

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**12-06-06
02:19 PM

December 6, 2006

Agenda ID #6237
Quasi-Legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 06-03-004

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Peevey. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic copies of comments should be sent to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Ebke at meb@cpuc.ca.gov. All parties must serve hard copies on the ALJ and the assigned Commissioner, and for that purpose I suggest hand delivery, overnight mail, or other expeditious method of service. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ ANGELA K. MINKIN
Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:niz

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER PEEVEY**
(Mailed 12/6/2006)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Policies,
Procedures and Rules for California Solar
Initiative, the Self-Generation Incentive Program
and Other Distributed Generation Issues.

Rulemaking 06-03-004
(Filed March 2, 2006)

**OPINION ADOPTING METHODS TO DETERMINE THE RENEWABLE
ENERGY CREDITS FROM RENEWABLE DISTRIBUTED GENERATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
OPINION ADOPTING METHODS TO DETERMINE THE RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS FROM RENEWABLE DISTRIBUTED GENERATION.....	1
I. Summary	2
II. Background.....	4
III. Subsidy Issues	7
A. Overview	7
B. Should RECs Be Apportioned?	8
1. Parties' Comments	8
2. Discussion.....	9
C. Who Should Receive The REC Benefits?	10
1. Comments Supporting that IOUs Receive the REC Benefits.....	10
2. Comments Supporting that Renewable DG Owners Retain the REC Benefits	13
3. Discussion.....	15
D. Should Net Metering Benefits Be Considered in the Calculation of Ratepayer Subsidies?	21
1. Parties' Comments	21
2. Discussion.....	22
IV. Measurement Issues	23
V. Assignment of Proceeding	24
VI. Comments on Proposed Decision.....	24
Findings of Fact.....	24
Conclusions of Law.....	26
ORDER.....	27

OPINION ADOPTING METHODS TO DETERMINE THE RENEWABLE ENERGY CREDITS FROM RENEWABLE DISTRIBUTED GENERATION**I. Summary**

This decision resolves the subsidy and measurement issues raised in Decision (D.) 05-05-011 and Rulemaking (R.) 06-03-004 for Distributed Generation (DG) facilities. We resolve these issues in the context of recently adopted Senate Bill (SB) 1, Stats. 2006, ch. 132, and our previously established policy to promote development of all renewable DG facilities in California. In taking the approach adopted herein, we also recognize our responsibility to achieve the goals of SB 1 without unduly burdening ratepayers.

SB 1 codified the state's commitment to the creation of a self-sustaining solar market, which we interpret to mean one in which ratepayer incentives are no longer necessary to promote installation of solar DG facilities. In D.06-08-028, the Commission adopted a rebate schedule under which the incentives offered to solar system owners and paid by ratepayers decline when certain capacity targets are met.¹ Underlying this approach is the premise that the rebates offered should be calibrated to the realities of the market, such that they are sufficient to motivate installation of solar facilities and should be reduced as the economics of solar become more attractive.

¹ The Commission will modify this decision to make specific conforming changes to reconcile the program as developed by the Commission with SB 1.

We find that Renewable Energy Credits (RECs)² are one among several factors that may affect the economics of solar and other renewable DG facilities, and as such may play an important role in driving the deployment of renewable DG in California and achieving the goals of California Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS).³ In light of this finding, and to facilitate the goals of SB 1, we conclude that renewable DG facility owners should retain 100% of the RECs associated with their facilities. We also recognize that the value of RECs, combined with other market factors, may drive the deployment of solar DG in such a way that SB 1 objectives can be achieved with less ratepayer support than that authorized by the legislature. Thus, consistent with our obligation to protect ratepayers from undue expense, we will revisit the California Solar Initiative (CSI) incentives with an eye toward reducing them in light of the pace of market development. This assessment will be conducted as part of the CSI review process established in Phase 1 of this proceeding. Similarly, we will examine the level of incentives offered under the Self-Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) given the pace of deployment for other types of renewable DG.

² “A REC consists of the renewable and environmental attributes associated with the production of electricity from a renewable resource.” D.03-06-071. Findings of Fact (F.O.F.) 2 and SB 107 (Stats. 2006, ch. 464), which codified and expanded the definition of RECs. Pub. Util. Code § 399.12(g)(2).

³ The California RPS was established pursuant to SB 1078, (Sher) which required procurement of at least 1% per year of renewable energy in California with a goal of reaching 20% renewable energy by 2017. It has recently been updated by SB 107 (Stats. 2006, ch. 464) which, among other things, advanced the 20% goal to 2010 (Pub. Util. Code § 399.15(b)(1)) and provided legislative definition of REC (Pub. Util. Code § 399.12(g)).

Because we allow renewable DG system owners to retain 100% of their RECs, utilities will not be counting the output of renewable DG facilities that have received ratepayer incentives toward their RPS obligations at this time. Thus, we see no reason to impose specific metering requirements beyond those already established in previous decisions. If and when the Commission authorizes unbundled RECs to be applied toward the RPS, it may be necessary to revisit the metering requirements to ensure the number of RECs sold is an accurate reflection of renewable DG system output, consistent with the measurement requirements adopted for grid connected renewable facilities and the Western Renewable Energy Generation Information System (WREGIS) tracking system.⁴

II. Background

DG is a parallel or stand-alone electric generation unit generally located within the electric distribution system at or near the point of consumption.⁵ Self generation refers to DG technologies that are installed on the customer's side of the meter to provide electricity to the customer for a portion of its load. The Commission has long recognized the value of DG in the resource planning and procurement context and has made a substantial effort to encourage the installation of DG in California. The joint agency Energy Action Plan II, issued by the California Energy Commission (CEC) and this Commission, emphasizes the state's commitment to DG development. Toward that end, the Commission,

⁴ WREGIS is a regional renewable energy tracking and registry system. See <http://www.energy.ca.gov/portfolio/wregis/index.html> for more information.

⁵ R.04-03-017, p. 6.

in coordination with the CEC, has implemented several policies and programs that provide financial incentives to DG owners to promote DG deployment. In 2001, the Commission established the SGIP to provide incentives to DG facilities with differential incentives for renewable and super clean DG units. The Commission expanded the SGIP's budget for solar programs by \$300 million in December 2005 to spur additional solar development, and introduced the CSI. In 2006, the Commission committed a total of \$2.8 billion (including the \$300 million) to the CSI with the goal of installing 3000 megawatts of new solar DG facilities in the service territories of the California investor-owned utilities (IOUs) between 2006 and 2016.⁶ We then opened this Rulemaking to develop program rules and policies for the CSI and the SGIP, and to continue addressing general policies related to DG.

We established Phase II of this proceeding to consider, among other issues, two issues that were identified in D.05-05-011 related to the treatment of DG output for the purpose of compliance with the requirements of the California's RPS. In that decision, we clarified how renewable DG can participate in the RPS and explored how the RECs from renewable DG facilities might be counted towards the IOUs' RPS obligations.⁷ A REC consists of the renewable and environmental attributes associated with the production of electricity from a

⁶ The total included 2640 MW for CSI and 360 MW for the CEC's New Solar Homes Partnership. Subsequent passage of SB 1 will necessitate changes to the exact budget and goals, which will be addressed in a forthcoming order, but the basic outline of the Commission's program remains the same.

⁷ The CEC is responsible for determining RPS eligibility of generation and verifying load-serving entities' (LSEs) claims of RPS-eligible energy deliveries.

renewable resource and is an accounting tool for measuring RPS compliance.⁸ In D.05-05-011, we concluded that the owners of renewable DG facilities own the RECs associated with the generation of electricity from those facilities, but we also concluded that we needed to consider:

1. How to calculate the ratepayers' share of DG RECs to fairly reflect the subsidies they have paid to DG projects.
2. How to measure a DG project's output with sufficient accuracy to support the use of the output for RPS purposes.

By a ruling dated July 12, 2006, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) requested comments on the above issues.

Comments were filed by Americans for Solar Power (ASPv), R. Thomas Beach (Beach), Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE), PV Now, joined by California Solar Energy Industries Association and the Vote Solar Initiative (hereinafter "The Joint Solar Parties"), City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), the Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), the Green Power Institute (GPI), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E)/Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), and the Independent Energy Producers Association (IEP).

Reply comments were filed by ASPv, Beach, CARE, Joint Solar Parties, CCSF, DRA, GPI, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E/SoCalGas, and The Utility Reform Network (TURN).

