



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

**FILED**  
05-16-08  
04:59 PM

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

FILED  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
MARCH 13, 2008  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA  
RULEMAKING 08-03-008

**TURN'S REQUEST FOR COMPENSATION**

**FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS 06-08-028 AND 07-01-018**



Marcel Hawiger, Staff Attorney

**THE UTILITY REFORM  
NETWORK**

711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 929-8876 ex. 311  
Fax: (415) 929-1132  
Email: [marcel@turn.org](mailto:marcel@turn.org)

May 16, 2008

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	1
II.	TURN'S SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS.....	2
	A. Standard of Evaluation for Substantial Contribution .....	2
	B. TURN's Participation Made a Substantial Contribution to the Holdings and Conclusions of the Commission.....	3
	1. Work Conducted Prior to March 2, 2006 .....	3
	2. Decision 06-05-025.....	3
	3. Decision 06-08-028.....	4
	4. Decision 07-01-018.....	9
	C. TURN's Participation Did Not Unnecessarily Duplicate the Showings of Other Parties .....	11
	D. Benefits To Ratepayers Of Turn's Participation .....	12
III.	ITEMIZATION OF SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES .....	13
	A. Summary .....	13
	B. Allocation of costs and fees by issue and task .....	15
	C. The Hours and hourly rates claimed for compensation .....	15
	1. Attorney hours and rates.....	15
	2. Consultant hours and rates .....	16
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	18

**TURN'S REQUEST FOR COMPENSATION**  
**FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS 06-08-028 AND 07-01-018**

Pursuant to §1801 et seq. of the Public Utilities (PU) Code and Rule 17.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) submits this request for an award of compensation in the amount of \$19,022.65 for its substantial contributions to Decisions (D.) 06-08-028 and 07-01-018, which adopted incentive design and other program design elements for the California Solar Initiative (CSI) program.

**I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

TURN timely filed a Notice of Intent on April 21, 2006, estimating expected compensation of \$80,675 in this proceeding. Assigned Administrative Law Judge Duda issued a Ruling on May 16, 2006 finding that TURN is a customer pursuant to §1802(b), has met the requirement for financial hardship pursuant to §1804(a)(2)(B) and is eligible for intervenor compensation. ALJ Duda cautioned intervenors that they should minimize duplication and should demonstrate “unique presentation of facts or arguments that were relied upon by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) or Commission in resolving this proceeding” in order to qualify for compensation.

Consistent with the requirement of PU Code §1804(c), this request for compensation is being filed within 60 days of March 17, 2008, the issuance date of the Order Instituting Rulemaking 08-03-008, which closed proceeding R.06-03-004.

TURN notes that the Commission has already ruled on requests for compensation filed by three other intervenors in R.06-03-004 in Decision 07-12-007.

Section 1804(c) further requires that a compensation request include “a detailed description of services and expenditures and a description of the customer’s substantial contribution to the hearing or proceeding.” This requirement is satisfied in the following sections. This request for compensation also addresses requirements adopted in the intervenor compensation rulemaking and investigation (see D.98-04-059), including requirements that the benefits to ratepayers outweigh the costs of participation, and that the customer represented interests that would “otherwise be underrepresented.”

## **II. TURN’S SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

### **A. Standard of Evaluation for Substantial Contribution**

Section 1802(h) of the PU Code defines "substantial contribution" as follows:

'Substantial contribution' means that, in the judgment of the commission, the customer's presentation has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer. Where the customer's participation has resulted in a substantial contribution, even if the decision adopts that customer's contention or recommendations only in part, the commission may award the customer compensation for all reasonable advocate's fees, reasonable expert fees and other reasonable costs incurred by the customer in preparing or presenting that contention or recommendation.

The Commission has interpreted the Section 1802 definition, in conjunction with Section 1801.3, so as to effectuate the legislature’s intent to encourage effective and efficient intervenor participation.

## **B. TURN's Participation Made a Substantial Contribution to the Holdings and Conclusions of the Commission**

### **1. Work Conducted Prior to March 2, 2006**

The Commission addressed various issues related to the design and funding of the California Solar Initiative in rulemaking 04-03-017, which was closed upon the issuance of this rulemaking on March 2, 2006. TURN intervened in R.04-03-017 to submit comments on the proposed increase in funding for solar distributed generation. TURN never filed a request for compensation in that proceeding.

Senate Bill 1 was introduced in February 2005 and was under discussion during this entire time period. Arguably, some of the work done by TURN prior to March 2, 2006 (both before and after the issuance of decisions in R.04-04-017) was directly related to the work conducted in this proceeding and could be claimed for compensation in R.06-03-004. However, TURN does not seek compensation for those hours. We document the hours spent in R.04-03-007 and in this proceeding prior to March 2, 2006 for information purposes in Attachment D and in Table 2 below.

### **2. Decision 06-05-025**

TURN filed comments on the March 21, 2006 Ruling of ALJ Duda, strongly supporting the proposed reduction of incentive levels to \$2.50/watt after deployment of the first 50 MW. In Decision 06-05-025 the Commission adopted this change.

### **3. Decision 06-08-028**

In Decision 06-08-028 the Commission adopted several important program design elements for the California Solar Initiative (CSI), including a system of performance-based incentives for payment to qualifying solar technologies. Some provisions were later modified in D.06-12-033 to align the program with the requirements of SB 1.

TURN participated actively in this phase of the rulemaking proceeding. TURN made specific recommendations in our opening comments (filed May 16, 2006) and reply comments (filed May 26, 2006) to the draft staff proposal regarding rebate design and program administration. The Commission adopted several of TURN's recommendations in D-06-08-028 as detailed below.

#### Performance-Based Incentives

TURN supported the adopted of performance-based incentives for larger systems and argued that performance-based incentives should apply to systems over 100 kW initially and be extended to cover smaller systems as experience is gained in subsequent years.<sup>1</sup> TURN suggested a system cutoff between 8 and 30 kW. The Commission agreed with both of these recommendations, as shown in Conclusions of Law 7 and 8:

---

<sup>1</sup> TURN Reply Comments, May 26, 2006. p 1-2. TURN Opening Comments, p. 1.  
TURN Compensation Request

### Conclusions of Law

7. We should apply a PBI structure to solar projects 100 kW and larger based on the ability of customers investing in larger systems to finance system costs.

