOR: CALPINE CORPORATIONS

MATHEW BARMACK  
CALPINE CORPORATION  
4160 DUBLIN BLVD., SUITE 100  
DUBLIN, CA 94568  
FOR: CALPINE CORPORATION

WILLIAM H. BOOTH  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH  
67 CARR DRIVE  
MORAGA, CA 94596  
FOR: CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION

THOMAS BEACH  
CROSSBORDER ENERGY  
2560 9TH ST., SUITE 213A  
BERKELEY, CA 94710-2557  
FOR: CROSSBORDER ENERGY/CAL WEA/CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL

ANTHONY J. IVANCOVICH  
 ASST. GENERAL COUNSEL - REGULATORY  
 CALIFORNIA ISO  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630  
 FOR: CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM  
 OPERATOR CORPORATION

CAROLYN KEHREIN  
 ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
 ENERGY USERS FORUM  
 2602 CELEBRATION WAY  
 WOODLAND, CA 95776  
 FOR: ENERGY USERS FORUM

ANDREW B. BROWN  
 ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, L.L.P.  
 2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905  
 FOR: SIERRA PACIFIC POWER CO.

## Information Only

---

BRAD WETSTONE  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CARLOS LAMAS-BABBINI  
 COMVERGE, INC.  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CINDY L. CASSELMAN  
 PILOT POWER GROUP, INC. (1365)  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JOHN W. LESLIE, ESQ.  
 LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KEVIN WOODRUFF  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SHAWN COX  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

WILLIAM LYONS  
 TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000

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

EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALICE GONG  
 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

ARTHUR HAUBENSTOCK  
 BRIGHTSOURCE ENERGY  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

DAVID MORSE  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

DOUGLAS DAVIE  
 WELLHEAD ELECTRIC  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

STEPHEN HESS  
 DIRECTOR, MARKET POLICY & REG. AFFAIRS  
 EDISON MISSION MARKETING & TRADING INC.  
 EMAIL ONLY  
 EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

CHRISTOPHER C. O'HARA  
 ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL-REGULATORY  
 NRG ENERGY  
 211 CARNEGIE CENTER DRIVE  
 PRINCETON, NJ 08540

JOE GORBERG  
 LS POWER GENCO, LLC  
 1700 BROADWAY, 35TH FLOOR  
 NEW YORK, NY 10019

STEVEN HUHMANN  
 MORGAN STANLEY CAPITAL GROUP INC.  
 2000 WESTCHESTER AVENUE  
 PURCHASE, NY 10577

MELISSA R. DORN  
 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY  
 600 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W.  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20005

VICTORIA LAUTERBACH  
 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
 600 13TH STREET, NW  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
 FOR: MORGAN STANLEY CAPITAL GROUP INC.

JAMES ROSS  
 RCS, INC.  
 500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320  
 CHESTERFIELD, MO 63017

LORI NALLEY  
 TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC  
 1422 71ST EAST 71ST STREET, SUITE J  
 TULSA, OK 74136

GRETCHEN SCHOTT  
 SENIOR COUNSEL  
 RRI ENERGY, INC  
 1000 MAIN STREET  
 HOUSTON, TX 77002

TRENT CARLSON  
 VP, REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
 RRI ENERGY, INC  
 1000 MAIN STREET  
 HOUSTON, TX 77002

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN  
 ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES  
 646 EAST THIRD AVENUE  
 DURANGO, CO 81301

FRED MOBASHERI  
 CONSULTANT  
 ELECTRIC POWER GROUP, LLC  
 201 SOUTH LAKE AVE., SUITE 400  
 PASADENA, CA 91101

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
 PO BOX 800 / 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE.  
 ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

JENNA TREBS  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE.  
 ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

MICHAEL D. MONTOYA  
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
 2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, PO BOX 800  
 ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

DANIEL A. KING  
 SEMPRA GENERATION  
 101 ASH STREET, HQ 14  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

DONALD C. LIDDELL  
 DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
 2928 2ND AVENUE  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92103

MICHAEL D. EVANS  
 SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA (US) L.P.  
 4445 EASTGATE MALL, SUITE 100  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92120

NUO TANG  
 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
 8315 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP21D  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

RANDY NICHOLSON  
 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
 8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32H  
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

TRACEY L. DRABANT  
 ENERGY RESOURCE MANAGER  
 BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE  
 PO BOX 1547  
 BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315

INGER GOODMAN  
 COMMERCE ENERGY INC  
 575 ANTON BLVD., SUITE 650  
 COSTA MESA, CA 92626

MARK FRAZEE  
 PRINCIPAL INTEG. RES. PLANNER  
 CITY OF ANAHEIM PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPT.  
 201 S. ANAHEIM BLVD., SUITE 802  
 ANAHEIM, CA 92805

ALAN HOLMBERG  
 CITY OF OXNARD  
 300 WEST THIRD STREET, THIRD FLOOR  
 OXNARD, CA 93030

SUE MARA  
 RTO ADVISORS, LLC  
 164 SPRINGDALE WAY  
 REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062

MARC D. JOSEPH  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO  
 601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000  
 SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

JAMES HENDRY  
 UTILITIES SPECIALIST

KAREN TERRANOVA  
 ALCANTAR & KAHL

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM.  
1155 MARKET STREET, FOURTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