⁸ D.03-06-071. F.O.F. 2; SB 107, new Pub. Util. Code § 399.12 (g).

In the following sections, we address parties' comments on the subsidy questions followed by a discussion of the subsidy issues. Because of the outcome of this issue, it is unnecessary to resolve the measurement issues at this time.

III. Subsidy Issues

A. Overview

The July 12 ALJ Ruling requested proposals on the following subsidy issues:

- What method should the Commission use to determine the portion of a REC from a renewable DG facility that was supported by a ratepayer subsidy?
- Should net metering benefits be considered in the calculation of ratepayer subsidies, and if so, how?

Parties were generally against apportioning the REC benefits between ratepayers⁹ and DG owners, but felt that one or the other should retain them. However, they were sharply divided about whether the ratepayers or renewable DG owners should receive the benefits.

Parties had opposing views regarding whether net metering should be treated the same as SGIP and CSI in determining the apportionment of RECs. Some argued that net metering provides a subsidy to DG owners similar to programs such as SGIP, or CSI and others argued that it does not.

As stated above, the parties briefed several issues unnecessary to resolve in today's decision. Below, we address the following two questions:

⁹ We clarify that in this context the IOUs would be receiving the benefits of RECs on behalf of the ratepayers.

- Should RECs be apportioned between ratepayers and renewable DG owners?
- Who should receive the REC benefits for the CSI and SGIP programs?

B. Should RECs Be Apportioned?

1. Parties' Comments

There is almost unanimous agreement among parties against apportioning the REC benefits. DRA, ASPv, Joint Solar Parties, IEP, and CCSF specifically recommend against dividing RECs between renewable DG system owners and the IOUs. These parties generally argue that such an approach would add to the complexity and administrative burden of the process with little to gain. For example, the Joint Solar Parties recommend against monetizing or dividing REC ownership, because such an attempt would introduce unnecessary complexity, add administrative cost to the program, and would be contrary to supporting the rapid development of solar markets. The Joint Solar Parties claim that “this additional complexity also negatively impacts marketers and installers by increasing the administrative and marketing burdens they face thereby directly increasing their costs.”¹⁰ In addition, the Joint Solar Parties argue that apportioning RECs would be a departure from standard practice in many other states that have solar programs separate from their RPS programs. ASPv points to the difficulty of tracking and accounting for RECs based on the years it has taken to develop and implement the WREGIS tracking system. IEP adds that attempts at apportioning RECs would undermine the transparency and

¹⁰ Opening Comments of Joint Solar Parties, p. 11.

consistency that is sought through WREGIS. CCSF provides a numeric example that illustrates the REC benefits that would be accrued to a single LSE if RECs were to be divided among all RPS-obligated LSEs. CCSF also explains that it would be a multi-step process to devise a methodology to apportion RECs. According to CCSF,

“any method developed would need to track generation and consumption from all eligible customer generators statewide, take into consideration declining rebates and potentially a declining ratepayer contribution to the investment in a DG facility, provide a means to equitably assign subsidized renewable DG RECs among all LSEs that are obligated to participate in the RPS program (IOUs, Energy Service Providers, and Community Choice Aggregators), and track load shifting among LSEs to ensure that the assignment of RECs is proportionate to the contributions made by the ratepayers of a given LSE.”¹¹

2. Discussion

In D.05-05-011, we held that renewable DG system owners own 100% of the RECs associated with their facilities.¹² At the same time, we recognized that the ratepayers make significant contributions towards renewable DG facilities through subsidies and the existence of those subsidies must be taken into consideration. We observed the difficulty this poses for RPS credit allocation, but envisioned we would account for the impact of the ratepayer contribution by adopting a methodology that divided RECs between the

¹¹ See CCSF Comments, Aug. 4, 2006, p. 2.

¹² Ordering Paragraph 2.

ratepayers and the DG system owners. In the July 12 ALJ Ruling, we directed the parties to propose ways to accomplish that allocation.

As noted above, most parties argued against such an allocation process. After reviewing parties' comments, we are now convinced that we should not apportion the REC benefits. From a practical standpoint, it would make little sense to expend the effort necessary to do so, because as the majority of the parties have argued, apportioning RECs would require extensive work and would add unnecessary complexity to our process without providing corresponding benefits to the process. For instance, CCSF provided an example which illustrates a multi-step and complex accounting process for apportioning RECs. We are also concerned that apportioning RECs would create tracking and accounting issues that would have to be addressed. Therefore, we do not require that RECs be divided between the ratepayers and renewable DG owners. However, that holding is not the end of our inquiry. We now have to determine who should receive the REC benefits: the ratepayers or the renewable DG owners?

C. Who Should Receive The REC Benefits?

1. Comments Supporting that IOUs Receive the REC Benefits

Those who believe that ratepayers, through IOUs, should receive the DG REC benefits argue that ratepayers have already paid for the environmental attributes of DG investment and should not have to pay twice for the same benefits (e.g., when an IOU or LSE buys renewable energy to meet its RPS requirements). PG&E, SCE, GPI, and TURN are concerned about ratepayer double payment. They argue ratepayers would end up paying twice for the same renewable output, if utilities have to pay for the renewable attributes in

addition to the output of the DG facilities.¹³ These parties argue that ratepayers pay for the environmental attributes of a renewable DG facility through the incentives provided to renewable DG owners. To the extent ratepayers provide green subsidies to customers installing renewable DG systems, these parties believe ratepayers should receive the green benefits from the DG output.

These parties suggest RECs from renewable DG facilities which receive ratepayer funds should be counted towards the utilities' RPS obligation. PG&E clarifies that this policy should apply only to renewable DG units that receive incentives that are solely based on the renewable attributes of their facilities. In other words, subsidies that are provided to both renewable and non-renewable projects would not be subject to this requirement. TURN also supports this view.

PG&E further clarifies that the new policy should apply only to projects which receive green incentives after these new rules are adopted. SCE adds that this approach is similar to the treatment of central station renewable generation in the RPS program where renewable generators confer the right to the environmental attributes of their output on the IOU, in exchange for payment for their power. Similar to SCE, GPI believes that grid distributed renewables and customer side of the meter (CSM) DG units who receive incentives should be treated equivalently. GPI also supports TURN's position, citing to D.05-05-011, p. 3:

¹³ As several parties have noted, RECs are currently bundled with the energy produced by DG units and, as such, have no value in the current regulatory compliance structure. However, if in the future, RECs are unbundled from underlying energy production, they would have a value separate from the energy and could be bought and sold for compliance purposes. Our discussion of RECs refers to this condition.

“The RPS program should avoid developing rules for DG renewables that confer any advantage or disadvantage to these systems compared with grid-distributed systems... RPS program rules should strive to provide equal treatment for renewables that are grid distributed, and renewables that are on the customer side of the meter, even when the rules specific to these two different types of renewables have to be different.”

GPI interprets “this principle to mean that DG RECs should count towards the California RPS obligation of LSEs in the same way that RECs from-grid-distributed renewables are counted.”¹⁴ GPI further argues that “whether the Photovoltaic (PV) system is connected on the customer’s side of the meter should not make any difference in terms of how it counts towards the RPS.”¹⁵ GPI proposes to allow LSEs to count the energy from renewable CSM DG towards their RPS target. SDG&E/SoCalGas have a slightly different view. They propose adding all the value provided to DG facilities and subtracting the value of energy provided to the ratepayers to determine if there is a positive subsidy from ratepayers to DG facilities. They recommend we use this information to determine if, and over what period, all RECs should accrue to ratepayers.

SCE proposes that the entire output of a renewable DG facility that has received ratepayer-funded subsidies count towards the RPS obligation of all LSEs. SCE argues that the purpose of the renewable DG subsidy is to encourage customers to install renewable DG facilities that would not be constructed

¹⁴ GPI Opening Comments, p. 3.

¹⁵ Id.

without the subsidy. SCE claims utility customers fund numerous subsidy programs such as SGIP, and CSI, and therefore, should receive the renewable benefits of DG facilities that receive those funds. Otherwise, SCE contends that ratepayers would be paying twice for the same environmental attributes, because ratepayers would pay once by providing the incentive and again by either paying the system owner for the RECs, or by having to acquire additional renewable power to meet the IOU's RPS obligation. SCE proposes that if DG owners choose to participate in any subsidy program, 100% of any environmental attributes associated with their generation be transferred to the ratepayers who pay to fund the various renewable DG subsidy programs. TURN also agrees that ratepayers should not pay twice for RPS compliance by funding rebates and incentive programs and also paying separately for RECs. Therefore, TURN supports SCE's proposal.

