

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

<p>Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission’s Own Motion into Addressing the Commission’s Water Action Plan Objective of Setting Rates that Balance Investment, Conservation, and Affordability for the Multi-District Water Utilities of: California-American Water Company (U210W), California Water Service Company (U60W), Del Oro Water Company, Inc. (U61W), Golden State Water Company (U133W), and San Gabriel Valley Water Company (U337W).</p>
--

R. _____

ORDER INSTITUTING RULEMAKING INTO ADDRESSING THE COMMISSION’S WATER ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVE OF SETTING RATES THAT BALANCE INVESTMENT, CONSERVATION, AND AFFORDABILITY FOR MULTI-DISTRICT WATER UTILITIES

1. Summary

By this Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR), the Commission initiates a proceeding into addressing the Commission’s Water Action Plan’s objective of setting rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability¹ for multi-district water utilities. To advance this objective we are considering establishing guidelines for some variation of a “High-Cost” Fund and consolidating districts and rates within the multi-district water utilities.

¹ California Public Utilities Commission December 15, 2005 Water Action Plan, p. 20 and 21, the principle and objective of which remain the same as in its 2010 Water Action Plan, p. 7.

2. Background

On December 15, 2005, the Commission adopted a Water Action Plan to be used as a roadmap for water polices and priorities in response to increasing statewide concerns about water quality and supply and the Commission's desire to implement innovative solutions to water problems. Innovative solutions include adoption or modification of quality and supply approaches being implemented in the energy and telecommunications sectors as well as strategies being used by water agencies and entities not subject to Commission jurisdiction. That action plan identified four key principles: (1) safe, high quality water, (2) highly reliable water supplies, (3) efficient use of water, and (4) reasonable rates and viable utilities.

Building off of these principles, the Commission developed six objectives, each with a series of actions to advance each objective. These objectives are to: (1) maintain highest standards of water quality, (2) strengthen water conservation programs to a level comparable to those of energy utilities, (3) promote water infrastructure investment, (4) assist low income ratepayers, (5) streamline Commission regulatory decision-making, and (6) set rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability.

At issue in this OIR is the sixth objective of setting rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability. Among the actions listed to advance this objective is to develop policies to subsidize high cost areas, either through some variation of a "High-Cost" Fund or through consolidation of districts and rates. The Commission, in establishing this objective, recognized that there can be a significant difference in the cost of providing safe, reliable, and adequate water in different geographical areas. In many areas, charging the full cost of providing water service would result in either rates that are unaffordable to

many customers in the region or in rate shock where the price increases by a large amount.

In the past, the Commission occasionally has implicitly subsidized customers in higher cost areas by keeping their rates low while raising the rates to customers in lower cost areas. This practice is called “regionalization” or “consolidation of rates.” As part of advancing this sixth objective, the Commission is to examine mechanisms such as a high cost fund or regional rates for small districts of the multi-district utilities that will enable them to help keep basic rates manageable and to minimize rate shock, including an examination of the efficiency of so called “postage stamp rates.”²

The Commission identified specific actions to support this objective, which provided for a determination of whether and when cross-subsidization between customers is justified, and how explicit that subsidy should be. Generally, the cross-subsidization can be justified when the benefits (lower rates for customers in high cost areas) exceed the costs (higher rates for customers in lower cost areas: less-efficient allocation of water resources).³

After three years of drought subsequent to the adoption of the 2005 Water Action Plan, that plan was updated in 2010 but retained the same principles and objectives identified in the 2005 plan.⁴

² The Commission has used a similar approach for telecommunications ratepayers through the High Cost Fund-A for small local telecommunications companies and the High Cost Fund-B for larger local telephone providers.

³ Water Action Plan of December 15, 2005, p. 21.

⁴ The 2010 Water Action Plan was approved by the Commission at its October 28, 2010 Business Meeting.

3. Traditional Rate Setting

Water utilities' authorized revenue requirements and rates have traditionally been set and approved on a district by district basis. In other words, individual districts within a multi-district water utility would have revenue requirements and tariffs distinctly separate and different from each of the other districts within a water utility. Some of those districts even have distinctly different rates within the service areas of a specific district, such as California Water Service Company's Antelope Valley District, as summarized in the following table.