RICK COUNIHAN  
ENERNOC, INC.  
500 HOWARD STREET, SUITE 400  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

ROGER GOLDSTEIN  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

TIM LINDL  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY ST., STE. 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

WILL MITCHELL  
COMPETITIVE POWER VENTURES, INC.  
55 2ND STREET, SUITE 525  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

TOM JARMAN  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE SATREET, RM. 909, MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1814

RAFI HASSAN  
SUSQUEHANNA FINANCIAL GROUP, LLLP  
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 3250  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

THOMAS W. SOLOMON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, 39TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5894

IRENE K. MOOSEN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
53 SANTA YNEZ AVE.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

DIANE I. FELLMAN  
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY & MARKET AFFAIRS  
NRG WEST  
73 DOWNEY STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117

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

ALICE L. REID  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.  
PO BOX 7442  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 7442  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

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

ED LUCHA  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

GRACE LIVINGSTON-NUNLEY  
ASSISTANT PROJECT MANAGER  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000 MAIL CODE B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

ED CHANG  
FLYNN RESOURCE CONSULTANTS INC.  
5440 EDGEVIEW DRIVE  
DISCOVERY BAY, CA 94514

KERRY HATTEVIK  
NEXTERA ENERGY  
829 ARLINGTON BLVD.  
EL CERRITO, CA 94530

SEAN P. BEATTY  
MIRANT CALIFORNIA, LLC  
PO BOX 192  
PITTSBURGH, CA 94565

AVIS KOWALEWSKI  
CALPINE CORPORATION  
4160 DUBLIN BLVD, SUITE 100  
DUBLIN, CA 94568

JEANNE MCKINNEY  
CALPINE CORPORATION  
4160 DUBLIN BLVD., SUITE 100  
DUBLIN, CA 94568

BARRY F. MCCARTHY  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP  
100 W. SAN FERNANDO ST., SUITE 501  
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

C. SUSIE BERLIN  
MCCARTHY & BERLIN LLP  
100 W. SAN FERNANDO ST., SUITE 501  
SAN JOSE, CA 95113  
FOR: CITY OF OXNARD

MICHAEL G. NELSON, ESQ.  
 MACCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP  
 100 W. SAN FERNANDO STREET, SUITE 501  
 SAN JOSE, CA 95113

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH  
 BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.  
 44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE  
 MENDOCINO, CA 95460

DAVID E. MORSE  
 217 F STREET, NO. 53  
 DAVIS, CA 95616

ERIC LEUZE  
 RRI ENERGY, INC  
 4174 RIVA RIDGE DRIVE  
 FAIR OAKS, CA 95628

BETH ANN BURNS  
 SR. COUNSEL - LEGAL & REGULATORY DEPT  
 CALIFORNIA ISO  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630  
 FOR: CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM  
 OPERATOR CORPORATION

CYNTHIA HINMAN  
 CALIFORNIA ISO  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630  
 FOR: CALIFORNIA ISO

KEITH JOHNSON  
 SENIOR MARKET&PRODUCT DEVELOPER  
 CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630

MELANIE GILLETTE  
 DIR - WESTERN REG. AFFAIRS  
 ENERNOC, INC.  
 115 HAZELMERE DRIVE  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630

SAEED FARROKHPAY  
 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
 110 BLUE RAVINE ROAD, SUITE 107  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630

WADE MCCARTNEY  
 SR. MARKET DESIGN & POLICY SPECIALIST  
 CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630

CALIFORNIA ISO  
 LEGAL & REGULATORY DEPT.  
 151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
 FOLSOM, CA 95630

STEPHEN GREENLEAF  
 VP, COMPLIANCE DIRECTOR  
 JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.  
 2864 ABERDEEN LANE  
 EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762

BRIAN THEAKER  
 DIR., REGULATORY RELATIONS  
 DYNEGY, INC.  
 980 9TH STREET, SUITE 2130  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

DARYL METZ  
 CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
 1516 9TH ST., MS-23  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

MIKE JASKE  
 CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
 1516 NINTH STREET, MS-20  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SCOTT BLAISING  
 BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN, P.C.  
 915 L STREET, SUITE 1270  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN KELLY  
 INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION  
 1215 K STREET, SUITE 900  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

JIM WOODWARD  
 ELECTRICITY SUPPLY ANALYSIS DIVISION  
 CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
 1516 NINTH STREET, MS 20  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

SAMANTHA G. POTTENGER  
 ELLISON, SCHNEIDER AND HARRIS L.L.P.  
 2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

JEDEDIAH GIBSON  
 ATTORNEY AT LAW  
 ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS  
 2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
 SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

## State Service

---

DONALD J. BROOKS  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CHLOE LUKINS  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
ROOM 4101  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID M. GAMSON  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
ROOM 5019  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ELIZABETH DORMAN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 4300  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

FARZAD GHAZZAGH  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
ROOM 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FOR: DRA

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

KARL MEEUSEN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVE DIVISION  
ROOM 5217  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LANA TRAN  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRIC GENERATION PERFORMANCE BRANCH  
AREA 2-D  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MARY JO STUEVE  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
ROOM 4101  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PEJMAN MOSHFEGH  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
UTILITY & PAYPHONE ENFORCEMENT  
AREA 2-E  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PETER SPENCER  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
UTILITY & PAYPHONE ENFORCEMENT  
AREA 2-E  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

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

LYNN MARSHALL  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-20  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

---

**[TOP OF PAGE](#)**  
**[BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)**