PG&E proposes to allow the utilities to count the entire output of renewable DG towards their RPS obligations, but only for projects which receive subsidies that are unique to renewables. TURN argues the Commission has never held that DG owners could separately sell 100% of their RECs for RPS compliance. Based on this argument, TURN contends it would be unreasonable for any renewable DG system owner to rely on any assumed revenues from selling RECs in making investment decisions. Furthermore, TURN maintains allowing renewable DG owners to sell their RECs to another entity would endorse double counting on the DG part.

2. Comments Supporting that Renewable DG Owners Retain the REC Benefits

Those who support allowing renewable DG owners to keep their REC benefits, argue that:

- The subsidies paid by ratepayers cover the capital costs of DG facilities and not the environmental attributes from the energy produced by these facilities;
- System owners are responsible for the majority of the investment and assume the majority of risk associated with DG facilities and therefore they should be allowed to retain all RECs;
- Allowing ratepayers to retain RECs could hinder the goals of encouraging deployment of renewable DG;
- The benefits of renewable DG accrue to ratepayers regardless of whether or not RECs are transferred to the utility for compliance purposes;
- The incentives provided to support renewable DG deployment are provided to capture benefits other than those embodied by RECs (e.g., peak capacity) so concerns about paying twice for the same benefits are incorrect;
- It is unclear if subsidies are being provided per se, since the benefits DG provides to ratepayers may more than offset the costs to ratepayers;
- A REC is a property right and therefore there will be a taking issue if the Commission holds the REC should be transferred to the LSEs.

IEP and ASPv argue that incentives provided by ratepayers support non-environmental benefits and thus, the claim that RECs should accrue to the utilities is unsupported. IEP contends that incentives support energy and capacity benefits rather than environmental attributes of renewable DG. ASPv argues rebates do not distinguish between environmental and non-environmental benefits such as resource diversity, and transmission and distribution savings. CCSF contends that DG incentives do not pay for renewable attributes of DG. CCSF points to other benefits such as demand

reduction, and reduced utility procurement risk as ancillary benefits that should be taken into account.

Beach supports renewable DG owners receiving 100% of the value of the RECs associated with the DG facility. He asserts that California ratepayers realize substantial benefits from renewable DG even without directly receiving the associated RECs. He identifies several benefits as “baseline” value. For example, he argues that renewable DG will help the IOUs meet their RPS even if the RECs associated with that DG are not transferred to the IOU. He explains that renewable DG removes retail load from IOUs’ system; thereby reducing the amount of renewable generation the utility must buy to meet its RPS goal.

The Joint Solar Parties assert the SGIP and CSI incentives were designed to offset part of the upfront capital costs of eligible solar systems and were never intended to be used to procure environmental attributes or RECs for inclusion in RPS. As a result, the Joint Solar Parties argue ratepayers have never paid for the RECs and therefore are not entitled to them.

CCSF discusses how additional revenue from REC sales would encourage new renewable DGs to be built, increasing the amount of renewable generation available to meet California’s RPS requirement.

3. Discussion

SB 1¹⁶ directs the Commission and the CEC to implement the CSI consistent with specific requirements and budget limits set forth in the legislation. The overriding goal of SB 1 is to achieve a self-sustaining solar market, in which ratepayer incentives are no longer needed to promote

¹⁶ SB 1, Stats. 2006, ch.132, goes into effect in January 1, 2007.

installation of solar DG facilities. Our decision today is guided by this statute, which affects new solar DG projects, and our policy to encourage installation of all renewable DG facilities in California.

Currently, a variety of incentives and tariff options such as direct renewable DG incentives, net-metering and waived interconnection fees exist to encourage and reward investment in renewable DG. For example, SGIP provides incentives to solar, wind and other renewable DG facilities. The CSI incentives, established in D.06-08-028, are designed to facilitate the goals of SB 1 by making the economics of solar more attractive to potential facility owners. The level of incentives are based on our estimation of the various factors that impact the investment decision, including system costs, electric rates, the availability of net metering, cost of capital, and federal tax incentives. The incentives offered under the CSI are intended to fill the value gap between what prospective system owners receive absent an incentive, in light of the various factors affecting system economics, and what prospective owners need to receive in order to be willing to invest in a solar DG system.

RECs represent another factor that may play an important part in the decision to invest in a solar or other renewable DG systems by providing an additional source of value from which DG system owners can benefit. This value is derived fundamentally from the role that RECs play in backing “green claims.”¹⁷ Such claims can be retained by the DG system owner, thus allowing

¹⁷ A green claim is an assertion of the environmental benefits resulting from a given action. In the case of renewable DG, green claims may embody the host of positive externalities that renewable facilities provide, including all avoided emissions that would have otherwise resulted. Central to this concept is the idea of additionality,

Footnote continued on next page

them to make green claims, or they can be sold to another party for monetary value. Under this scenario, the right to any green claims is transferred to the buyer.

A number of parties argue that RECs do in fact play an important role in the decision to invest in a renewable DG system. To that end, they argue that taking RECs away from renewable DG owners could have a negative impact on the economic feasibility of a renewable DG project.

Unfortunately, little information is currently available about the value of RECs, either in driving current decisions to invest in solar DG facilities or in such future decisions. A number of parties have provided information regarding the value of RECs in other states. We are reluctant to rely on these values, because values from REC markets in other states may not be indicative of what will occur in the California context. At this juncture, we have no reason to believe California will be in the same situation or that a REC market in California will produce the same results.

That said, we agree that RECs could have significant value and may play a critical role in decisions to invest in renewable DG. For example, even if RECs have zero value from a resale or financing perspective, they may be fundamental to making decisions to install renewables to the extent that they enable customers to make green claims. If ownership of RECs is transferred to another party, DG system owners would not be able to make valid green claims. However, we cannot now determine the value of solar or other renewable DG

specifically that the action taken will provide environmental benefits beyond what would have occurred if the action had not been taken.

RECs, nor can we determine the impact that transferring the RECs from DG owners to ratepayers would have on the development of DG solar projects. The future role and value of RECs in motivating solar installations depends on many factors, including whether California migrates to an unbundled REC-based RPS regime, in which the RECs can be purchased separately from the underlying energy by an RPS-obligated entity to meet its renewable energy requirements, as well as the level of demand for RECs in the voluntary market.

Our policy priority in developing the CSI program is to achieve the goals of SB 1, specifically to encourage solar installation and create a self-sustaining solar market. Thus, we are reluctant to make a decision that could potentially discourage investments in DG solar projects and jeopardize this objective. To the extent RECs have any value, whether explicitly through the sale of RECs into a voluntary or a compliance market, or implicitly, by enabling system owners to make green claims, they may provide a benefit, which could affect the decision to invest in solar DG systems. Transferring RECs from DG system owners to ratepayers would remove that potential benefit and thereby could adversely impact decisions to invest in solar and other renewable DG projects.

Allowing solar DG system owners to retain the RECs produced by their facilities is also consistent with the long-term goal of transitioning the solar industry away from ratepayer incentives to a self-sustaining model in which no such incentives are necessary. To the extent that RECs may prove to have any value, whether explicitly or implicitly as discussed above, they could supplement and eventually, in combination with other elements of economic value, replace altogether ratepayer incentives as these incentives are phased out.

In addition, allowing solar system owners to retain the RECs produced by their systems is aligned with the performance-based orientation of SB 1. The amount of RECs, and thus the value that can be derived from them, is directly related to system output. RECs therefore provide system owners an additional incentive to maintain their systems. This incentive exists for the duration of the life of the system.

Finally, we believe that transferring the RECs to the ratepayers as a condition of receiving ratepayer incentives, whether under the CSI or the SGIP, would run afoul of the policy articulated in D.02-10-062 to encourage the installation of renewable DG facilities. In that decision we included renewable DG in our definition of eligible renewable generation under the RPS to encourage installation of additional renewable DG facilities.¹⁸ We fail to see how transferring the RECs to the utilities as a condition of receiving ratepayer incentives, whether under the CSI, SGIP, or via net-metering, would encourage renewable DG installation. Rather, such a transfer might detract from system economics and perceived benefits, and could discourage investment in renewable DG facilities. If, however, we allow system owners to retain their RECs, they will be able to benefit from any demand for RECs derived from the compliance market, if and when the state migrates to an unbundled REC regime for RPS compliance purposes.