SERVICE AREAS	MONTHLY SERVICE CHARGE (5/8 x 3/4 inch Meter)	QUANTITY RATE (per 100 cubic feet)
Fremont Valley	\$39.62	\$4.1203
Grand Oaks ⁵	\$12.49	\$1.0618
Lake Hughes	\$39.62	\$4.1203
Lancaster	\$44.12	\$2.0242 ⁶
Leona Valley	\$44.26	\$3.2618 ⁷
District Range	\$12.49 to \$44.26	\$1.0618 to \$4.1203

This traditional rate setting process for water utilities differs from the rate setting process for energy utilities for whom rates are set on a system wide basis.

⁵ The revenue requirement and rates of the Grand Oaks service area are set independent of the four other service areas that California Water Service Company includes in its Antelope Valley District pursuant to Decision 07-05-053.

⁶ Rate is for only the first 1,400 cubic feet per 100 cubic feet of water usage.

⁷ Rate is for only the first 1,100 cubic feet per 100 cubic feet of water usage.

For example, Pacific Gas and Electric Company has a single revenue requirement and rate structure, although it serves areas throughout California. However, customer payments vary between geographical regions due to varying baseline quantities that reflect differences in climate.

Although the district-by-district rate setting process continues to exist, there have been exceptions. In 2010, California Water Service Company consolidated its Mid-Peninsula and South San Francisco Districts into a single new district, Bayshore District, and established uniform tariffs for that district.⁸

In 1994, Golden State Water Company (GSWC) consolidated its 16 districts into three regions while continuing to keep the ratemaking process at the district level.⁹ GSWC's Region I included seven separate ratemaking districts; Region II a single ratemaking district; and Region III eight ratemaking districts.

GSWC's regionalization had no effect on the number of ratemaking areas in its system until 1999, when it consolidated its eight ratemaking districts in Region III into a single region-wide ratemaking area with uniform tariffs. Because of the disparity in the rates of the eight districts in Region III at that time, the Commission adopted a phase-in plan to transition the individual ratemaking areas to regional tariffs. The tariff rates for those districts whose rates were above the regional-wide tariffs were frozen until the region-wide

⁸ Decision 10-12-017, at 20.

⁹ Region I included water operations located in the central and northern portions of California. Region II included water operations located in or near the South Bay area of Los Angeles County. Region III included water operations located in the mountains and upper desert areas of Southern California, portions of Orange County, and a number of cities in the Inland Empire region of Los Angeles. (Exhibit 1 of GSWC to Investigation 07-01-022).

tariffs increased and reached the level of the frozen districts' rates.¹⁰ This consolidation of districts in Region III reduced the number of GSWC's 16 ratemaking areas to nine.

The following table shows, by utility, the number of districts with separate revenue requirements and tariffs that currently exist.¹¹

Multi-District Water Utilities	Districts
California-American Water Company	6
California Water Service Company	23
Del Oro Water Company	17 ¹²
Golden State Water Company	9
San Gabriel Water Company	2

4. Factors Affecting Establishment of Consolidated Revenue Requirement and Uniform Rate Guidelines

The revenue requirement and rates for individual districts within multi-district water utilities have been established based on the cost of providing water service within a specific district. Factors that impact such cost have included infrastructure, geography, topography, and hydrology.

¹⁰ As of 2007, six of the former ratemaking districts in Region III were on the Region III tariff and two of the former ratemaking districts' rates remained frozen.

¹¹ Except for Del Oro Water Company, each of the multi-district water utilities also allocates common general office investments and expenses to their various districts.

¹² Fourteen of Del Oro's districts are identified in Resolution No. W-4804 dated November 2, 2009, Del Oro's acquisition of another three water systems was approved by the Commission in D.11-03-016.

In 1992, the Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates and the Class A water utilities jointly developed a set of policy guidelines to be considered in district rate consolidations. Those guidelines established four criteria: proximity, rate comparability, water supply and operation, as detailed in Decision (D.) 05-09-004. With the Commission's adoption of its 2005 Water Action Plan subsequent to the issuance of D.05-09-004, it is appropriate to consider establishing guidelines that enables the Commission to attain its Water Action Plan's objective of uniform rates that balance utility investments and affordability of rates for the multi-district water utilities.