8. We should transition smaller systems, larger than 30 kW, to a PBI structure in 2010, after we have experience with PBI and to allow sales and financing arrangements to evolve.

Additionally, the Commission approvingly cited TURN's analysis concerning system performance degradation in concluding that no cap on performance incentives should be instituted for high-performing systems.<sup>2</sup>

### Incentive Adjustment Mechanism

TURN recommended that the Commission modify the staff proposal so as to adopt a "volume trigger" based on the amount of deployed megawatts attached to conditional reservations in order 1) to best gauge market demand at particular rebate levels, and 2) to alleviate market disruption and tremendous burdens in managing the fund due to 'stop-and-go' incentive cycles and significant drop out rates.<sup>3</sup> TURN argued that a volume-based trigger best "allows for each distinct market to respond to incentive levels appropriately and independently."

The Commission modified its previously adopted adjustment mechanism so as to make adjustments in incentive levels based purely on volume, agreeing with the analysis offered by TURN and two other parties:

---

<sup>2</sup> D.06-08-028, *mimeo.* p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> TURN opening comments, May 16, 2006, p. 4-5. TURN reply comments, May 26, 2006. p. 6 and 7.  
TURN Compensation Request 5

We make this change to a volume-based MW trigger mechanism because we agree with comments from the solar industry, SDREO, and TURN that we should avoid premature incentive reductions through arbitrary calendar-based adjustments. As TURN points out, an approach based solely on actual reserved MW levels is administratively simple and transparent and captures market factors without burdensome market monitoring. We agree with Sun Light that the Commission should let market forces determine the cost of solar and not incentive levels. We also agree with SDREO that eliminating the time dimension removes the “rush” to submit applications during the final days before a scheduled reduction. A volume-based adjustment mechanism allows the level of demand for solar facilities to drive reductions in Commission incentives.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission supported this discussion in findings of fact 45-47 and in Ordering Paragraph 19. The Commission also adopted separate goals and triggers for each utility in Ordering Paragraph 20, a design element supported by TURN.<sup>5</sup>

#### Expected Performance Based Buydown Incentives

TURN recommended that the EPBB program include geographic location in the design factor, providing important evidence to support the rationale including calculations on PV system output in various areas of California.<sup>6</sup> The commission noted that it relied upon information provided by TURN and others in making the decision to include geographic location in the EPBB design, stating that parties provided compelling

---

<sup>4</sup> D.06-08-028, *mimeo.* p. 86-87.

<sup>5</sup> TURN Reply Comments, p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> TURN reply comments on, Staff Proposal Regarding Rebate Design and Program Administration, Rulemaking 06-03-004, May 26, 2006. p 2.

reasons why EPBB should take geographical location into account in the incentive payment calculation.<sup>7</sup>

The Commission specifically stated in Findings of Fact 23 that “[v]ariability in California's geography and climate affects the level of solar production around the state.” And the Commission held in Conclusion of Law 25 that “[t]he Design Factor for EPBB should include geographic location to more precisely estimate likely system performance and yield the highest level of overall system production per dollar of ratepayer support.”

Furthermore, TURN provided rationale about the benefit of west-facing PV systems during periods of peak demand (late afternoons), recommending that PV systems oriented between 180 and 270 degrees would receive equivalent design factor ratings.<sup>8</sup> The commission included findings of facts and conclusions of law based upon this rationale.

#### Findings of Fact

15. South-facing solar installations generally provide more total kWh output annually than west-facing installations, which reach peak production during a time more closely aligned to the utilities' system peak demand and yield energy of higher value.

#### Conclusion of Law:

---

<sup>7</sup> Decision 06-08-028, *mimeo.* p. 49.

<sup>8</sup> TURN reply comments on, Staff Proposal Regarding Rebate Design and Program Administration, Rulemaking 06-03-004, May 26, 2006. p 4.  
TURN Compensation Request

26. We should allow equivalent optimal design factors for south, southwest, and west orientations to promote either peak solar production or maximum total solar output.

### Funding Levels

TURN provided compelling evidence to support MW triggers, funding levels, and cost allocation be applied to each distinct customer class (residential and non-residential) and service territory to promote a market-responsive and self-correcting incentive model.<sup>9</sup> Despite adding administrative complexity, the Commission agreed with TURN's analysis that different triggers for each service territory allow "for each distinct market to respond to incentive levels appropriately and independently".<sup>10</sup>

On the issue of statewide uniformity in CSI incentive levels, a few parties suggested the Commission's previous decision to keep incentive levels uniform statewide should be reconsidered. TURN claims triggers by service territory will allow each distinct market to respond to incentive levels appropriately and independently. PG&E and the Joint Solar Parties agree the Commission should allow incentives to vary on a utility by utility basis. SCE and SDREO oppose the concept of different incentive levels in each utility territory. SCE reasons that since CSI is a statewide program, incentives should be available to all customers under the same set of rules.

With great reluctance, we are persuaded to modify our concept of one incentive level statewide in favor of allowing each utility territory to reduce its incentive level when conditional reservations for solar incentives in that territory reach pro rata shares of the MW targets. While it would certainly be administratively simpler to have only one statewide incentive level that adjusts everywhere at the same time, this ignores the unique characteristics of the solar market in the different geographic regions of the state. If installations in Southern California are booming and cause the first MW target to be reached, but installations in Northern California are moving more slowly, an incentive level reduction statewide to respond to demand conditions in the south could

---

<sup>9</sup> TURN reply comments, May 26, 2006. p 5-6.

<sup>10</sup> TURN reply comments, May 26, 2006. p. 6.

negatively impact the economics of the solar market in the north. Essentially, we must now trade the goal of program simplicity for a more complex program design that has a better chance of accomplishing the Commission's long-term solar goals.<sup>11</sup>

The Commission memorialized these conclusions in conclusion of law 51 and ordering paragraph 20:

Conclusions of Law

51. We should establish MW triggers for each utility, and for the residential and non-residential sectors within each utility, based on the MW levels of program participation adopted in the trigger mechanism in D.06-01-024.

Order

20. CSI MW goals are allocated across each utility using the percentage contribution that each utility makes to the total CSI budget, as shown in Table 10. Upon commencement of Step 2, program administrators shall ensure a portion of program funds, equivalent to one-third of program MWs, are reserved for residential applicants.

**4. Decision 07-01-018**

TURN devoted a very limited amount of attorney time (10.75 hours) in writing comments concerning the issue of the proper allocation of the renewable energy credits (RECs) associated with the production of solar energy from behind the meter photovoltaic systems that receive CSI incentives. TURN argued that RECs should allocated to the utility due to 1) the fact that only renewable energy output is eligible for net energy metering tariffs, and 2) the additional ratepayer CSI subsidies to solar DG. Alternatively, TURN argued that the CSI incentive levels should be reduced based on

---

<sup>11</sup> D.06-08-028, *mimeo.* p. 89-90.  
TURN Compensation Request

some assumed value of the REC, to be consistent with the theory that REC revenues will further stimulate solar installations.

The Commission ultimately decided that REC ownership should be retained by the DG system owner due to a fear that transferring RECs could "potentially discourage investments in DG solar projects" and based on the belief that REC ownership might encourage solar installations.<sup>12</sup> The Commission disagreed with TURN's legal analysis that the net metering tariff for solar and wind was predicated on the transfer of the renewable attributes to the utility.<sup>13</sup>

The Commission found that the record evidence was inadequate to estimate the current or future value of the REC, but that its policies should "ensure that ratepayers do not pay more than is necessary to achieve the goals sought therein."<sup>14</sup> The Commission held that future CSI incentive levels may need to be adjusted based on potential REC values:

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

---

<sup>12</sup> D.07-01-018, *mimeo.* p. 18-19.

<sup>13</sup> D.07-01-018, *mimeo.* p. 20-21.

<sup>14</sup> D.07-01-018, *mimeo.* p. 20.

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 recalibrate the CSI and the SGIP incentives to reflect prevailing market conditions, including the benefits system owners 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 change in the incentive level or schedule is appropriate.<sup>15</sup>

Because the Commission rejected TURN's primary recommendation and analysis, but agreed with TURN that CSI subsidies may need to be adjusted in the future to account for the additional value of the REC not presently included in the calculation of the CSI incentive levels, TURN voluntarily discounts 50% of the time spent on this issue in this request for compensation.

**C. TURN's Participation Did Not Unnecessarily Duplicate the Showings of Other Parties**

TURN's compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for duplication of the showings of other parties. The intervenor statutes allow the Commission to award full compensation even where a party's participation has overlapped in part with the showings made by other parties. PUC §1802.5.

Many interested parties participated in this proceeding. Since TURN's lead attorney in this proceeding is currently on leave, TURN cannot attest which of TURN's

---

<sup>15</sup> D.07-01-018, *mimeo.* p. 21. See, also, Findings of Fact 17 and 19.  
TURN Compensation Request

recommendations were unique and which supported positions advocated by other parties.<sup>16</sup> Based on TURN's pleadings and the text of Decisions 06-08-028, 07-01-018 and 07-12-007 (awarding compensation to three other intervenors), TURN believes that our participation focused on providing unique recommendations. TURN identified in our pleadings instances where we supported proposals made by other parties and TURN did not extensively reargue those positions.<sup>17</sup> TURN believes that it provided fairly unique recommendations and analyses on certain issues, including volume-based incentive adjustment triggers, different triggers for different service territories and the impact of geographic location on EPBB design factor rating.

TURN's focused participation is reflected in the text of our pleadings and in the relatively limited amount of hours spent on this proceeding.

#### **D. Benefits To Ratepayers Of Turn's Participation**

In D.98-04-059, the Commission directed intervenors filing compensation requests to attempt to "monetize" the benefits accruing to ratepayers as a result of the intervenor's participation. The Commission stated that such an assessment would ensure that: 1) ratepayers receive value from compensated intervention; and 2) only

---

<sup>16</sup> TURN suggests that a comparison of TURN's pleadings with the language in Decisions 06-08-028 and D.07-01-018 is sufficient to demonstrate TURN's unique substantial contributions, and that it would be unduly time consuming to review the filings submitted by all other parties at this stage in order to determine any possible level of overlap. However, if the Commission determines that such additional review may be necessary TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this compensation request with additional information.

<sup>17</sup> For example, TURN supported proposals by the City and County of San Francisco (Reply Comments, p. 4) and the Consumer of Federation of California (p. 5-6).

reasonable costs are compensated. D.98-04-059, mimeo, p. 73. The Commission noted that assigning a dollar value to intangible benefits may be difficult.

This proceeding addressed program design and it is not possible to quantify a specific financial impact of TURN's participation. However, TURN suggests that the Commission can find that the very limited number of hours spent in this proceeding by TURN's attorneys and consultant, addressing issues related to the potential success of the multi-billion dollar CSI program, was a productive contribution to this proceeding.

### **III. ITEMIZATION OF SERVICES AND EXPENDITURES**

#### **A. Summary**

TURN requests compensation of **\$19,022.65**, including \$12,606.25 for attorney time, \$6,270.00 for expert consulting and \$146.40 for direct expenses. Table 1 summarizes the entire compensation request and Table 2 details the request for attorney time.

Table 1: Summary of Compensation Request

<b>Expense Category</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Attorney Time	\$12,606.25
Consulting	\$6,270.00
Direct Expenses	\$146.40
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$19,022.65</b>

Table 2: Attorney Time

ATTORNEY	Billing Period	Hourly Rate	Substantive Issue Work		Compensation Related		Total		Percent Claimed	Total Requested Compensation
			Hours Expended	Hours Claimed	Hours Expended	Hours Claimed	Hours Expended	Hours Claimed (1)		
Hours Prior to 3/7/2006 (2)										
Robert Finkelstein			0.75	0.00			0.75	0.00		
Michel Florio			0.75	0.00			0.75	0.00		
Matthew Freedman			22.00	0.00			22.00	0.00		
Hours Post 3/7/2006										
Marcel Hawiger	2008	\$300.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	6.00	12.00	6.00	50.00%	\$1,800.00
Hayley Goodson	2006	\$195.00	1.75	1.75			1.75	1.75	100.00%	\$341.25
Matthew Freedman	2007	\$300.00	3.50	3.50			3.50	3.50	100.00%	\$1,050.00
	2006	\$280.00	38.25	32.88	1.50	0.75	39.75	33.63	84.59%	\$9,415.00
<b>TOTAL</b>							80.50	44.875	55.75%	\$12,606.25

(1) hours on "REC" issue discounted by 50%.

(2) Only hours after 3/7/2006 requested for compensation

Attachment A provides contemporaneous attorney time sheets, Attachment B provides an itemized list of direct expenses, and Attachment C provides detailed time sheet for consulting expenses for Ms. Sarah Truitt. Attachment D provides the detailed attorney time sheet and consultant expenses incurred in R.04-03-017, which are not being requested for compensation. Attorney time related to compensation was discounted by 50%.

**B. Allocation of costs and fees by issue and task**

D.85-08-012 specified three different categories of work activities that allow for differing degrees of issue-by-issue allocation. TURN used the code “CSI” to designate all work related to the CSI incentive levels and incentive design issues, and by using the code “REC” for work related to the issue of REC ownership.

**C. The Hours and hourly rates claimed for compensation are reasonable**

**1. Attorney hours and rates**

TURN requests compensation for approximately 40 hours, or just one week, of total professional attorney work time. This request is reasonable, and indeed quite modest, considering the number of issues related to the CSI program addressed in this phase. TURN has discounted approximately 10 hours of attorney time for compensation-related work and work concerning “REC” issues. TURN's attorneys on

this case maintained daily time records, included in Attachment A, with all hours allocated by attorney and activity code.

The hourly rates requested for the three TURN attorneys have all been previously authorized as shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Hourly Rates for Attorneys

<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Billing Period</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Decision Authorizing Hourly Rate</b>
Marcel Hawiger	2008	\$300.00	D.07-12-026, p. 24
Hayley Goodson	2006	\$195.00	D.07-12-026, p. 24
Matthew Freedman	2007	\$300.00	D.07-12-026, p. 24
	2006	\$280.00	D.06-10-018, p. 30

## 2. Consultant hours and rates

TURN requests compensation of \$6,270.00 for 57 hours of consulting service performed by Ms. Sarah Truitt.<sup>18</sup> Ms. Truitt's current resume is included as Attachment E. The Commission has not previously authorized a billing rate for Ms. Truitt, and TURN requests that the Commission authorize a billing rate of \$110 per hour for Ms. Truitt's

---

<sup>18</sup> In the time sheets included in Attachment C, Mr. Truitt's work is recorded under her previous surname of Tuntland. TURN has voluntarily disallowed the 19.75 hours of Ms. Truitt's time that was conducted prior to March 7, 2006.

work in 2006. This rate is the actual rate billed by Ms. Truitt to TURN and it is below the floor level of \$115/hour adopted by the Commission for experts in 2006.<sup>19</sup>

Ms. Truitt received a Bachelor of Arts' degree in Advertising, with a focus on marketing. Prior to her work with TURN she had worked a sales consultant for almost four years, most recently as a Solar Energy Sales Consultant for Sun Light and Power, a solar system installation company based in Berkeley, California. At Sun Light and Power Ms. Truitt successfully sold PV systems up to 129 kW in size.

Ms. Truitt's practical experience in solar system sales and marketing enabled her to assist TURN in evaluating proposals concerning the impact of different incentive structures and incentive program designs on customer acceptance and system sales.

TURN does not claim that Ms. Truitt qualifies as an expert on all energy or solar issues, but we suggest that her education and experience qualify her as an expert concerning the specific issues of incentive structure which were in dispute in this Phase of the proceeding. Based on her education and professional experience, which included one year of experience in the solar industry and three more years experience in general marketing and sales, TURN requests that the Commission authorize a billing rate of \$110/hour, which is just below the floor level for expert compensation. This

---

<sup>19</sup> D.07-01-009, *mimeo*, p. 8. As directed by the Commission, TURN is requesting only the rate billed by Ms. Truitt, even though it falls below the floor level adopted by the Commission.  
TURN Compensation Request

compares to a rate of \$100 and \$115 which the Commission adopted for two advocates who conducted work in this proceeding on behalf of CARE.<sup>20</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In the foregoing sections, TURN has described its substantial contributions to Decisions 06-05-025, 06-08-028 and 07-01-018, provided a detailed itemization of its costs of participation, and demonstrated the reasonableness of its requested hours and hourly rates. TURN has met all of the requirements of Sections 1801 et seq. of the Public Utilities Code, and therefore requests an award of compensation in the amount of \$19,022.65, plus interest if a decision is not issued within 75 days of today, in accordance with Section 1804(e) of the PU Code.

May 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /S/  
Marcel Hawiger

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
Phone: (415) 929-8876 ex. 311  
Fax: (415) 929-1132  
Email: [marcel@turn.org](mailto:marcel@turn.org)

---

<sup>20</sup> D.07-12-007, Appendix p. 2.  
TURN Compensation Request



ATTACHMENT A

ATTORNEY CONTEMPORANEOUS TIME SHEETS

Date	Attorney	Activity	Description	Time Spent
3/21/2006	HG	GP	read D06-01-024 and OIR re CSI -- focus on general developments and overlap w/ EE and rsch valuation / EM&V issues across loading order preferred resources	1.50
3/22/2006	HG	GP	discuss w/ MH; read ruling reducing incentives	0.25
<b>Total: HG</b>				<b>1.75</b>
3/16/2006	Matt	CSI	Attendance at PBI workshop	2.00
3/22/2006	Matt	CSI	Meeting with Sarah Tuntland to discuss CSI PBI issues	1.50
3/23/2006	Matt	GP	Preparation for, and attendance at, PHC	1.75
3/28/2006	Matt	CSI	Meeting with PV Now and Vote Solar, drafting of comments on ALJ Ruling re: rebate levels	3.00
4/5/2006	Matt	GP	Meeting w/PG&E to discuss net metering billing format	1.50
4/19/2006	Matt	CSI	Meeting w/Sarah Tuntland to discuss CSI/PBI issues	2.00
4/21/2006	Matt	Comp	Preparation of NOI	0.75
4/25/2006	Matt	GP	Review of ALJ rulings, staff whitepaper, and communication with Sarah Tuntland re: scope of work	1.25
5/9/2006	Matt	CSI	Meeting w/Sarah Tuntland to discuss CSI comments, post-meeting review of case materials	2.00
5/11/2006	Matt	Comp	Preparation of reply to SCE response to various NOIs	0.75
5/14/2006	Matt	CSI	Review and edits to draft CSI white paper comments	1.50
5/16/2006	Matt	CSI	Review and edits to CSI white paper comments	1.25
5/22/2006	Matt	CSI	Meeting w/Sarah Tuntland to discuss CSI reply comments	1.50
5/24/2006	Matt	CSI	Review and edits to reply comments	1.25
5/25/2006	Matt	CSI	Review, edits and final production of reply comments on staff paper	2.25
7/25/2006	Matt	CSI	Review of draft decision of ALJ Duda	0.50
8/16/2006	Matt	CSI	Review of opening comments on CSI PD	2.25
8/18/2006	Matt	REC	Review of opening comments on DG RECs, drafting of reply comments	4.00
8/21/2006	Matt	CSI	Drafting of reply comments on CSI PD	2.00
12/21/2006	Matt	REC	Drafting of comments on Peevey DG REC decision	3.50
12/22/2006	Matt	REC	Drafting of comments on Peevey DG REC decision	3.25
1/30/2007	Matt	CSI	Meeting with Environment California to discuss CSI issues	1.00
2/7/2007	Matt	CSI	Drafting of protest to SDG&E AL seeking CSI rate increase for 130% of baseline	2.50
<b>Total: MH</b>				<b>43.25</b>
4/29/2008	MH	Comp	Review time sheets; review past decisions; TC w/ Sarah Tuntland; internal email re compensation	1.50
5/12/2008	MH	Comp	draft comp request for R.06-03-004	2.50
5/13/2008	MH	Comp	draft comp request for R.06-03-004; skim past pleadings; read D.06-08-038; talk to Sarah T.; code time sheets	2.00

5/16/2008	MH	Comp	Draft comp request; read decisions 06-08-028 and 07-01-018	2.00
5/16/2008	MH	Comp	Draft comp request; review master files for R.04-03-017 and R.06-03-004	4.00
<b>Total: MH</b>				<b>12.00</b>
<b>Grant Total:</b>				<b>57.00</b>

ATTACHMENT B

DIRECT EXPENSES

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Billed</b>
3/28/2006	\$Copies	Comments on Duda Ruling; 8cc x 4pp	\$ 6.40
4/21/2006	\$Copies	NOI; 8cc x 7pp	\$ 11.20
5/11/2006	\$Copies	Reply to SCE Response to various NOIs; 8cc x 6pp	\$ 9.60
5/16/2006	\$Copies	Comments on draft staff proposal; 9cc x 8pp	\$ 14.40
5/26/2006	\$Copies	Reply Comments on draft staff proposal; 8cc x 10pp	\$ 16.00
8/18/2006	\$Copies	Reply Comments On ALJ Ruling Requesting Proposals On Methods To Determine The Renewable Energy Credits From Distributed Generation.	\$ 48.00
8/21/2006	\$Copies	Reply Comments On the DD Of ALJ Duda	\$ 40.80
<b>Grant Total:</b>			<b>\$ 146.40</b>

ATTACHMENT C

CONSULTANT TIME SHEETS FOR SARAH TRUITT (TUNTLAND)

Date	Attorney	Activity	Description	Time Spent
10/24/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to discuss agenda and Sarah's involvement.	1.00
10/25/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of staff white paper on procedures and rulemaking for CSI Program.	4.50
11/7/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to discuss staff white paper.	2.00
11/17/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of TURN's comments on CSI and draft decision on procedures and rulemaking.	0.75
11/23/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting comments on CSI staff white paper.	3.25
12/3/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to review comments.	1.75
12/8/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of Interim Order Opening Comments and other parties' comments.	1.50
12/14/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to review comments and plan reply comments.	1.00
12/29/2005	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting reply comments on CSI staff white paper.	5.00
3/14/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Preparatory reading on stakeholder's CSI program outlines for PBI Workshop.	2.50
3/16/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	PBI Workshop	5.00
3/22/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to discuss PBI Workshop.	1.00
3/31/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting ideal CSI program outline.	2.50
4/19/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting at TURN to discuss optimum CSI program outline.	1.50
4/20/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting ideal CSI program outline.	3.00
4/27/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting ideal CSI program outline.	1.00
5/3/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Preparatory reading for PV Rebate Workshop on May 4th.	1.00
5/4/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Workshop on PV rebates.	6.00
5/8/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Preparation of Opening Comments due May 16.	1.00
5/9/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting with TURN to review workshop and formulate comments.	1.75
5/10/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Organizing comments due May 16.	1.00
5/11/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Writing Opening Comments due May 16.	1.75
5/13/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Writing Opening Comments due May 16.	2.50
5/14/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Revising Opening Comments due May 16.	0.75
5/17/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of Opening Comments submitted by other parties.	2.25
5/18/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of Opening Comments submitted by other parties.	1.50
5/19/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of Opening Comments submitted by other parties.	1.00
5/20/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Review of Opening Comments submitted by other parties.	1.25
5/23/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Meeting to review Opening Comments at TURN and drafting reply comments.	4.25
5/24/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Drafting Reply comments due May 26.	1.00
5/25/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	Revising Reply comments due May 26.	1.75
6/13/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	CPUC-CEC Workshop Affordable Housing and CSI	7.00
9/14/2006	Sarah Tuntland	CSI	CA Solar	3.75
<b>Total: Sarah Tuntland</b>				<b>76.75</b>

ATTACHMENT D

ATTORNEY AND CONSULTANT EXPENSES IN R.004-03-017

(not sought for compensation)

Date	Attorney	Activity	Description	Time Spent
<u>Attorney: BF</u>				
1/2/2006	BF	.	Solar Init -- rev and edit commts	0.75
Total: BF				0.75
<u>Attorney: JBS--B Marcus</u>				
12/30/2005	JBS--B Marcus	.	JBS December 2005 Invoice; 2.75 @ 210.00	2.75
1/31/2006	JBS--B Marcus	.	JBS January Invoice	0.25
Total: JBS--B Marcus				3.00
<u>Attorney: MF</u>				
10/21/2005	MF	.	Discuss policy with staff	0.50
12/19/2005	MF	.	Discuss solar program w/ team	0.25
Total: MF				0.75
<u>Attorney: Matt</u>				
9/26/2005	Matt	.	Meeting with Vote Solar, UCS and others to discuss case strategy	3.00
10/20/2005	Matt	.	Meeting with solar industry groups to discuss California Solar Initiative and upcoming proposed decision	2.50
11/8/2005	Matt	.	Meeting with Sara Tuntland to discuss solar rebates and CPUC California Solar Initiative	1.00
12/1/2005	Matt	.	Meeting w/Sarah Tuntland to discuss comments on CSI PD	1.25
12/2/2005	Matt	.	Additional review of PD and draftig of comments	1.00
12/5/2005	Matt	.	Drafting of motion to intervene, notice of intent to seek compensation, and comments on PD	4.00
12/12/2005	Matt	.	Review of opening comments, drafting of reply comments on PD	2.50
12/16/2005	Matt	.	Review of CSI Proposed Decision, analysis of program proposals	1.50
12/20/2005	Matt	.	Review of CSI PD, drafting of opening comments	2.25
12/22/2005	Matt	.	Meeting w/Sarah Tuntland to discuss comments on CSI PD, drafting of latest version and distribution to TURN staff	1.50
2/1/2006	Matt	.	Meeting w/PV Now to discuss CSI program issues	1.50
Total: Matt				22.00
<b>Grand Total</b>				<b>26.50</b>

ATTACHMENT E

RESUME FOR SARAH TRUITT

## SARAH TRUITT

3055 16<sup>th</sup> Street NW Apt. 507 · Washington, DC 20009  
sarah.truitt@gmail.com · (415) 385-9642

### EDUCATION

---

#### THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Washington, DC

Master of Business Administration, Concentration in Strategic Energy Policy & Management

May 2008

- Potomac Fellow, merit scholarship
- President, George Washington's Net Impact Chapter, also Climate Change Group Leader
- Co-Founder of the GW Sustainability Coalition, appointed to the University President's Task Force on Sustainability

#### Relevant MBA Projects (completed)

- Research topics- Cap and trade, energy efficiency funding, photovoltaic industry, energy policy, national RPS
- Sustainable Development in Emerging Countries course completed at INCAE Business School **Alajuela, Costa Rica**  
June 2007 – July 2007

#### UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Boulder, CO

Bachelor of Arts in Advertising, Concentration in Marketing

September 1994 - December 1997

- Dean's list graduate and member of Golden Key National Honor Society
- University of Wollongong, exchange student in Australia

NSW, Australia

February – August 1997

### EXPERIENCE

---

DAVID GARDINER & ASSOCIATES *Environment and Energy Consulting Firm*

Washington, DC

*Project Consultant*

May 2007 – present

- Co-create letters to Commissioners and members of Congress on shareholder value related to climate exposure
- Help clients think through climate change issues and collaborate on strategic climate plans with C-level executives
- Research carbon markets, energy efficiency markets, fuel economy policy and standards

ACORE – *American Council on Renewable Energy Intern*

Washington, DC

- Speaker interviewer at Phase II Policy conference in November 2007

May– August 2007

- Research intern focused on carbon markets, energy efficiency, and renewable energy policy

THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK *Consumer advocacy organization*

San Francisco, CA

*Photovoltaic Industry Consultant*

October 2005 – August 2006

- Co-created guidelines for the California Solar Initiative, a \$3.2 billion solar energy rebate program, wrote comments for review by the California Public Utilities Commission

SUN LIGHT AND POWER *Photovoltaic and solar thermal system installer*

Berkeley, CA

*Solar Energy Sales Consultant*

October 2004 – October 2005

- Sold the largest photovoltaic system in company history in both size (129kW) and revenue (\$970,000)
- Initiated successful sales process for a 29kW, \$250,000 photovoltaic system at Mills College in Oakland
- Created and delivered presentation explaining solar energy to Bay Area architects and firms

AMERICAN LAWYER MEDIA *Legal publishing company*

San Francisco, CA

*Sales Consultant: National Law Journal, New York Law Journal, Recorder*

May 2002 – February 2005

- Exceeded sales goals by over 50% each year, hired as sales training consultant after leaving the company
- Appointed as manager of *The Lawyers' Guide to San Francisco*, managing operations, sales and distribution of the 30,000 circulation special publication, revenue goal reached in a 45 day timeframe

### OTHER

---

**Volunteer Activities:** Green Festival, ACORE, Grid Alternatives/ Habitat for Humanity, Mountain Mentors, NPR-WAMU

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Larry Wong, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the following is true and correct:

On June 11, 2008 I served the attached:

**TURN'S REQUEST FOR COMPENSATION**

**FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS 06-08-028 AND 07-01-018**

on all eligible parties on the attached lists to **R.08-03-008** by sending said document by electronic mail to each of the parties via electronic mail, as reflected on the attached Service List.

Executed this June 11, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

          /S/          

Larry Wong

**Service List for R.08-03-008**

abb@eslawfirm.com  
abcstaterobbyist@sbcglobal.net  
abonds@thelen.com  
abrowning@votesolar.org  
adamb@greenlining.org  
akbar.jazayeri@sce.com  
amber.dean@sce.com  
andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org  
andy.vanhorn@vhcenergy.com  
anewman@solarcity.com  
annette.gilliam@sce.com  
annie.henderson@energycenter.org  
asteele@hanmor.com  
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com  
awhiting@openenergycorp.com  
AXY4@pge.com  
barbara@earthskysolar.com  
bautistafaith@yahoo.com  
bbaker@summitblue.com  
bchao@simmonsco-intl.com  
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com  
ben@solarcity.com  
bernadette@environmentcalifornia.org  
bill@brobecksolarenergy.com  
bills@clearEdgepower.com  
bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us  
bk7@pge.com  
blaising@braunlegal.com  
bob.ramirez@itron.com  
bob@energydynamix.net  
brad@bradburkearchitect.com  
brbarkovich@earthlink.net  
brenda.latter@itron.com  
bstewart@solarcraft.com  
CABe@pge.com  
californiadockets@pacificcorp.com  
case.admin@sce.com  
cbressanitanko@rsggrp.com  
cchen@ucsusa.org  
cec@cpuc.ca.gov  
cem@newsdata.com  
cfaber@semprautilities.com  
ciece@ucop.edu  
CJSv@pge.com  
CLHs@pge.com  
cmanson@semprautilities.com  
cmanzuk@semprautilities.com  
cmkehrein@ems-ca.com  
Corlando@energy.state.ca.us  
cp@kacosolar.com  
aes@cpuc.ca.gov  
arr@cpuc.ca.gov  
as2@cpuc.ca.gov  
brd@cpuc.ca.gov  
cec@cpuc.ca.gov  
cln@cpuc.ca.gov  
css@cpuc.ca.gov  
df1@cpuc.ca.gov  
dil@cpuc.ca.gov  
dks@cpuc.ca.gov  
dot@cpuc.ca.gov  
dsh@cpuc.ca.gov  
eah@cpuc.ca.gov  
gyee@arb.ca.gov  
jci@cpuc.ca.gov  
jf2@cpuc.ca.gov  
jjw@cpuc.ca.gov  
jm3@cpuc.ca.gov  
jxm@cpuc.ca.gov  
kar@cpuc.ca.gov  
lp1@cpuc.ca.gov  
mc3@cpuc.ca.gov  
meb@cpuc.ca.gov  
mscheibl@arb.ca.gov  
mts@cpuc.ca.gov  
mvc@cpuc.ca.gov  
nao@cpuc.ca.gov  
nlc@cpuc.ca.gov  
ppettingill@caiso.com  
psd@cpuc.ca.gov  
pw1@cpuc.ca.gov  
rl4@cpuc.ca.gov  
sco@cpuc.ca.gov  
tam@cpuc.ca.gov  
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov  
tdp@cpuc.ca.gov  
zca@cpuc.ca.gov

cpucsolar@rahus.org  
craig.lewis@greenvolts.com  
croaman@ccsf.edu  
cswollums@midamerican.com  
cte@eslawfirm.com  
ctoca@utility-savings.com  
d.miller@suntechnics.com  
Dan.Thompson@SPGsolar.com  
dan@energysmarthomes.net  
darmanino@co.marin.ca.us  
david.felix@mmarenew.com  
david.kopans@fatspaniel.com  
David.Townley@townleytech.com  
david@nemtzw.com  
dbeck@energy.state.ca.us  
dcarroll@downeybrand.com  
dchong@energy.state.ca.us  
deb@a-klaw.com  
deden@energy.state.ca.us  
demorse@omsoft.com  
dfield@openenergycorp.com  
dhardy@cabrilloedc.org  
diane\_fellman@fpl.com  
dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net  
djamison@capstoneturbine.com  
dks@cpuc.ca.gov  
donaldgilligan@comcast.net  
douglass@energyattorney.com  
dprall@solarpowerinc.net  
dvidaver@energy.state.ca.us  
edward.randolph@asm.ca.gov  
ek@a-klaw.com  
ekgrubaugh@iid.com  
eklinkner@ci.pasadena.ca.us  
elarsen@rcmdigesters.com  
elee@davisenergy.com  
elee@sandiego.gov  
Elizabeth.Ferris@spgsolar.com  
elvine@lbl.gov  
elvine@lbl.gov  
emackie@gridalternatives.org  
emackie@gridalternatives.org  
emello@sppc.com  
enriqueg@lif.org  
ensmith@mwe.com  
er@suntechamerica.com  
eric.carlson@thompsontec.com  
eshafner@solel.com  
eyhecox@stoel.com  
faisal@gridalternatives.org  
filings@a-klaw.com

fortlieb@sandiego.gov  
fred@tiogaenergy.com  
fsmith@sflower.org  
fwmonier@tid.org  
gary@sunlightandpower.com  
gbeck@etfinancial.com  
gdehart@anaheim.net  
george.simons@itron.com  
george@utilityconservationservices.com  
ghinners@reliant.com  
glbarbose@lbl.gov  
glw@eslawfirm.com  
gmorris@emf.net  
gopal@recolteenergy.com  
gpickering@navigantconsulting.com  
grant.kolling@cityofpaloalto.org  
guliasi@sunfundcorp.com  
gwiltsee@dricompanies.com  
h.dowling@suntechnics.com  
hchoy@isd.co.la.ca.us  
heidi@sunlightandpower.com  
hfhunt@optonline.net  
hgreen@sunedison.com  
info@calseia.org  
info@solarpathfinder.com  
irene.stillings@energycenter.org  
iris.chan@spgsolar.com  
j.marston@suntechnics.com  
J6BY@pge.com  
jack@penfund.net  
jamckinsey@stoel.com  
james.lehrer@sce.com  
janh@pacpower.biz  
janice@strategenconsulting.com  
Javier.Burgos@sce.com  
jbarnet@smud.org  
jchamberlin@strategicenergy.com  
jcluboff@lmi.net  
jcox@fce.com  
jeff@grosolar.com  
jennifer.porter@energycenter.org  
JerryL@abag.ca.gov  
jesser@greenlining.org  
jhamrin@resource-solutions.org  
jharris@volkerlaw.com  
jim@dshsolar.com  
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com  
jig@eslawfirm.com  
jkarp@winston.com  
jlanderos@proteusinc.org  
jlarkin@us.kema.com

jluckhardt@downeybrand.com  
jmaskrey@sopogy.com  
jmcfarland@treasurer.ca.gov  
JMCLA@comcast.net  
jmgarber@iid.com  
jna@speakeasy.org  
jnelson@psrec.coop  
jody\_london\_consulting@earthlink.net  
joel.davidson@sbcglobal.net  
joelene.monestier@spgsolar.com  
john.schuster@utcpower.com  
john.supp@energycenter.org  
john@proctoreng.com  
johnperlin@physics.ucsb.edu  
johnredding@earthlink.net  
jon.bonk-vasko@energycenter.org  
jordan@tiogaenergy.com  
Jose.atilio@gmail.com  
josephhenri@hotmail.com  
joshdavidson@dwt.com  
jpigott@optisolar.com  
jpross@sungevity.com  
jrichman@bloomenergy.com  
jrohrbach@reliant.com  
jsomers@lisc.org  
jsqueri@goodinmacbride.com  
julie.blunden@sunpowercorp.com  
juliettea7@aol.com  
jwiedman@goodinmacbride.com  
jwimbley@csd.ca.gov  
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com  
jwwd@pge.com  
jyamagata@semprautilities.com  
karambelas@fce.com  
karen@klindh.com  
karin.corfee@kema.com  
karly@solardevelop.com  
kbest@realenergy.com  
kbosley@bear.com  
kdubin@mwe.com  
kdusel@navigantconsulting.com  
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com  
kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov  
ken.krich@ucop.edu  
kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com  
kennyk@solel.com  
kfox@wsgr.com  
kirk@NoElectricBill.com  
kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com  
kmills@cfbf.com  
KMPa@pge.com

knotsund@berkeley.edu  
ksheldon@sma-america.com  
ksmith@powerlight.com  
ksoares@usc.edu  
kstokes@solarpowerinc.net  
Kurt.Scheuermann@itron.com  
kyle.l.davis@pacificorp.com  
l\_brown246@hotmail.com  
lauren.purnell@pge-corp.com  
laurene\_park@sbcglobal.net  
legislative@recsolar.com  
lesterno@energy.state.ca.us  
lex@consumercal.org  
lfultz@sbcglobal.net  
lglover@solidsolar.com  
liddell@energyattorney.com  
LMerry@vervesolar.com  
lmerry@vervesolar.com  
lmh@eslawfirm.com  
LowryD@sharpsec.com  
lpark@navigantconsulting.com  
lschavrien@semprautilities.com  
lwrazen@sempraglobal.com  
m.stout@cleantechamerica.com  
MABolinger@lbl.gov  
manjusuri@yahoo.com  
marcel@turn.org  
marigruner@yahoo.com  
mark.mah@glunetworks.com  
markgsp@sbcglobal.net  
Marshall.Taylor@dlapiper.com  
mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov  
matt.scullin@newresourcebank.com  
matt.summers@itron.com  
matt@sustainablespace.com  
mcalabrese@sandiego.gov  
mdavis@barnumcelillo.com  
mday@goodinmacbride.com  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
mdorn@mwe.com  
mdoughto@energy.state.ca.us  
meganmmyers@yahoo.com  
mhyams@swater.org  
Michael.Brown@utcpower.com  
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net  
michaelkyes@sbcglobal.net  
michaely@sepcor.net  
michelle.breyer@gs.com  
mike.montoya@sce.com  
mjwms@calwes.com  
mkay@aqmd.gov

mkober@pyramidsolar.com  
mluevano@globalgreen.org  
mmazur@3phasesRenewables.com  
mponceatty@aol.com  
mrawson@smud.org  
mrw@mrwassoc.com  
mshames@ucan.org  
mstout@unlimited-energy.com  
MtenEyck@ci.rancho-cucamonga.ca.us  
mwbeck@lbl.gov  
mwt@cpuc.ca.gov  
myuffee@mwe.com  
nehemiah.stone@us.kema.com  
nellie.tong@us.kema.com  
nes@a-klaw.com  
Nick.Allen@morganstanley.com  
nick@npcsolar.com  
njfolly@tid.org  
NJPadgett@lbl.gov  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
nsuetake@turn.org  
nzigelbaum@nrdc.org  
obrienc@sharpsec.com  
olivia.samad@sce.com  
patrick.lilly@itron.com  
paul.kubasek@sce.com  
paul@tiogaenergy.com  
pbrehm@infiniacorp.com  
pepper@cleanpowermarkets.com  
pepper@sunfundcorp.com  
ph@phatmedia.com  
phammond@simmonsco-intl.com  
phillip\_mcleod@lecg.com  
placourciere@thelen.com  
pnarvand@energy.state.ca.us  
policy@recurrentenergy.com  
preston@sonomaenergymgt.com  
pstoner@lgc.org  
pthompson@summitblue.com  
ptramonte@bear.com  
pucservice@dralegal.org  
pvallen@thelen.com  
rachel@ceert.org  
rb@greenrockcapital.com  
rbaybaya@energy.state.ca.us  
rbelur@enphaseenergy.com  
rberke@csd.ca.gov  
rguild@solarcity.com  
rhanna@reliant.com  
rhuang@smud.org  
rhwiser@lbl.gov

rishii@aesc-inc.com  
rjl9@pge.com  
rkmoore@gswater.com  
rmccann@umich.edu  
rob@consol.ws  
rob@dcpower-systems.com  
rob@teamryno.com  
Robert.F.LeMoine@sce.com  
robert.pettinato@ladwp.com  
robertg@greenlining.org  
rod.larson@sbcglobal.net  
rogerlaubacher@pvpowered.com  
ron@reenergy.com  
ronnie@energyrecommerce.com  
rschmidt@bartlewells.com  
ryan.flynn@pacificcorp.com  
rzhang@cityofpasadena.net  
S2B9@pge.com  
saeed.farokhpay@ferc.gov  
sandidgeo@aol.com  
sara@solaralliance.org  
sarahtuntland@yahoo.com  
sbarata@opiniondynamics.com  
sberlin@mccarthy.com  
sbeserra@sbcglobal.net  
scfarms@socal.rr.com  
scott.son@newresourcebank.com  
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com  
scott@debenhamenergy.com  
scottanders@sandiego.edu  
sdhilton@stoel.com  
sebesq@comcast.net  
sendo@ci.pasadena.ca.us  
sephra.ninow@energycenter.org  
sewayland@comcast.net  
sfrantz@smud.org  
SGraham@navigantconsulting.com  
Sgupta@energy.state.ca.us  
shallin@recsolar.com  
Shoeless838@comcast.net  
skoffman@powernab.com  
slins@ci.glendale.ca.us  
sls@a-klaw.com  
smiller@energy.state.ca.us  
socal.forum@yahoo.com  
Spatrick@sempra.com  
ssciortino@anaheim.net  
ssmyers@att.net  
stephen.morrison@sfgov.org  
stephen@seiinc.org  
steve@energyinnovations.com

steven.huhman@morganstanley.com  
steven@moss.net  
susan.munves@smgov.net  
susanne@emersonenvironmental.com  
svolker@volkerlaw.com  
sww9@pge.com  
taram@greenlining.org  
tbardacke@globalgreen.org  
tblair@sandiego.gov  
tcarlson@reliant.com  
tdillard@sppc.com  
ted@energy-solution.com  
Tenorio@sunset.net  
TFlanigan@EcoMotion.us  
thaliag@greenlining.org  
thamilton@icfi.com  
THAMILTON5@CHARTER.NET  
theresa.mueller@sfgov.org  
thunt@cecmail.org  
tim@drakerlabs.com  
Tim@HMWInternational.com  
tim\_merrigan@nrel.gov  
tmacbride@goodinmacbride.com  
tomb@crossborderenergy.com  
tomhoff@clean-power.com  
traceydrabant@bves.com  
troberts@sempra.com  
usdepic@gmail.com  
vincent@vincentbattaglia.com  
vkisch@stoel.com  
vprabhakaran@goodinmacbride.com  
wamer@kirkwood.com  
warehouse@mohrpower.com  
whughes@smud.org  
wwester@smud.org  
yonah@powerbreathing.com  
zfranklin@gridalternatives.org  
zingher@ieee.org