For all of the reasons stated above, we will allow solar and other renewable DG facility owners to keep 100% of the RECs associated with their facilities. However, we recognize that in pursuing any legislative mandate, or

¹⁸ D.02-10-062, p. 21.

our own policy initiatives, it is our responsibility to ensure that ratepayers do not pay more than is necessary to achieve the goals sought therein. Currently, ratepayers bear the costs of the CSI and the SGIP. As noted above, the incentives under the CSI are based on our estimation of what is required to promote solar installation consistent with the goals of SB 1. A similar rationale underlies the level of incentives developed in the context of the SGIP.

As conditions change, the level of incentive necessary to motivate renewable DG installation may also change. For example, electric tariffs may change making solar more or less attractive, the federal tax credit may or may not be renewed, system costs could decline at a faster or slower rate than anticipated, and importantly, RECs may provide an important source of value to system owners. The value of RECs should be included with the other relevant factors affecting system economics to determine whether a change in the incentive level or schedule is appropriate. The totality of factors and their collective influence on system economics and their impact on the pace of renewable DG market development is what matters. We see no reason to attempt to adjust the level of CSI or SGIP incentives because of REC ownership alone. At some point, it may be reasonable to adjust the CSI and the SGIP incentives to reflect the realities of the market, including the benefits system owners may derive from RECs. It is our intention to evaluate the incentives being offered on a going forward basis in light of the pace of market development. We will conduct this review as envisioned in D.06-08-028, under which we established a CSI review process, including whether the value of RECs indicates that a different incentive level or reduction schedule than that currently adopted is appropriate.

D. Should Net Metering Benefits Be Considered in the Calculation of Ratepayer Subsidies?

1. Parties' Comments

TURN, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E/SoCalGas argue that net metering is a subsidy that should be considered in our calculation of ratepayer subsidies. TURN considers net metering as a financial subsidy exclusively for solar and wind. TURN submits that "net metering is explicitly intended to recognize and reward the renewable attribute of enrolled generation."¹⁹ As a result, TURN argues that a DG facility's enrollment in a net metering tariff should trigger the transfer of REC. PG&E also notes that for a variety of public policy reasons, the Legislature and the Commission have instituted programs and rules that promote renewable DG, and argues that utilities should be allowed to count the output of renewable DG in meeting their RPS targets.²⁰

SDG&E/SoCalGas offered a method to determine the subsidy by subtracting the avoided energy cost from the billed amount.

In contrast, CARE, CCSF, and Beach argue that we should not include net metering in determining claims on DG REC, because it is not a subsidy. Beach argues the net metering provides a benefit to other ratepayers for which the net metered customer will not be compensated through the net metering tariffs. CARE contends that net metering is not a subsidy. CCSF argues net metering is an accounting mechanism that does not compensate DG customers for excess power above their usage and as such it is not akin to a

¹⁹ See TURN Reply Comments, p. 5.

²⁰ See PG&E's Comments, August 4, 2006, pp. 3, 4.

power purchase agreement. CCSF notes that “unless the customer and the LSE provide for the transfer of the RECs by contract or in a net-metering service agreement, the REC should be the exclusive property of the DG owner.”²¹

2. Discussion

In our July 12 ALJ Ruling, we specifically asked whether net-metering benefits should be considered in the calculation of ratepayer subsidies. In the context of the cost benefit methodology being developed in Phase II of this proceeding, the magnitude of any subsidies being provided by ratepayers will need to be reflected, including those that may be provided via the net-metering tariff. However, whether or not a subsidy is being provided through net metering, and if so, the magnitude of that subsidy is not relevant to the issue of REC ownership since we are not conditioning receipt of ratepayer incentives on transferring the renewable DG RECs to the utilities. Net-metering is a benefit to DG system owners, and plays an important role in the decision to invest in a renewable DG system. This positive influence may be reflected in the pace of development of the renewable DG market, much like other factors such as electricity rates, system costs, the availability of the federal tax credit, and the value of RECs. As in the case of RECs, if the value system owners receive via net-metering is such that fewer direct incentives like those provided under the CSI or SGIP are warranted, we will consider reducing those incentives accordingly. However, as we observed above in the context of the REC discussion, it is the collective influence of multiple factors on the pace of

²¹ See CCSF’s Comments, August 4, 2006, p. 5.

deployment that will be determinative of whether an incentive reduction is appropriate.

IV. Measurement Issues

D.05-05-011 stated that DG participation in the RPS program is hindered by the problem of measuring the electric production from DG facilities.²² In July 12 ALJ Ruling, we sought comments on the following questions:

- How can the Commission measure DG output for purposes of RPS?
- Can meters be installed and if so, what type, and for what size systems?
- If meters are not reasonable for certain smaller systems, what method can be used to measure DG output for these systems?
- How can the Commission ensure that electrical generation consumed on the customer side of the meter is added to the utility's total retail sales?

The above issues would apply only if the output from renewable DG were to be used by the utilities to meet their RPS obligations. Given the approach adopted here to allow system owners to retain 100% of their RECs, utilities will not be counting the output of renewable DG in their RPS calculations at this time. Therefore, the above measurement issues are unnecessary to address at this time. If and when the Commission authorizes unbundled RECs to be applied toward the RPS, it may be necessary to revisit the metering requirements to ensure the number of RECs sold is an accurate reflection of renewable DG system output, consistent with the measurement requirements adopted for grid connected renewable facilities and the WREGIS tracking system.

²² See D.05-05-011, p. 6.

V. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the assigned Commissioner and Maryam Ebke is the assigned ALJ for this portion of the proceeding.

VI. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of Commissioner Peevey in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 14.2(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____.

Findings of Fact

1. There is almost unanimous agreement among parties against apportioning RECs between the load serving entities on behalf of the ratepayers and renewable DG system owners.
2. Apportioning RECs between ratepayers and renewable DG owners would either be highly arbitrary or highly complex.
3. Direct incentives, like those offered through the SGIP and the CSI, tariff options like net-metering, and waived interconnection fees exist to encourage and reward investment in renewable DG.
4. RECs represent another factor that may play an important role in the decision to invest in solar or other renewable DG facilities.
5. Little information is available regarding the value of RECs.
6. Values from REC markets in other states may not be indicative of what will occur in the California context.
7. Even if RECs have zero value from a resale perspective, they may be fundamental to making decisions to install renewables because they may enable customers to make green claims as defined in this decision.

8. If DG system owners transfer their RECs, they would not be able to legitimately make green claims.

9. The future role and value of RECs in motivating solar and other renewable DG installations depends on many factors including whether California migrates to an unbundled REC-based RPS regime, as well as the level of demand for RECs in the voluntary market.

10. To the extent RECs have any value, whether explicitly through the sale of RECs into a voluntary or a compliance market, or implicitly, by enabling system owners to make green claims, they may provide a benefit, which could affect the decision to invest in renewable DG systems.

11. Transferring RECs from renewable DG system owners to ratepayers could adversely impact decisions to invest in solar and other renewable DG projects.

12. Allowing solar DG system owners to retain the RECs produced by their facilities is consistent with the long-term goal of making the solar industry self-sufficient.

13. Allowing solar system owners to retain the RECs produced by their systems is aligned with the performance based orientation of SB 1.

14. Transferring the RECs to ratepayers as a condition of receiving ratepayer incentives, whether under the CSI or the SGIP, would run afoul of the policy articulated in D.02-10-062 to encourage the installation of renewable DG facilities.

15. If renewable DG system owners retain the RECs, then, system owners would have the option of selling their RECs into the compliance market, thereby enhancing the economics of renewable DG, if and when the Commission adopts an unbundled REC regime for RPS compliance.

16. Transferring the RECs from renewable DG systems to the ratepayers as a condition of receiving ratepayer incentives would not encourage renewable DG installation.

17. As conditions change, the level of incentives necessary to motivate renewable DG installation consistent with the goals of SB 1 and the SGIP program may change.

18. Many factors, including the value of RECs collectively, influence renewable DG system economics and thus the pace of renewable DG market development.

19. At some point, it may be reasonable to adjust the CSI and the SGIP incentives to reflect the realities of the market, including the benefits system owners may derive from RECs and net-metering.

20. Net-metering provides a benefit to renewable DG system owners, and plays an important role in the decision to invest in a renewable DG system.

21. Transferring the RECs from renewable DG systems to the ratepayers as a condition of receiving net metering would not encourage renewable DG installation.