It is appropriate to identify the similarities that exist between districts within a multi-district water utility. It is also appropriate to determine the differences that exist between districts and whether those differences can be mitigated to meet the objective of consolidation of districts and uniformity of rates. The objective may result in single utility revenue requirements and rates or consolidation of individual districts within multi-district water utilities.

Named respondents identified in Section 9 of this OIR are required, and all other entities are invited, to file initial comments and reply comments to the following questions and request for information.

Subsequent to the receipt and review of filed initial comments and reply comments, the assigned Administrative Law Judge, in consultation with the assigned Commissioner, may establish a workshop schedule to address issues and to seek a consensus on guidelines, to the extent possible, for consolidating districts and setting uniform rates for the multi-district water utilities to balance utility investments, conservation and affordability of rates. Any adopted guidelines will apply to all multi-district water utilities.

Question 1 – Identify infrastructure similarities that may exist among districts within a multi-district water utility.

Question 2 – Identify infrastructure dissimilarities that may exist in districts within a multi-district water utility and address if and how those dissimilarities can be mitigated.

Question 3 – Identify geographical and topographical similarities that may exist among districts within a multi-district water utility.

Question 4 – Identify geographical and topographical dissimilarities that may exist among districts within a multi-district water utility and address if and how those dissimilarities can be mitigated.

Question 5 – Identify hydrological similarities that may exist among districts within a multi-district water utility.

Question 6 – Identify hydrological dissimilarities that may exist among districts within a multi-district water utility and address if and how those dissimilarities can be mitigated.

Question 7 – Identify rate differences between a district within a multi-district water utility and a mutual, municipal, or another public utility providing water service adjacent to the service territory of that district of a multi-district water utility and address if and how those differences can be mitigated.

Question 8 – Identify any unique differences in one or more districts within a multi-district water utility not addressed in the prior questions and address if and how those unique differences can be mitigated.

Question 9 – Identify the tier block quantities for each district within a multi-district water utility.

Question 10 – Identify the average residential water usage for each district within a multi-district water utility.

Question 11 – Identify rate subsidies being provided within each district of a multi-district water utility, such as low income rates and rate support funds. Identify qualifying criteria to receive the subsidies and explain whether these subsidizations are consistent throughout each district and if not, why not.

Question 12 - What impact, if any, would single revenue requirements and uniform rates or consolidation of some or all district revenue requirements and rates of a multi-district water utility have on conservation efforts and

Water Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms? If impacts exist, are there any mitigating factors that could be implemented?

Question 13 – What operational and regulatory impacts, if any, would result if some or all district revenue requirements and rates of a multi-district water utility were consolidated?

Question 14 – What financial impacts, if any, would result from consolidation of some or all district revenue requirements and rates of a multi-district water utility?

Question 15 – What advantages and disadvantages of implementing a utility-wide or consolidated district high cost fund for the purpose of establishing uniform rates throughout each district of a multi-district water utility?

Question 16 – What requirements and conditions, if any, should be included in guidelines for establishing a high cost fund and consolidating districts within a multi-district water utilities' revenue requirements and rates?

Question 17 – If guidelines are adopted for establishing a high cost fund and consolidating districts of multi-district water utilities revenue requirements and rates, how should they be implemented?

Question 18 – To the extent that guidelines are adopted to establish a high cost fund and to consolidate districts of multi-water district water utilities, how should customers be notified and educated?

Question 19 - Are there any other factors that should be considered in establishing guidelines for a high cost fund and consolidating districts of multi-district water utilities' revenue requirements and rates?

Question 20 – What impact, if any, would the establishment of a high cost fund and consolidation of revenue requirements and uniformity of rates have on future water company acquisitions by multi-district water companies?

Question 21 – What impact, if any, would Public Utilities Code Section 701.10 have on the ability of multi-district water utilities to establish a high

*cost fund and to consolidate some or all of their revenue requirements and rates into single revenue requirements and rates? Can these impacts be mitigated?*¹³

5. Preliminary Scoping Memo

The scope of this rulemaking is to address the Commission's Water Action Plan's objective of setting rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability for Multi-District Water Utilities through the consideration of establishing guidelines for some variation of a "High-Cost" Fund and consolidation of some or all districts and rates within the multi-district water utilities.