22. Because system owners retain 100% of their RECs according to this decision, utilities will not be able to count the output of ratepayer supported renewable DG facilities in their RPS calculations at this time.

23. Under the approach adopted in this decision, there is no need to impose any measurement requirements beyond those to which renewable DG system owners are already subject.

Conclusions of Law

1. In D.02-10-062 we declared that renewable DG is an RPS-eligible resource.

2. RECs should not be apportioned between ratepayers and renewable DG owners.
3. The Commission should allow all renewable DG system owners to retain the RECs produced by their facilities.
4. The Commission should not adjust the level of CSI or SGIP incentives based on the value of RECs or net-metering alone.
5. The Commission should consider reducing renewable DG incentives, if the pace of market development indicates that that fewer direct incentives, such as those provided under the CSI or SGIP are warranted.
6. If and when the Commission authorizes unbundled RECs to be applied toward RPS compliance, it may be necessary to revisit the metering requirements to ensure the number of RECs sold is an accurate reflection of renewable DG system output, consistent with the measurement requirements adopted for grid connected renewable facilities and the WREGIS tracking system.
7. This decision should be effective immediately to resolve the uncertainty of RECs ownership in the circumstances addressed by this decision.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Renewable Distributed Generation facilities shall maintain ownership of all Renewable Energy Credits associated with their facilities.
2. The Commission shall revisit the incentives as part of the California Solar Initiative review process as described here to assess whether or not the goals of

Senate Bill 1 and the Self-Generation Incentive Program can be achieved at lower cost to ratepayers through a reduction in the incentive level or schedule.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability is current as of today's date.

Dated December 6, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ELVIRA NIZ

Elvira Niz

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

***** APPEARANCES *****

Michael Mazur
Chief Technical Officer
3 PHASES ENERGY SERVICES, LLC
2100 SEPULVEDA BLVD., SUITE 37
MANHATTAN BEACH CA 90266
(310) 798-5275
mmazur@3phases.com

Marc D. Joseph
Attorney At Law
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZA
601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080
(650) 589-1660
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
For: California State Association of Electrical Workers

Evelyn Kahl
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
ek@a-klaw.com
For: Energy Producers & Users Coalition

Seema Srinivasan
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
sls@a-klaw.com
For: Cogeneration Association of California

Jan Mcfarland
AMERICANS FOR SOLAR POWER
1100 11TH STREET, SUITE 311
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 346-7578
janmcfar@sonic.net
For: ASPv

David J. Coyle
ANZA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC
58470 HIGHWAY 371
PO BOX 391090
ANZA CA 92539-1909

John R. Redding
ARCTURUS ENERGY CONSULTING, INC.
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO CA 95460-9525
(707) 937-0878
johnredding@earthlink.net
For: Silicon Valley Leadership Group

Karen Norene Mills
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE
SACRAMENTO CA 95833
(916) 561-5655
kmills@cfbf.com
For: California Farm Bureau Federation

Les Nelson
Executive Director
CALIFORNIA SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSN
30012 AVENTURA, SUITE A
RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA CA 92688
(949) 713-3500
lnelson@westernrenewables.com

Vincent Schwent
CALIFORNIA SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSN.
3013 OYSTER BAY AVENUE
DAVIS CA 95616
(916) 837-6380
vschwent@sbcglobal.net
For: CALSEIA

Lynne M. Brown
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY INC.
24 HARBOR ROAD
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94124
(415) 285-4628
l_brown246@hotmail.com

Michael E. Boyd
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC.
5439 SOQUEL DRIVE
SOQUEL CA 95073
(408) 891-9677
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net
For: California for Renewable Energy, Inc.

Jacques De Deken
CEROX CORP
2602 AIRPARK DR
SANTA MARIA CA 93455
(805) 925-8111 X214
Jacques@cerox.com
For: CEROX CORP

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Stephen A.S. Morrison
Attorney At Law
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 554-4637
stephen.morrison@sfgov.org
For: City and County of San Francisco

Grant Kolling
Senior Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF PALO ALTO
250 HAMILTON AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR
PALO ALTO CA 94301
(650) 329-2171
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org
For: City of Palo Alto

Susan Munves
CITY OF SANTA MONICA
1212 5TH STREET
SANTA MONICA CA 90401
(310) 458-8229
susan.munves@smgov.net

Janis C. Pepper
CLEAN POWER MARKETS, INC.
PO BOX 3206
LOS ALTOS CA 94024
(650) 949-5719
pepper@cleanpowermarkets.com
For: Self

Robert Hammon
CONSOL
7407 TAM OSHANTER DRIVE, SUITE 200
STOCKTON CA 95210
(209) 473-5000
rob@consol.ws
For: ConSol

Alexis K. Wodtke
Attorney At Law
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA (CFC)
520 S. EL CAMINO REAL, STE. 340
SAN MATEO CA 94402
(650) 375-7847
lex@consumercal.org
For: California Federation of California

Howard Choy
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1100 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE, ROOM 300
LOS ANGELES CA 90063
(323) 881-3939
hchoy@isd.co.la.ca.us

Tom Beach
CROSSBORDER ENERGY
2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 316
BERKELEY CA 94710
(510) 649-9790
tomb@crossborderenergy.com
For: Self

Christopher Hilen
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533
(415) 276-6573
chrishilen@dwt.com
For: City of Palo Alto

Ann L. Trowbridge
Attorney At Law
DAY CARTER MURPHY LLC
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO CA 95864
(916) 444-1000
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com
For: California Clean DG Coalition

Jane E. Luckhardt
Attorney At Law
DOWNEY BRAND LLP
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-1000
jluckhardt@downeybrand.com
For: California Clean DG Coalition

James Mctarnaghan
Attorney At Law
DUANE MORRIS
ONE MARKET, SPEAR TOWER, SUITE 2000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 957-3088
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
For: Self

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Regina DeAngelis
Legal Division
RM. 4107
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5530
rmd@cpuc.ca.gov

Lynn M. Haug
Attorney At Law
ELLISON & SCHNEIDER
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
lmh@eslawfirm.com
For: Americans for Solar Power

William W. Westerfield, Iii
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
www@eslawfirm.com
For: Fat Spaniel Technologies, Inc.

William W. Westerfield Iii
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
www@eslawfirm.com
For: Sierra Pacific Power Company, Fat Spaniel Technologies,
Inc.

Greggory L. Wheatland
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
glw@eslawfirm.com
For: Vote Solar

Steve Chadima
ENERGY INNOVATIONS, INC.
130 WEST UNION STREET
PASADENA CA 91103
(626) 535-2784
steve@energyinnovations.com
For: Energy Innovations, Inc.

Carolyn Kehrein
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
1505 DUNLAP COURT
DIXON CA 95620-4208
(707) 678-9506
cmkehrein@ems-ca.com
For: Energy Users Forum

Keith Trader
Director Of Sales
ENERGY RECOMMERCE INC
116 E OLIVA CT.
NOVATO CA 94947-2116
(415) 595-0659
ktrader@energyrecommerce.com

Leif Ronnie Pettersson
Chief Technology Officer
ENERGY RECOMMERCE INC.
116E OLIVA COURT
NOVATO CA 94947-2116
(415) 493-5402
ronnie@energyrecommerce.com

Dan Perkins
ENERGY SMART HOMES
983 PHILLIPS ST.
VISTA CA 92083
(760) 315-2055
perkydanp@yahoo.com

Gene Beck
ENVIROTECH FINANCIAL, INC.
333 CITY BLVD. W 17TH FL
ORANGE CA 92868
(714) 532-2731
gbeck@etfinancial.com

David Kopans
FAT SPANIEL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
2 PRINCETON ROAD
ARLINGTON MA 02474
(617) 947-2454
david.kopans@fatspaniel.com

Mary Luevano
GLOBAL GREEN USA
2218 MAIN STREET, 2ND FLOOR
SANTA MONICA CA 90405
(310) 581-2700
mluevano@globalgreen.org

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Mark Johnson
GOLDEN SIERRA POWER
PO BOX 551432
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE CA 96155
(530) 577-5142
markgsp@sbcglobal.net
For: GOLDEN SIERRA POWER

Ronald Moore
GOLDEN STATE WATER/BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC
630 EAST FOOTHILL BLVD.
SAN DIMAS CA 91773
(909) 394-3600
rkmoore@gswater.com

James D. Squeri
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jsqueri@gmsr.com
For: California Building Industry Association

Brian T. Cragg
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
bcragg@gmsr.com
For: Independent Energy Producers Association

James D. Squeri
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jsqueri@gmsr.com
For: California Retailers Association

Michael B. Day
JOSEPH F. WIEDMAN
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 765-8408
mday@gmsr.com
For: PV Now

Joseph F. Wiedman
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY,LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jwiedman@gmsr.com
For: PV NOW

Gregg Morris
GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
2039 SHATTUCK AVENUE, STE 402
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 644-2700
gmorris@emf.net
For: Green Power Institute

Norman A. Pedersen
T. ALANA STEELE
HANNA AND MORTON LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1500
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2916
(213) 430-2510
npedersen@hanmor.com
For: Southern California Generation Coalition

Michael Kyes
7423 SHAUN CT.
SEBASTOPOL CA 95472
(707) 829-3447
michaelkyes@sbcglobal.net

Rod Larson
LARSON CONSULTING SERVICES
973 E. FRONT STREET
VENTURA CA 93001
(805) 652-0104
rod.larson@sbcglobal.net
For: Golden State Water Company

Megan Macneil Myers
LAW OFFICES OF MEGAN MACNEIL MYERS
PO BOX 638
LAKEPORT CA 95453
(707) 263-9662
meganmmyers@yahoo.com
For: ASPv

Sara Steck Myers
LAW OFFICES OF SARA STECK MYERS
122 - 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121
(415) 387-1904
ssmyers@att.net
For: Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Joshua Harris
LAW OFFICES OF STEPHAN C. VOLKER
436 14TH STREET, SUITE 1300
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 496-0600
jharris@volkerlaw.com

John Jensen
President
MOUNTAIN UTILITIES
PO BOX 205
KIRKWOOD CA 95646
(209) 258-7444
jjensen@kirkwood.com

Liz Merry
NORCAL SOLAR ENERGY ASSOCIATION
PO BOX 3008
BERKELEY CA 94703
(530) 852-0354
lmerry@norcalsolar.org
For: NorCal Solar Energy Association

Brian Cherry
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-4977
bkc7@pge.com

Randall J. Litteneker
STACY WALTER
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-2179
rjl9@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Stacy W. Walter
RANDALL J. LITTENEKER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-6611
sww9@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Douglas Larson
PACIFICORP
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 2300
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84140
(801) 220-2190
doug.larson@pacificorp.com

Robert Marshall
PLUMAS-SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OP
PO BOX 2000
73233 HIGHWAY 70 STE A
PORTOLA CA 96122-2000
(530) 832-0110
marshall@psln.com

Harvey M. Eder
PUBLIC SOLAR POWER COALITION
1218 12TH STREET, NO. 25
SANTA MONICA CA 90401
(310) 393-2589
For: Public Solar Power Coalition

Eric Larsen
Environmental Scientist
RCM DIGESTERS
PO BOX 4716
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 834-4568
elarsen@rcmdigesters.com

Gopal Shanker
President
RECOLTE ENERGY
3901 LAKE COUNTY HIGHWAY
CALISTOGA CA 94515
(707) 480-1960
gopal@recolteenergy.com

Arno Harris
RECURRENT ENERGY, INC.
220 HALLECK ST., SUITE 220
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129
(415) 298-7096
arno@recurrentenergy.com

Lori A. Glover
President
S.O.L.I.D. USA, INC.
10645 N. TATUM BLVD., SUITE 200-306
PHOENIX AZ 85028
(602) 677-5741
lglover@solidsolar.com

Steve Rahon
Director, Tariff & Regulatory Accounts
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32C
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1548
lschavrien@semprautilities.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Theodore E. Roberts
Attorney
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017
(619) 699-5111
troberts@sempra.com
For: Sempra Energy Solutions

Andrew Mcallister
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE
8520 TECH WAY, SUITE 110
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 244-7282
For: San Diego Regional Energy Office

Irene M. Stillings
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE
8520 TECH WAY, SUITE 110
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 244-1192
irene.stillings@sdenergy.org

Theresa L. Mueller
Attorney At Law
SAN FRANCISCO CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682
(415) 554-4640
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org
For: The City and County of San Francisco

Kent Sheldon
Commercial Sales Manager
SMA AMERICA, INC.
12438 LOMA RICA DRIVE
GRASS VALLEY CA 95945
(530) 273-4895
ksheldon@sma-america.com

Michael Yambrach
SOLAR ENERGY PRODUCTION CORPORATION
1487 POINSETTIA AVE., SUITE 124
VISTA CA 92081
(760) 734-1700
michaely@sepcor.net

Amber Dean
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6961
amber.dean@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison

Akbar Jazayeri
Director Of Revenue & Tarriffs
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. ROOM 390
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
akbar.jazayeri@sce.com

Case Administration
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-1212
case.admin@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison

Michael D. Montoya
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6057
mike.montoya@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison

R. Olivia Samad
AMBER E. DEAN
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6961
amber.dean@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison Company

Steven D. Patrick
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS/SDG&E
555 WEST 5TH STREET, SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-2954
spatrick@sempra.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric/Southern California Gas

Susan Kulakowski
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
327 BONAIR SIDING
STANFORD CA 94305-7272
(650) 723-4570
susank@bonair.stanford.edu
For: Stanford University

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Janice Lin
Managing Partner
STRATEGEN CONSULTING LLC
146 VICENTE ROAD
BERKELEY CA 94705
(510) 665-7811
janice@strategenconsulting.com

Stephen Miller
CYANE DANDRIDGE
STRATEGIC ENERGY INNOVATIONS
185 N. REDWOOD DRIVE, SUITE 188
SAN RAFAEL CA 94903
(415) 507-2186
stephen@seiinc.org
For: Strategic Energy Innovations

Gary Gerber
SUNLIGHT & POWER COMPANY
1035 FOLGER AVENUE
BERKELEY CA 94710
(510) 845-2997
gary@sunlightandpower.com
For: Sun Light & Power Comapny

Julie Blunden
SUNPOWER CORPORATION
3939 NORTH FIRST ST.
SAN JOSE CA 95134
(408) 240-5500
julie.blunden@sunpowercorp.com
For: Sunpower Corp.

Keith Mccrea
Attorney At Law
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415
(202) 383-0705
kmccrea@sablaw.com
For: California Manufacturers & Technology Assn.

Chris Vaeth
Attorney At Law
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4026
chrisv@greenlining.org
For: Greenlining Institute

Nonya Collier
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4013
nonyac@greenlining.org
For: Greenlining Institute

Matthew Freedman
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
freedman@turn.org
For: TURN

J. P. Ross
THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE
182 2ND STREET, SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 874-7437
jpross@votesolar.org

Sarah Tuntland
2709 MCALLISTER, APARTMENT C
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118
(415) 385-9642
sarahTuntland@yahoo.com
For: TURN

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Edward Randolph
Chief Consultant
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE/UTILITIES AND COMMERC
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 319-2083
edward.randolph@asm.ca.gov

Valerie Beck
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2125
vjb@cpuc.ca.gov

Gary M. Yee
Industrial Section
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
PO BOX 2815
SACRAMENTO CA 95812
(916) 327-5986
gyee@arb.ca.gov

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Michael Scheible
Deputy Executive Officer
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD
1001 I STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95677
(916) 324-6021
mscheibl@arb.ca.gov

Payam Narvand
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS -45
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
pnarvand@energy.state.ca.us

Sanford Miller
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS 45
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 654-5166
smiller@energy.state.ca.us

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
PO BOX 2815
SACRAMENTO CA 95812-2815

Philip D. Pettingill
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD
FOLSOM CA 95630
(916) 608-7241
ppettingill@caiso.com

Jeanne Clinton
Executive Division
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-1159
cln@cpuc.ca.gov

Bryan Crabb
Executive Division
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 322-8858
brd@cpuc.ca.gov

Paul Douglas
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5579
psd@cpuc.ca.gov

Dorothy Duda
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5109
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2800
dot@cpuc.ca.gov

Maryam Ebke
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5101
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2271
meb@cpuc.ca.gov

Julie A. Fitch
Division of Strategic Planning
RM. 5203
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5552
jf2@cpuc.ca.gov

Suzy Hong
Legal Division
RM. 5037
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2116
suh@cpuc.ca.gov

Kurt Johnson
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-5595
kmj@cpuc.ca.gov