The above identified questions and request for information set forth the specific inquiries and issues within the scope. Therefore, we seek comments from all parties on these matters. This OIR will be conducted in accordance with Article 6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure

6. Category of Proceeding and Need for Hearing

Pursuant to Rule 7.1(d), we preliminarily determine the category of this OIR to be quasi-legislative as the term is defined in Rule 1.3(d).

¹³ Section 701.10 requires that rates and charges established by the Commission for water service shall do all of the following: (a) Provide revenues and earnings sufficient to afford the utility an opportunity to earn a reasonable return on its used and useful investment, to attract capital for investment on reasonable terms and to ensure the financial integrity of the utility, (b) minimize the long-term cost of reliable water service to water customers (c) provide appropriate incentives to water utilities and customers for conservation of water resources, (d) provide equity between present and future users of water service, (e) promote the long-term stabilization of rates in order to avoid steep increases in rates, (f) be based on the cost of providing the water service including, to the extent consistent with the above policies, appropriate coverage of fixed costs with fixed revenues.

with the assigned Commissioner's concurrence, may modify the schedule as necessary during the course of the proceeding. In no event do we anticipate this proceeding to require longer than 18 months from the issuance of the scoping memo to complete.

9. Parties, Service List, and Subscription Service

California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Del Oro Water Company, Inc., Golden State Water Company, and San Gabriel Valley Water Company are named respondents to this OIR. The Division of Ratepayer Advocates is also a named respondent to this OIR.

Park Water Company and Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company are commonly considered a single entity comprised of two districts. However, they are distinctly separate entities. Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Park Water Company. Park Water Company and Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company are not named respondents to this OIR because they are not part of a multi-district water company. However, they are welcome to participate.

San Jose Water Company is not included in the multi-district water utility classification because its rates are based on a single revenue requirement and are uniform throughout its service territory except for pump charges in its mountain service territory. San Jose Water Company is also welcome to participate in this rulemaking.

We will serve this OIR on the named respondents and on the service lists (appearances, state service list, and information-only category) of Applications (A.) 11-05-003 (California American Water Company), A.11-05-001 (California Water Service Company), A.11-05-004 (Golden State Water Company), and A.10-07-019 (San Gabriel Valley Water Company). Del Oro Water Company, which

files individual district advice letters for Consumer Price Index increase in rates in lieu of general rate case proceedings, must serve a copy of this OIR on all persons that have commented on its advice letters since January 1, 2009. Other interested persons are invited to participate in this OIR.

Such service of the OIR does not confer party status in this proceeding upon any person or entity, and does not result in that person or entity being placed on the service list for this proceeding.

The Commission will create an official service list for this proceeding, which will be available at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/published/service_list. We anticipate that the official service list will be posted before the first filing deadline in this proceeding. Before serving documents at any time during this proceeding, parties shall ensure they are using the most up-to-date official service list by checking the Commission's website prior to each service date.

While all multi-district water utilities may be bound by the outcome of this proceeding, only those who notify us that they wish to be on the service list will be accorded service by other until a final decision is issued.

If you want to participate in the Rulemaking or simply monitor it, follow the procedures set forth below. To ensure you receive all documents, send your request within 20 days after the OIR is published. The Commission's Process Office will update the official service list on the Commission's website as necessary.

9.1. Official Service List

The named respondents are automatic parties to the proceeding pursuant to Rule 1.4(d) and will be listed as such on the official service list. Within 20 days of the publication of this OIR, each named respondent must inform the Commission's Process Office of the contact information for a single

representative to be named in the respondent's listing in the Parties category of the official service list, although other representatives and persons affiliated with the named parties may be placed in the Information Only category of the official service list.

Any person who wishes to ensure service of documents filed in this proceeding will be added to the Information Only category of the official service list upon request to the Process Office at any time. However, in order to ensure service of the initial comments that are due to be filed by September 30, 2011, it is advisable that you make your request to the Process Office within 20 days of the publication of this OIR. (Persons who expect to become parties by filing comments will not be added or moved to the Parties category until and unless such comments are filed.)

Any persons may become a party to the proceeding by filing and serving timely comments (Rule 1.4(a)(2)(ii), and will be added to the Parties category of the official service list at that time. (If you are already on the official service list in the Information Only category, you will be automatically moved to the Parties category upon the filing of comments.)

Persons may also become a party by making an oral motion (Rule 1.4(a)(3), or by filing a motion (Rule 1.4(a)(4)). If you make an oral motion or file a motion, you must also comply with Rule 1.4(b). These rules are in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, which you can read at the Commission's website.

You may contact the Process Office by e-mail (Process_Office@cpuc.ca.gov) or letter (Process Office, California Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102). Include the following information:

- Docket Number of the OIR;

- Name and entity represented, if applicable;
- Postal Address;
- Telephone Number;
- E-mail Address;¹⁴ and,
- Category (Party,¹⁵ State Service, or Information Only)

Once you are on the official service list, you must ensure that the information you have provided is up-to-date. (Rule 1.9(f).) To change your postal address, telephone number, e-mail address, or the name of your representative, send the change to the Process Office by letter or e-mail.

9.2. Serving and Filing Documents

When you serve a document, use the official service list published at the Commission's website as of the date of service. You must comply with Rules 1.9 and 1.10 when you serve a document to be filed with the Commission's Docket Office.

The Commission encourages electronic filing and e-mail service in this Rulemaking. You may find information about electronic filing at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/efiling>. E-mail service is governed by Rule 1.10. If you use e-mail service, you must also provide a paper copy to the assigned Commissioner and ALJ. The electronic copy should be in Microsoft Word or Excel formats to the extent possible. The paper copy should be

¹⁴ Parties are not required to serve hard copies of filed documents on persons who appear in the Information Only category of the official service list. (Rule 1.10(b).) In order to receive electronic service of such documents, persons who appear in the Information Only category must include an e-mail address.

¹⁵ If you are not already a party, choose "State Service" status if you are an employee of the State of California; otherwise, choose "Information Only" status.

double-sided. E-mail service of documents must occur no later than 5:00 p.m. on the date that service is scheduled to occur.

If you have questions about the Commission's filings and service procedures, contact the Docket Office.

9.3. Subscription Service

This proceeding can also be monitored by subscribing in order to receive electronic copies of documents in this proceeding that are published on the Commission's website. There is no need to be on the service list in order to use the subscription service. Instructions for enrolling in the subscription service are available on the Commission's website at <http://subscribecpuc.cpuc.ca.gov/>.

10. Public Advisor

Any person or entity interested in participating in this OIR who is unfamiliar with the Commission's procedures should contact the Commission's Public Advisor in San Francisco at (415) 703-2074 or (866) 849-8390 or e-mail public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov; or in Los Angeles at (213) 576-7055 or (866) 849-8391, or e-mail public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov. The TTY number is (866) 836-7825.

11. Intervenor Compensation

Any party that expects to request intervenor compensation for its participation in this OIR must file its notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation in accordance with Rule 17.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure within 30 days of the mailing of this OIR.

12. Ex Parte Communications

Pursuant to Rule 8.2(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, *ex parte* communications are allowed without restriction or reporting

in any quasi-legislative proceeding. Therefore, there are no restrictions or reporting requirements applied to this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The 2005 Water Action Plan was adopted by the Commission to be used as a roadmap for water policies and priorities in response to increasing statewide concerns about water quality and supply and its desire to implement innovative solutions to water problems.

2. An objective identified in the 2005 Water Action Plan was the setting of rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability. An identified action to advance this objective was to consider developing policies to subsidize high cost areas, either through some variation of a “High-Cost” Fund or through consolidation of districts or rates.

3. The 2010 Water Action Plan did not change the principle and objective of the 2005 Water Action Plan.

4. Water utilities’ authorized revenue requirements and rates have traditionally been set and approved on a district-by-district basis.

5. Although the district-by-district rate setting process continues to exist exceptions to the process were granted in limited circumstances to California Water Service Company and Golden State Water Company.