Jaclyn Marks
Division of Strategic Planning
RM. 5119
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2778
jm3@cpuc.ca.gov

Jay Morse
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-3113
jxm@cpuc.ca.gov

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Lisa Paulo
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5495
lp1@cpuc.ca.gov

Terrie D. Prosper
Executive Division
RM. 5301
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2160
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov

Don Schultz
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. SCTO
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 327-2409
dks@cpuc.ca.gov
For: DRA

Andrew Schwartz
Executive Division
RM. 5119
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5586
as2@cpuc.ca.gov

Anne E. Simon
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5024
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2014
aes@cpuc.ca.gov

Donald R. Smith
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-1562
dsh@cpuc.ca.gov
For: DRA

Christine S. Tam
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 355-5556
tam@cpuc.ca.gov

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Ronald K. Ishii
AESC, INC.
5927 BALFOUR COURT, SUITE 213
CARLSBAD CA 92008
(760) 931-2641 112
rishii@aesc-inc.com

Karen Terranova
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
filings@a-klaw.com

Donald Brookhyser
ALCANTAR & KAHL
1300 SW FIFTH AVE., SUITE 1750
PORTLAND OR 97210
(503) 402-8702
deb@a-klaw.com

Matt Tennis
Legislative Director
ASSOCIATED BUILDERS&CONTRACTORS OF CA
1029 K STREET, SUITE 32
SACRAMENTO CA 95819
(916) 441-2658
abcstatelobbyist@sbcglobal.net

Reed V. Schmidt
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY CA 94703-2714
(510) 653-3399
rschmidt@bartlewells.com
For: California City-County Street Light Association

Donald B. Rooker
BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE
42020 GARSTIN DRIVE
PO BOX 1547
BIG BEAR LAKE CA 92315
(909) 866-4678 184
donaldrooker@bves.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Tracey Drabant
Energy Resource Manager
BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE
PO BOX 1547
BIG BEAR LAKE CA 92315-1547
(909) 866-1666
traceydrabant@bves.com

Ryan Wiser
BERKELEY LAB
MS-90-4000
ONE CYCLOTRON ROAD
BERKELEY CA 94720
(510) 486-5474
rhwiser@lbl.gov

Mark Stout
Major Accounts - Unlimited Energy
BSEE/MA ENERGY AND RESOURCES
5004 E UNIVERSITY AVE
FRESNO CA 93727
(559) 273-4037
mstout@unlimited-energy.com
For: BSEE/MA ENERGY AND RESOURCES

Bruno Jeider
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK CA 91502
(818) 238-3700
bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
517-B POTRERO AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110
CEM@newsdata.com

Juliette Anthony
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY
678 BLACKBERRY LANE
SAN RAFAEL CA 94903
(415) 507-9147
juliettea7@aol.com

Janice G. Hamrin
CENTER FOR RESOURCE SOLUTIONS
PRESIDIO BUILDING 97
PO BOX 29512
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129
(415) 561-2100
jhamrin@resource-solutions.org

Paul Detering
Ceo
CEROX CORPORATION
2602 AIRPARK DRIVE
SANTA MARIA CA 93455
(650) 492-0611
paul@cerox.com

Steven G. Lins
CITY OF GLENDALE
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
613 EAST BROADWAY, SUITE 220
GLENDALE CA 91206-4394
(818) 548-3397
slins@ci.glendale.ca.us

Lindsay Joye
Marketing Engineer
CITY OF PALO ALTO UTILITIES
PO BOX 10250
PALO ALTO CA 94303
(650) 329-2680
Lindsay.Joye@CityofPaloAlto.org

Tom Hoff
CLEAN POWER RESEARCH
10 GLEN CT.
NAPA CA 94558
(707) 224-9992
tomhoff@clean-power.com

Ted Pope
Director
COHEN VENTURES, INC./ENERGY SOLUTIONS
1738 EXCELSIOR AVENUE
OAKLAND CA 94602
(510) 482-4420 X221
ted@energy-solution.com

Michael Colvin
2603 BENVENUE 4
BERLELEY CA 94704
(415) 710-1224
colvin@berkeley.edu

Donald Miller
Vp Of Strategic Planning - Americas
CONERGY, INC.
660 J STREET, SUITE 270
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 554-3025
d.miller@suntechnics.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Marshall M. Taylor, Esq.
DLA PIPER US LLP
550 SOUTH HOPE STREET, SUITE 2300
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 330-7739
Marshall.Taylor@dlapiper.com

Donald C. Liddell, Pc
DOUGLAS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVENUE
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 993-9096
liddell@energyattorney.com

Dan L. Carroll
DOWNEY BRAND LLP
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-1000
dcarroll@downeybrand.com

Tom Hamilton
Managing Partner
ENERGY CONCIERGE SERVICES
321 MESA LILA RD
GLENDALE CA 91208
(818) 306-5099
THAMILTON5@CHARTER.NET

Kevin J. Simonsen
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
646 EAST THIRD AVENUE
DURANGO CO 81301
(970) 259-1748
kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com

Epic Intern
EPIC/USD SCHOOL OF LAW
5998 ALCALA PARK
SAN DIEGO CA 92110
(619) 260-4806
usdepic@gmail.com

Saeed Farrokhpay
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
110 BLUE RAVINE RD., SUITE 107
FOLSOM CA 95630
(916) 294-0322
saeed.farrokhpay@ferc.gov

Eric Yussman
Regulatory Analyst
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE
LOUISVILLE KY 40223
(502) 214-6331
eyussman@knowledgeinenergy.com

Ralph Dennis
Director, Regulatory Affairs
FELLON-MCCORD & ASSOCIATES
9960 CORPORATE CAMPUS DRIVE, SUITE 2000
LOUISVILLE KY 40223
(502) 214-6378
ralph.dennis@constellation.com

Diane I. Fellman
Attorney At Law
FPL ENERGY, LLC
234 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 703-6000
diane_fellman@fpl.com

Stephen Frantz
6301 S STREET, MS A353
SACRAMENTO CA 95817
(916) 732-5107
sfrantz@smud.org
For: Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Laura Fultz
5004 E UNIVERSITY AVE
FRESNO CA 93727
(559) 486-2266
lfultz@sbcglobal.net
For: Unlimited Energy

Jack Pigott
GEN 3 SOLAR, INC.
31302 HUNTSWOOD AVENUE
HAYWARD CA 94544
(510) 401-5816
jpigott@gen3solar.com

Rachel McMahon
Senior Policy Associate
GLOBAL GREEN USA
2218 MAIN STREET
SANTA MONICA CA 90404
(310) 581-2700
rmcmahon@globalgreen.org

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Michelle J. Breyer
GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.
85 BROAD STREET, 29TH FLOOR
NEW YORK NY 10004
(212) 357-5501
michelle.breyer@gs.com

Ryan Bennett
GREENROCK CAPITAL
14 MAIN STREET
TIBURON CA 94920
(415) 789-8954
rb@greenrockcapital.com

Orlando B. Foote
HORTON, KNOX, CARTER & FOOTE
895 BROADWAY STREET
EL CENTRO CA 92243-2341
(760) 352-2821
ofoote@hkcf-law.com

Elston K. Grubaugh
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
333 EAST BARIONI BLVD.
IMPERIAL CA 92251
(760) 339-9224
ekgrubaugh@iid.com

George Simons
Principal Research Consultant
ITRON
1104 MAIN STREET, SUITE 630
VANCOUVER WA 98660
(530) 756-4168
George.Simons@itron.com

Tony Foster
ITRON INC.
1111 BROADWAY, STE 1800
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 844-2822
tony.foster@itron.com

H. Clinton Porter
KACO SOLAR
1002 B OREILLEY AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94129
(917) 292-7674
cp@kacosolar.com

Nellie Tong
KEMA, INC.
492 NINTH STREET, SUITE 220
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 891-0446
nellie.tong@us.kema.com

Phillip Mcleod
LAW & ECONOMICS CONSULTING GROUP
2000 POWELL STREET, STE 600
EMERYVILLE CA 94608
phillip_mcleod@lecg.com

Heather Hunt
LAW OFFICE OF HEATHER HUNT
242 WHIPPOORWILL LANE
STRATFORD CT 06614
(203) 380-1477
hfhunt@optonline.net

Galen Barbose
LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LAB
MS 90-4000
1 CYCLOTRON RD.
BERKELEY CA 94720
(510) 495-2593
GLBarbose@LBL.gov