Conclusion of Law

The Commission should initiate a new OIR to address the Commission’s Water Action Plan’s objective of setting rates that balance investment, conservation, and affordability for multi-district water utilities through the consideration of establishing guidelines for some variation of a “High-Cost” Fund and consolidation of districts and rates within the multi-district water utilities.

Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. An Order Instituting Rulemaking is instituted on the Commission's own motion into guidelines for the consolidation multi-district water utilities' revenue requirements and uniformity of rates.

2. The multi-district water companies of California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Del Oro Water Company, Inc., Golden State Water Company, and San Gabriel Valley Water Company are named respondents to this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

3. The Division of Ratepayer Advocates is also a named respondent to this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

4. Entities on the service list of Applications 11-05-001, 11-05-003, 11-05-004, 10-07-019, and other interested persons are invited to participate in this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

5. Named respondents are required, and all other persons are invited, to file initial comments and reply comments to the specific questions in this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

6. The outcome of this Order Instituting Rulemaking and establishment of any guidelines for some variation of a "High-Cost" Fund and consolidation of some or all districts and rates within the multi-district water utilities shall be applicable to all multi-district investor-owned water utilities.

7. The Executive Director shall cause copies of this order to be served on:
(a) named respondents California-American Water Company, California Water Service Company, Del Oro Water Company, Inc, Golden State Water Company, San Gabriel Water Company, and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, and
(b) the service list of Applications 11-05-001, 11-05-003, 11-05-004, and 10-07-019.

8. The Executive Director shall also cause copies of this order to be served on Park Water Company, Apple Valley Water Company and San Jose Water Company.

9. Del Oro Water Company shall within 15 days after the issuance of this Order Institute Rulemaking serve a copy of this Order Instituting Rulemaking on all parties that have commented on its advice letters since January 1, 2009. Within 20 days after the issuance of this Order Instituting Investigation, Del Oro Water Company shall file a certificate of service in this proceeding.

10. Within 20 days of the publication of this OIR, each named respondent must inform the Commission's Process Office of the contact information for a single representative to be named in the respondent's listing in the Party category of the official service list.

11. The category of this Order Instituting Rulemaking is preliminarily determined to be a quasi-legislative, as that term is defined in the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 1.3(d).

12. This proceeding is preliminarily determined not to require evidentiary hearings.

13. The schedule for this proceeding is as set forth in Section 7. The assigned Commissioner, by ruling on the scoping memo and subsequent rulings, and the assigned Administrative Law Judge, by ruling with the assigned Commissioner's concurrence, may modify the schedule as necessary during the course of the proceeding, consistent with resolving this proceeding within 18 months.

14. The issues to be considered in this Order Instituting Rulemaking are those set forth in the Preliminary Scoping Memo.

15. Initial comments and reply comments shall conform to the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Opening comments must be

filed on or before September 30, 2011 and reply comments on or before October 28, 2011.

16. Any persons objecting to the preliminary categorization of this Order Instituting Rulemaking as “quasi-legislative” or to the preliminary determination that evidentiary hearings are not necessary, issues to be considered, or schedule shall state their objections in their initial comments of this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

17. The assigned Administrative Law Judge, in consultation with the assigned Commissioner, shall determine whether to hold a workshop after reviewing the filed initial comments and reply comments to this Order Instituting Rulemaking. Any Workshop notice will be issued at least 10 days prior to the date of the workshop.

18. After initial service of this order, a new service list for the proceeding shall be established following procedures set forth in this order. The Commission’s Process Office will publish the official service list on the Commission’s website (www.cpuc.ca.gov) as soon as practical. Parties may also obtain the service list by contacting the Process Office at (415) 703-2021. The assigned Commissioner, and the assigned Administrative Law Judge acting with the assigned Commissioner’s concurrence, shall have ongoing oversight of the service list and may institute changes to the list or the procedures governing it as necessary.

19. Any party that expects to claim intervenor compensation for its participation in this Order Instituting Rulemaking shall file its notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation in accordance with Rule 17.1 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, within 30 days of the mailing of this Order Instituting Rulemaking.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, 2011 at San Francisco, California.