Mark Bolinger
LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY
MS 90-4000
ONCE CYCLOTRON ROAD
BERKELEY CA 94720
(510) 495-2881
MABolinger@lbl.gov

Karen Lindh
LINDH & ASSOCIATES
7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB119
ANTELOPE CA 95843
(916) 729-1562
karen@klindh.com

Robert L. Pettinato
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, SUITE 1150
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
(213) 367-1735
robert.pettinato@ladwp.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Dick Lowry
5901 BOLSA AVENUE
HUNTINGTON BEACH CA 92647
(714) 903-5030
LowryD@sharpsec.com
For: Sharp Electronics Corporation - Solar Energy Solutions
Group

Richard Mccann, Ph.D
M. CUBED
2655 PORTAGE BAY, SUITE 3
DAVIS CA 95616
(530) 757-6363
rmccann@umich.edu

C. Susie Berlin
Attorney At Law
MC CARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501
SAN JOSE CA 95113
(408) 288-2080
sberlin@mccarthyllaw.com

Barry F. Mccarthy
Attorney At Law
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
100 PARK CENTER PLAZA, SUITE 501
SAN JOSE CA 95113
(408) 288-2080
bmcc@mccarthyllaw.com

Cathy S. Woollums
MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS COMPANY
106 EAST SECOND STREET
DAVENPORT IA 52801
(563) 333-9008
cswoollums@midamerican.com

David Felix
MMA RENEWABLE VENTURES
640 2ND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107
(415) 986-8038
david.felix@mmarenew.com

Christopher J. Mayer
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
MODESTO CA 95352-4060
(209) 526-7430
chrism@mid.org

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 1440
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 834-1999
mrw@mrwassoc.com

Erin Ranslow
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078
(916) 631-3200
cpucrulings@navigantconsulting.com

Gordon Pickering
Principal
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078
(916) 631-3200
gpickering@navigantconsulting.com

Laurie Park
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078
(916) 631-3200
lpark@navigantconsulting.com

Liz Merry
Executive Director
NORCAL SOLAR
2402 WESTERNESSE RD.
DAVIS CA 95616
(530) 852-0354
lmerry1@yahoo.com

Scott Tomashefsky
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY
180 CIRBY WAY
ROSEVILLE CA 95678-6420
(916) 781-4291
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com

Yonah Offner
1176 BELMONT TERRACE
VISTA CA 92084
(760) 727-7339
yonah@powerbreathing.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Jay Luboff
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-5241
JlLy@pge.com

Josephine Wu
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-3414
jwwd@pge.com

Luke Tougas
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-3610
LATc@pge.com

Michael Campbell
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-8343
MNCe@pge.com

Marianne Walpert
PACIFIC POWER MANAGEMENT
12970 EARHART AVE. SUITE 110
AUBURN CA 95602
(530) 887-1984 109
mwalpert@pacpower.biz

Kyle L. Davis
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH,
PORTLAND OR 97232
(503) 813-6601
kyle.l.davis@pacificorp.com

Steve Endo
PASADENA DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER
150 S. LOS ROBLES
PASADENA CA 91101
(626) 744-6246
sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us

Eddie Jimenez
Director Special Programs
PORTEUS INC.
1830 N. DINUMB BLVD
VISALIA CA 93291
(559) 733-5423
eddie@proteusinc.org

Kari Smith
POWERLIGHT CORPORATION
2954 SAN PABLO AVENUE
BERKELEY CA 94706
(510) 868-1230
ksmith@powerlight.com

David Hochschild
PV NOW
3857 - 20TH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94114
(415) 314-8042
david@pvnow.com

Shilpa Ramalya
77 BEALE STREET, ROOM 981
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-3186
srrd@pge.com

Rosalie A. D'Quilope
Real Estate Advisors
RCLCO
1880 CENTURY PARK EAST
LOS ANGELES CA 90067
(310) 203-3035
rdquilope@rclco.com

James Ross
RCS, INC.
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320
CHESTERFIELD MO 63017
(636) 530-9544
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com

Gary Hinnners
RELIANT ENERGY, INC.
PO BOX 148
HOUSTON TX 77001-0148
(713) 497-4321
ghinnners@reliant.com

Mark Rawson
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
6201 S STREET, MS B257
SACRAMENTO CA 95817
(916) 732-6364
mrawson@smud.org

Charles Manzuk
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP 32D
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 636-5548
cmanzuk@semprautilities.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Joy C. Yamagata
Regulatory Manager
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC/SOCALGAS
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 654-1755
jyamagata@semprautilities.com

Jennifer Porter
Policy Analyst
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE
8690 BALBOA AVENUE
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 244-1180
jennifer.porter@sdenenergy.org

Nathalie Osborn
Project Manager
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE
8520 TECH WAY, SUITE 110
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1450
(858) 244-1193
nathalie.osborn@sdenenergy.org

Sephra A. Ninow
Research Assistant
SAN DIEGO REGIONAL ENERGY OFFICE
8690 BALBOA AVENUE
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
sephra.Ninow@sdenenergy.org

Fraser D. Smith
City And County Of San Francisco
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103
(415) 554-1572
fsmith@sflower.org

Michael A. Hyams
Power Enterprise-Regulatory Affairs
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
1155 MARKET ST., 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103
(415) 554-1513
mhyams@sflower.org

Linda Wrazen
SEMPRA GLOBAL ENTERPRISES
101 ASH STREET, HQ 08C
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 696-4411
lwrazen@sempraglobal.com

Elena Mello
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD
RENO NV 89520
(775) 834-5696
emello@sppc.com

Trevor Dillard
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD
RENO NV 89520
regulatory@sierrapacific.com

Ellen Shafner
SOLEL, INC.
701 NORTH GREEN VALLEY PARKWAY, STE. 200
HENDERSON NV 89074
(866) 677-0444
eshafner@solel.com

Kenny Kleinerman
Manager, Marketing Communications
SOLEL, INC.
SUITE 200
701 NORTH GREEN VALLEY PARKWAY
HENDERSON NV 89074
(866) 677-0444
kennyk@solel.com

Martin Kay
Program Supervisor
SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
21865 COPLEY DR.
DIAMOND BAR CA 91765-3252
(909) 396-2000
mkay@aqmd.gov

Paul Kubasek
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-8183
paul.kubasek@sce.com

Clay E. Faber
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST FIFTH STREET, GT-14E7
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-5129
cfaber@semprautilities.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL
R0603004 LIST

Dan Thompson
SPG SOLAR
863 E. FRANCISCO BLVD.
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
(415) 459-4201
Dan.Thompson@SPGsolar.com

Kevin Fox
STOEL RIVES LLP
900 SW FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 2600
PORTLAND OR 97204
(503) 294-9139
ktfox@stoel.com

Polly N. Shaw
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-3196
pns@cpuc.ca.gov

Robert Gnaizda
Policy Director/General Counsel
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4006
robertg@greenlining.org

Samuel Kang
Economic Development Associate
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4021
samuelk@greenlining.org

Tor Allen
Executive Director
THE RAHUS INSTITUTE
1535 CENTER AVE.
MARTINEZ CA 94553
(925) 370-7262
cpucsolar@rahus.org

Roger Pelote
THE WILLIAMS COMPANY, INC.
12736 CALIFA STREET
VALLEY VILLAGE CA 91607
(818) 761-5954
roger.pelote@williams.com

Paul Lacourciere
Attorney At Law
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 369-7601
placourciere@thelenreid.com

Nancy Folly
TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 949
TURLOCK CA 95382-0949
(209) 883-8506
njfolly@tid.org

Cliff Chen
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTIST
2397 SHATTUCK AVENUE, STE 203
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 843-1872
cchen@ucsusa.org

John Galloway
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS
2397 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 203
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 809-1564
jgalloway@ucsusa.org

Scott J. Anders
Research/ Administrative Center
UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO - LAW
5998 ALCALA PARK
SAN DIEGO CA 92110
(619) 260-4589
scottanders@sandiego.edu

Michael Shames
Attorney At Law
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 696-6966
mshames@ucan.org

Andrew J. Horn
VAN HORN CONSULTING
12 LIND COURT
ORINDA CA 94563-3615
(925) 254-3358
andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 06-DEC-2006 by: LIL

R0603004 LIST

Christopher O'Brien
Sharp Solar
VP STRATEGY AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS
3808 ALTON PLACE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20016
(202) 486-3427
obrienc@sharpsec.com
For: VP STRATEGY AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS