

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ BARNETT** (Mailed 4/3/2003)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company
for Verification, Consolidation, and Approval of
Costs and Revenues in the Transition Revenue
Account.

Application 98-07-003
(Post PX Direct Access
Credits)
(Filed July 1, 1998)

(See Appendix A for appearances.)

**OPINION ADOPTING A POST POWER EXCHANGE
DIRECT ACCESS CREDIT FOR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
AND SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY**

I. Summary

This is another decision that addresses the direct access (DA) credit. We recently set forth the background leading up to this installment in Decision (D.) 02-07-032, which we repeat for clarity.¹ This proceeding is to determine a new method of computing the charges to be paid by direct access customers to Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and SCE, and to determine the reasonableness of the utilities' current DA credit methods. This decision finds reasonable the direct access credit methods used by PG&E and SCE since the demise of the Power Exchange (PX) and approves of "bottoms-up" billing for

¹ D.02-07-032 dealt with Southern California Edison (SCE). This proceeding deals with both SCE and PG&E, but the background facts are the same for both utilities. We have modified the material accordingly.

direct access customers. In bottoms-up billing, the utilities bill only for distribution and transmission service; the customer purchases electricity from a third party. Thus, under the “bottoms-up” approach, customers pay for the services they purchase from the utilities, including any nonbypassable charges. This is in contrast to DA customers paying the same charges as bundled customers and then receiving a credit for the generation component of their bill.

II. Background

Since 1998, PG&E and SCE have offered service to two distinct classes of customers. Bundled service customers received the full range of electric services from the utilities, which include energy procurement and delivery. PG&E and SCE customers could also choose, under the DA option, to purchase energy from an electric service provider (ESP). PG&E and SCE continue to deliver electricity to both DA and bundled service customers.

A. Rate Freeze

Total rates were frozen at levels in effect on June 10, 1996 for all customers. Bundled service customers paid these frozen rates for the duration of the transition period (January 1, 1998 through March 31, 2002 or a Commission-authorized earlier end date). These frozen tariff rates included a generation rate component. The generation rate was unbundled into a market price and a competition transition charge (CTC) component. The CTC was calculated residually as the difference between the fixed generation rate component and the market price, where the market price was based on the utility’s cost of procuring power from the PX and the California Independent System Operator (ISO). All customers pay the CTC and the CTC revenues were to be used to pay for the utility’s stranded generation costs, also known as transition costs.

B. The Avoided Cost Credit

The utilities calculated a market price for billing purposes utilizing the cost and quantities of power purchased from the PX. This PX price was used to determine the contribution to the recovery of CTC (when compared to the generation rate component of frozen rates) and also represented the utilities' avoided cost of procuring energy. The PX component of the generation rate was either applied to recover the cost of purchasing power for bundled service customers or given as a credit to DA customers. The credit reflected the fact that DA customers had chosen to procure their energy through an ESP rather than the utility. So long as the market price, or DA credit, remained below the generation component of the customer's frozen rate, the DA customer continued to make a contribution to CTC in exactly the same manner as a similarly situated bundled service customer.

C. The Zero Minimum Bill Provision

Because the DA credit was based on the market price from the PX, it was possible that the credit would exceed either the generation bill component or the entire bill. If the PX price exceeded the generation rate component, then customer's bill reflected a negative CTC, *i.e.*, no contribution to recovery of stranded costs. If the PX credit exceeded the entire amount of the bill, meaning that the PX credit was greater than the sum of the generation, distribution, transmission, public purpose, and the other rate components, the customer would receive a negative bill or a credit. In other words, the DA customer would receive a credit for the entire utility bill. This is also known as a "credit" bill.

Prior to June 1999, under the zero minimum bill tariff provision in effect at that time, DA customers receiving the PX credit could experience, at a minimum, a monthly bill of \$0. In D.99-06-058, the Commission eliminated the

zero minimum bill provision. The elimination of the zero-minimum bill provision allowed DA customers to receive the entire PX credit even if it resulted in a negative (credit) bill. Prior to market dysfunctions in mid 2000, PX credits in excess of total monthly charges were generally carried over to succeeding months and were netted against positive bills.

The dysfunction of California energy markets in mid 2000 through mid 2001, undermined the original basis for calculating the DA credit. The prices charged the utilities during the waning days of the PX were substantially higher than the cost of producing the energy; were regularly higher than the generation component of frozen rates; and in fact, were frequently so high that the DA credit exceeded the entire amount of a DA customer's bill for the services the DA customer did take from the utility and the generation rate component. The PX collapsed in January 2001. Afterwards, consistent with Commission decisions adopting an interim accounting methodology for utility retained generation (URG) and payment mechanisms for recovery of the costs of Department of Water Resources (DWR) power purchases, the utilities based their DA credit on a combination of the costs of URG and DWR-provided power as an approximation of the cost of energy. These changes in the California electricity market require a new method of computing direct access charges.

III. PG&E's Proposal

PG&E proposes to calculate a credit to direct access customers as follows: For the period December 28, 2000 to January 16, 2001, (since DWR assumed power buying on behalf of PG&E on January 17, 2001), PG&E would use the Schedule PX price to set the DA credit, with the energy cost capped at the level ultimately determined by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to be just and reasonable. PG&E believes issuing bill adjustments to the

DA customers and ESPs who received the benefit of a DA credit that was based on unjust and unreasonable prices is justified for this period to adhere to the avoided cost principle and prevent the shifting of costs from DA customers to other ratepayers. For periods subsequent to January 18, 2001, the date PG&E could no longer purchase energy from the PX, PG&E seeks authority to adopt the DA credits for past periods as determined by PG&E using the combination of URG and DWR costs for the period after January 18, 2001, continuing through PG&E's implementation of bottoms-up billing for DA customers. Bottoms-up billing charges DA customers only the distribution and transmission component of the bundled customer bill.

A. The Period December 28, 2000 to January 18, 2001

PG&E proposes that for the period December 28, 2000 to January 18, 2001, DA customers retain the benefit of DA credits already calculated, but that such credits should be limited by FERC's final determination of what the just and reasonable rates for wholesale energy during that period were. FERC is considering those rates in a proceeding affecting bulk power markets and wholesale energy prices in California.²

PG&E argues that its proposal does not violate any rule against retroactive ratemaking. It is based on simple fairness and sound policy. The DA credit during the period December 28, 2000 – January 18, 2001 was determined based on the cost of energy that PG&E purchased from the PX and ISO. When it approved PG&E's Schedule PX tariff, the Commission approved a credit calculation for DA customers that was based directly on FERC rates (as passed

² *San Diego Gas and Electric Company v. Sellers of Energy*, 92 F.E.R.C. (CCH) ¶61,172 (Aug. 23, 2000), reh'g pending.

through to PG&E by the PX and the ISO). PG&E says that if FERC changes those rates retroactively, through refund and as the FERC announced on November 1, 2000 that it may do³ --- the same considerations of policy and fairness which led the Commission to base the credit on actual energy costs compel a retroactive adjustment to DA credits.

PG&E asserts that if FERC determines that market prices paid to generators and used in the DA credit calculation were unjust and unreasonable, it would require the ISO to recalculate hourly prices, and the ISO and PX to rerun the settlement/billing process. What remains for this Commission to do is merely to recognize that a billing adjustment is required to give effect to the result of the FERC's investigation. In the opinion of PG&E, such an adjustment would not be retroactive ratemaking. First, this proceeding is not a general rate proceeding; thus, the prohibition against retroactive ratemaking does not apply. *See Southern Cal. Edison Co. v. Pub. Utils. Com.*, (1978) 20 Cal 3d 813, 816. Second, what PG&E proposes is not a change in a rate, but a true-up of its calculation under an existing effective tariff. PG&E believes that if it were the case that PG&E's energy costs during December 2000 and January 2001 were found to be higher than what was used to calculate DA credits, DA customers would be requesting an upward adjustment in their credits.

New West Energy Corporation (New West) and the Alliance for Retail Energy Markets and the Western Power Trading Forum (AReM/WPTF) oppose PG&E's proposal on the grounds that (1) it constitutes retroactive ratemaking and (2) retroactive rebilling would seriously impact DA customers. They argue

³ *See San Diego Gas and Electric Co. v. Sellers of Energy* 93 F.E.R.C. (CCH) ¶61, 121 at p. 61,370 (Nov. 1, 2000).

that retroactive rebilling would be a nightmare for DA customers. The impact of allowing retroactive rebilling has far reaching impacts on DA customers who include the price of energy in their services and products. Those DA customers could not recoup increased costs two years later. The process to find past DA customers and recompute bills would be confusing, difficult, and inequitable. Some DA customers would see increased costs, while others who had moved out of state or could not be located for whatever reason, would avoid the effect of the recalculation. AReM/WPTF believe that the interests of ratepayers are best served by minimizing the need to revisit the past and imposing costs on customers long after they are able to make economic decisions based on a realistic understanding of their costs.

We agree with AReM/WPTF. In our opinion it would be unreasonable to recompute the DA credit should FERC order refunds. We are confronted, initially, with three unknown factors: whether FERC will order refunds: when FERC will order refunds (and when the order becomes final), and the amount of those refunds.⁴ As of this writing, FERC has the matter under consideration. Any order of refunds, if substantial, is expected to be appealed. It is impossible to predict the date of a final order. The period in question, December 28, 2000 to January 18, 2001, is two years old and counting. It is unfair for ratepayers who paid their utility bills two years ago to be subject to an unknown liability to be paid at an unknown future date. We need not elaborate on the intensive effort required by PG&E to recompute individual bills nor the intensive efforts and

⁴ When we speak of refunds in this context we refer not to money going back to DA customers, but to a recomputation of their credit. If a refund is ordered the credit

Footnote continued on next page

spent resources of end users to verify those recomputed bills. Because we deny PG&E's proposal we do not reach the question of whether approval of the proposal would constitute retroactive ratemaking.

B. The Period January 19, 2001 to the Implementation of Bottoms-Up Billing

PG&E proposes to use its current methodology for calculating the DA credit for the period from and including January 19, 2001 to the implementation date of a final Commission order in this proceeding. PG&E maintains that its current methodology strikes a balance between the philosophical underpinnings of the DA credit, which was based on avoided cost assuming a functional, efficient market for energy, and Commission efforts to deal with the dysfunctionality of that market after the demise of the PX.

PG&E states that its ability to purchase electricity in excess of its own generation including must-take generation from the PX's day-ahead and day-of markets ended effective January 18 and January 19, 2001, respectively. On January 31, 2001, the Commission issued D.01-01-061, adopting an interim accounting methodology for URG, which was subject to later adjustment and true-up. Because of the immediate need for a reasonable cost proxy for utility retained generation, PG&E calculated the Schedule PX price using an estimate of its cost-of-service for its retained generation. In D.01-03-081, the Commission elaborated on the payment mechanisms used for recovery of the costs of DWR power sales to PG&E's end-user customers. PG&E has used those payment

would have been less and the DA customer would have been overpaid by PG&E thereby causing a repayment to PG&E.

amounts, as modified by subsequent decisions, as the basis for the pricing of DWR-provided power under Schedule PX.

Thus, since the demise of the PX, PG&E has used a measure of the cost of energy to determine the DA credit, but (due to the same demise) is not based on its actual avoided costs. In place of the forward-market price of power from the PX and other avoided costs, PG&E now uses a weighted average generation cost for retained generation, power purchases and DWR power, increased by ISO administrative costs. PG&E also adjusts prices for distribution losses, the uncollectible allowance, and a procurement adder as required by Schedule PX. PG&E does not propose to retroactively adjust credits that were rendered using its current methodology. No party objects to PG&E's proposal. It is a reasonable approach that recognizes the market realities and will be adopted.

C. Bottoms-Up Billing

PG&E proposes to provide bottoms-up billing to DA customers, once its new billing system is in place. Under this method, there is no credit. DA customers would pay the sum of transmission (including reliability services), distribution, nuclear decommissioning, public purpose programs, and the fixed transition amount (FTA), where applicable, as well as any nonbypassable charges approved by the Commission for DA customers. DA customers would not pay the average three-cent per kWh and one-cent per kWh generation surcharges; however, they would pay charges the Commission may impose on them, for example, DWR bond charges, applicable DWR power costs, PG&E's ongoing CTC, and PG&E's historic uncollected charges.

In order to implement bottoms-up billing for DA customers, PG&E proposes to amend its tariff to include in distribution rates the costs of the nonfirm discounts, rate limiter adjustments, and power factor adjustments

(including standby reactive charges). Since these costs had previously been allocated to generation, they could be avoided by a DA customer billed on a bottoms-up basis. By putting these costs in distribution rates, DA customers will not avoid paying for these discounts. This was approved in the Phase 2 Post-Transition Electric Ratemaking (PTER) decision (D.00-06-034, Ordering Paragraph No. 14). No party objects to PG&E's proposal. This approach is reasonable because it complies with previous decisions and it will be adopted.

IV. SCE's Proposals

A. The Period January 19, 2001 to June 2, 2001

On January 19, 2001, SCE ended its participation in the PX markets. As a result, SCE could no longer utilize the PX price to calculate the DA credit. Thus, SCE was compelled to modify its DA credit methodology to reflect the fact that it was no longer procuring power from the PX, but rather from a number of sources. SCE, therefore, modified its DA credit methodology to rely instead on a weighted average energy price. SCE used this modified methodology until June 3, 2001. SCE requests that the Commission ratify its DA credit calculation between January 19, 2001 and June 2, 2001. No party objects. We agree that it is reasonable because it uses an appropriate calculation for the DA credit.

B. The Period June 3, 2001 to Implementation of Bottoms-Up Billing

Since June 3, 2001, SCE has utilized a DA credit calculation based on the generation rate of the customer's otherwise applicable tariff (OAT). Under Schedule PE-Procured Energy, the DA credit is set at the generation component of the OAT, adjusted for charges or credits. SCE requests that the Commission ratify its modified OAT generation methodology employed since June 3, 2001. No party objects. Again, we agree that this is a reasonable approach and we approve it.

SCE proposes that for the remainder of the Rate Repayment Period (as defined in the Settlement)⁵ Historical Procurement Charges (HPC), and all other authorized non-bypassable charges, should be subtracted from the generation component of the DA customers OAT before it is credited to them. SCE says the Commission has already signaled its approval of this mechanism in the findings of fact D.02-07-032:

“SCE will modify the currently effective DA credit calculation by subtracting the HPC as adopted from the generation rate of the DA customers’ OAT before it is credited to them. The HPC will have the effect of reducing future credits.”⁶

SCE, therefore, urges the Commission to find that until bottoms-up billing is adopted at the end of SCE’s Rate Repayment Period, SCE’s HPC, and all other authorized non-bypassable charges, should be subtracted from the generation component of the DA customers’ OAT before it is credited to them. No party objects. This methodology appropriately ensures that DA customers pay the required nonbypassable charges. It is reasonable and will be adopted.

C. Bottoms-Up Billing

SCE asserts that nearly every party to this proceeding agrees that the best prospective approach is to avoid the crediting methodology entirely by moving to a bottoms-up billing approach. Under this approach, DA customers’ bills would be based on the services they purchase from the utility, plus any

⁵ The Rate Repayment Period is defined as September 1, 2001 to the earlier of December 31, 2003 or when SCE recovers its Procurement Related Obligation Account (PROACT) balance. For a detailed description of the Settlement, the HPC, and PROACT, *see* D.02-07-032.

⁶ *See* D.02-07-032, Finding of Fact 10.

nonbypassable charges, instead of paying the same total charges as bundled service customers and then receiving a credit. SCE submits that there is broad support for this approach and that the Commission should authorize a bottoms-up approach for SCE at the end of its Settlement Rate Repayment period. SCE's proposal is the same as PG&E's. It is reasonable and will be adopted.

V. The 10% Discount for Residential and Small Commercial Customers

Section 368 of the Public Utilities Code, among other things, froze rates at their June 10, 1996 levels through no later than March 31, 2002, and provided an immediate 10% reduction of those rate levels for residential and small commercial customers. In 2001, Section 368.5⁷ of the Public Utilities Code was added, which states, in part, that, "[T]he commission may not subject those residential and small commercial customers to any rate increases or future rate obligations solely as a result of the termination of the 10% rate reduction." These references to rate levels implicitly refer to total bundled rate levels, since total rates paid by DA customers are unknown, fluctuate over time, and differ from customer to customer.

PG&E proposes a slightly different treatment of the 10% reduction than SCE proposes. PG&E currently provides the 10% reduction to DA residential and small commercial customers. PG&E argues that this 10% reduction is

⁷ Section 368.5(a) states that the Commission may not subject residential and small commercial customers to any rate increase or future rate obligations solely as a result of the termination of the 10% rate reduction. Section 368.5(b) retains the Commission's authority to increase rates to those customers for reasons other than the termination of the 10% rate reduction. Therefore, bundled service or DA customers cannot receive a rate increase solely by depriving either group of the 10% rate reduction.

eliminated when bottoms-up billing is established because rates will not have been increased “solely as a result of the termination of the 10% rate reduction.” SCE’s current DA billing methodology, which it proposes to apply until Settlement Rates are no longer in effect, provides a 10% reduction to residential and small commercial DA customers. The Commission has directed SCE to maintain the 10% rate reduction for at least the duration of the Settlement Rates. Once the Settlement Rates disappear, however, and SCE moves to a bottoms-up calculation, the 10% rate discount for residential and small commercial DA customers may be eliminated.

To sum up: today both PG&E and SCE provide the 10% reduction to their DA residential and small commercial customers. This will continue for PG&E until it implements bottoms-up billing at which time it may be eliminated. For SCE the 10% reduction will continue for the duration of the Settlement Rates (which are expected to end by mid-2003). At that time SCE will implement bottoms-up billing and may eliminate the 10% reduction.

We agree with PG&E and SCE that upon implementation of bottoms-up billing a rate increase for DA customers will not result “solely as a result of the termination of the 10% rate reduction.” It will result from going to bottoms-up billing.

VI. The Audit of the DA Credit Process

AReM/WPTF request an ongoing audit process for the DA credit. AReM/WPTF claim that this audit is necessitated by the wide disparity in methods proposed by the two utilities and the variation in credits. AReM/WPTF say that PG&E’s DA credit method causes DA customers to pay a portion of PG&E’s generation charges, even though they do not procure power from PG&E. There is a need to audit the DA credits provided by PG&E prior to the

implementation of bottoms-up billing to verify that PG&E has only charged DA customers for non-generation utility charges and that PG&E has not been collecting excessive charges from DA customers. SCE and PG&E strongly disagree and submit that an ongoing audit of their DA credit process would be a blatant waste of time and resources.

Since June 3, 2001, SCE has provided a DA credit equal to the generation component of the customer's OAT. SCE proposes to continue this practice until a move to bottoms-up rates, after which, there will be no DA credit. SCE contends that the generation component of the OAT is transparent and easily verifiable. In other words, there is nothing to audit under SCE's preferred approach. There are no assumptions built into SCE's approach. The credit is equal to the published generation component of the OAT.

PG&E argues that an audit would be not only pointless, but also expensive. A previous DA credit audit authorized by D.99-06-058 cost more than \$1.5 million and discovered only a few minor variances in the monthly reports. PG&E maintains that the cost of that audit far exceeded any benefits. PG&E asserts it is not reasonable for all utility ratepayers to have to pay to provide comfort to a small subset of DA customers in the form of an unnecessary audit.

We agree with PG&E and SCE. There is no persuasive evidence in this proceeding to show that an audit is necessary. There is no Commission staff report which raises any questions regarding the accuracy of utility DA credit accounting. Nor have any DA customers revealed a problem with utility DA credit accounting. Further, we have no intention of ordering an audit for the benefit of a small class of customers to be paid for by all utility customers. Should a DA customer find a discrepancy in its utility bill, the Commission's complaint procedure will afford redress.

TURN recommends that PG&E be ordered to prepare an analysis of the relative contributions of bundled and DA customers to the bankruptcy recovery refund, in order for those relative contributions to be allocated fairly.

TURN's witness had testified that:

At the absolute minimum, PG&E must be ordered to track the contributions toward the bailout fund that are coming from bundled and DA customers respectively. For bundled customers, this would mean tracking the difference, for each month beginning no later than June of 2001, between total bundled service generation revenues (including surcharges) collected by PG&E and the actual (or authorized) costs of URG and DWR power for that month. This account would then show the contribution of bundled customers toward the PG&E overcollection that appears likely to be used as part of the bankruptcy resolution.

For DA customers, the account should track the revenues from the one-cent surcharge, as well as any other net "headroom" or "CTC" that has been collected from DA customers through generation rates that exceeded the actual DA credit. This would show the contribution of DA customers toward the PG&E bailout fund. Once the basic data was accumulated, the Commission would at least be in a position to assess who has paid what. (Ex. 11, p. 8.)

We believe TURN is correct in pointing out the need for a report regarding PG&E's revenue collection sources and the allocation of that revenue in regard to bundled and DA customer costs. We will order PG&E to submit such a report.

VII. Comments of Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the Administrative Law Judge was mailed to the parties in accordance with Pub. Util. Code § 311(d) and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed by SCE, PG&E, TURN, ARm/WPTF, New West, and UC/CSU. We have modified the text of the decision to incorporate TURN's position. The utilities request more time to

implement bottoms-up billing than the proposed decision provides, while the ratepayer parties (other than TURN) request immediate implementation.

Although immediate implementation would be desirable, the modifications to the utilities' billing systems require a reasonable adjustment period. PG&E says that its CIS staff needs 90-120 days, and perhaps more, to implement bottoms-up billing; SCE recommends it implement bottoms-up billing on the earlier of (i) the end of its Rate Repayment Period, or (ii) September 1, 2003. We prefer to have both utilities implement bottoms-up billing simultaneously if possible, and within a reasonable time. Both utility proposals leave room for delay, which is unacceptable. Therefore, to provide sufficient time to modify billing systems to assure reasonable accuracy in billing, we will set the implementation date for both utilities at 75 days from the effective date of this decision.

AReM/WPTF recommend that the proposed decision be modified to provide for an audit of the DA credits provided by PG&E for the period starting January 19, 2001 and ending with the implementation of bottoms-up billing for DA customers. AReM/WPTF's argument merely repeats its argument in its brief and has been disposed of in the text of the decision.

AReM/WPTF contend that the PD should be modified to require PG&E to continue to provide the 10% rate reduction to residential and small DA customers as long as it continues to collect the Fixed Transition Amount (FTA) from such customers. The FTA, claim AReM/WPTF, "is used to fund the 10% rate reduction. If PG&E is allowed to collect the FTA from DA customers but is not required to provide such customers with the associated discount, DA customers will be subsidizing the 10% reduction provided to PG&E's bundled customers." We disagree. The FTA does not fund any current rate reduction. The FTA represents the repayment of the Rate Reduction Bonds

which were sized to fund the 10% rate reduction through the AB 1890 transition period. The AB 1890 transition period has passed. Thus, payment of the FTA is for a benefit already fully received (a 10% rate reduction during the transition period), not for the right to receive the 10% reduction now or in the future.

VIII. Assignment of Proceeding

Carl Wood is the Assigned Commissioner and Robert Barnett is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. Customers who purchase bundled service from their serving utility pay an electricity charge to cover the utility's power supply costs. For those bundled service customers, the total bundled bill includes charges for all utility services, including distribution and transmission as well as electricity.

2. A direct access customer receives distribution and transmission service from its serving utility, but purchases electricity from its ESP.

3. The Power Exchange credit is the billing credit that DA customers receive which reflects its serving utility's costs of procuring power. DA customers receive this credit because they purchase their power from an ESP.

4. In January 2001, the PX collapsed, ending the utilities' ability to purchase electricity in excess of their own generation from the PX's markets effective January 19, 2001.

5. On January 31, 2001, the Commission issued D.01-01-061 adopting an interim accounting methodology for utility retained generation (URG), which was subject to later adjustment and true-up.

6. In D.01-03-081, the Commission elaborated on the payment mechanisms used for recovery of the costs of DWR power sales to end user customers.

7. After it could no longer purchase energy from the PX, PG&E used a cost of energy to calculate the PX credit that was based on an estimate of cost-of-service for its URG, and its payments for DWR-provided power.

8. Bottoms-up billing for DA customers means that DA customers' bills are based on the services they purchase from their serving utility, plus any nonbypassable charges.

9. PG&E proposes to eliminate the DA credit and bill DA customers on a bottoms-up basis.

10. PG&E's billing system will need to be modified to accommodate bottoms-up billing.

11. Until bottoms-up rates are adopted at the end of SCE's Rate Repayment Period, SCE's HPC, and all other authorized non-bypassable charges, should be subtracted from the generation component of the DA customers' OAT before it is credited to them.

12. An audit of the DA credit is not needed, but an analysis of PG&E's generation and surcharge revenue is needed for the period January 2001 through April 2003.

Conclusions of Law

1. The method used by PG&E to determine the DA credit after the end of the PX to the date on which it implements bottoms-up billing is just and reasonable.

2. It is unreasonable to require DA customers to have their DA credit recomputed should FERC order refunds as it will subject DA customers to an unknown liability to be paid at an unknown future date.

3. The DA credit methodologies that SCE implemented from January 19, 2001 through the present are reasonable on the basis that they ensured that

DA customers received a credit exactly equal to the rate that SCE charged bundled service customers for energy procured on their behalf.

4. It is reasonable to replace the DA credit with bottoms-up billing.
5. Upon implementation of bottoms-up billing, a rate increase for DA customers will not result solely as a result of the termination of 10% rate reduction; instead, this is a result of moving to bottoms-up billing.
6. This decision should be effective today to provide certainty to DA customers and to the utilities.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) shall implement bottoms-up billing within 75 days from the effective date of this order.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this order, PG&E and SCE shall file an Advice Letter with revised tariff sheets to implement the authority granted in this decision. The revised tariff sheets shall become effective on filing, subject to a finding of compliance by the Energy Division, and shall comply with General Order 96-A. The revised tariff sheets shall apply to service rendered on or after their effective date.

3. PG&E shall provide the Energy Division with a report showing the amount of embedded generation rate revenue from frozen rates and surcharges that has been collected monthly from bundled service customers from January 2001 through April 2003. In addition, PG&E shall report the amount of surcharge revenues collected monthly from DA customers for the same period. PG&E shall show how it applied those revenues to associated costs incurred by bundled and DA customers during that period including the California Department of Water Resources charges and any offsetting credits provided to DA customers. PG&E shall serve this information on all parties to this proceeding within 20 days after the date of this order. PG&E shall file quarterly reports with the Energy Division updating the information ordered herein beginning the second quarter in 2003 until further action of the Commission. The first quarterly report to the Energy Division is due July 20, 2003.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

***** APPEARANCES *****

James H. Butz
AIR PRODUCTS AND CHEMICALS, INC.
7201 HAMILTON BLVD.
ALLENTOWN PA 18195
(610) 481-4239
butzjh@apci.com

Michael Alcantar
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 1750
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 402-9900
mpa@a-klaw.com
For: Cogeneration Association of California (CAC)

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

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 and Users Coalition

Edward G. Poole
Attorney At Law
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108
(415) 956-6413
epoole@adplaw.com
For: California Independent Petroleum Assoc. (CIPA)

Merilyn Ferrara
ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE
400 N 5TH ST.
PHOENIX AZ 85004
(602) 250-3161
mFerrara@apsc.com

Maurice Brubaker
BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Lon W. House
Energy Advisor
ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES
4901 FLYING C ROAD
CAMERON PARK CA 95682-9615
(530) 676-8956
lwhouse@el-dorado.ca.us
For: ACWA-USA

Barbara R. Barkovich
BARKOVICH AND YAP, INC.
31 EUCALYPTUS LANE
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
(415) 457-5537
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
For: Barkovich & Yap, Inc.

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

Marco Gomez
Attorney At Law
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
800 MADISON STREET, 5TH FLOOR
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 464-6058
mgomez1@bart.gov

Scott Blaising
Attorney At Law
BRAUN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8980 MOONEY ROAD
ELK GROVE CA 95624
(916) 682-9702
blaising@braunlegal.com
For: City of Cerritos

Chris Williamson
BREITBURN ENERGY COMPANY, LLC
515 S. FLOWER STREET, SUITE 4800
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 225-5900
cwilliamson@breitburn.com
For: BreitBurn Energy Company, LLC

Maryanne McCormick
CSBRT/CSBA

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

1215 FERN RIDGE PARKWAY, SUITE 208
ST. LOUIS MO 63141
(314) 275-7007
mbrubaker@consultbai.com
For: Brubaker & Associates

Fernando De Leon
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS-14
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5512
(916) 654-4873
fdeleon@energy.state.ca.us
For: California Energy Commission

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

Ronald Liebert
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE
SACRAMENTO CA 95833
(916) 561-5657
rliebert@cbbf.com
For: California Farm Bureau Federation

John A. Barthrop
General Counsel
COMMONWEALTH ENERGY CORP.
15901 RED HILL AVE., SUITE 100
TUSTIN CA 92780
(714) 259-2586
jbarthrop@electric.com

Edward Wheless
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS OF L.A.
PO BOX 4998
WHITTIER CA 90607
(562) 699-7411
ewheless@lacsdsd.org

Lynn M. Haug
Attorney At Law
ELLISON & SCHNEIDER

954 CAROL LANE
LAFAYETTE CA 94549
(925) 283-6264
mmcsba@yahoo.com

Robert B. Gex
ANDREW D. MASTIN
Attorney At Law, Bart
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3611
(415) 276-6553
bobgex@dwt.com
For: SF Bary Area Rapid Transit District

Norman J. Furuta
Attorney At Law
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
2001 JUNIPERO SERRA BLVD., SUITE 600
DALY CITY CA 94014-3890
(650) 746-7312
FurutaNJ@efawest.navfac.navy.mil
For: Federal Executive Agencies

William A. Mogel
Attorney At Law
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2533
(202) 442-3537
mogel.william@dorseyllaw.com
For: 7-Eleven, Inc. and El Torito Restaurants

Ann Trowbridge
Attorney At Law
DOWNEY BRAND SEYMOUR & ROHWER
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 441-0131
atrowbridge@dbsr.com
For: Real Energy, Inc./Sutter Health

Michael G. Nelson
Attorney At Law
ELECTRICAMERICA
15901 REDHILL AVENUE, SUITE 100
TUSTIN CA 92780
(800) 962-4655
For: Commonwealth Energy Corporation

Norman A. Pedersen
LAWRENCE G. WATKINS, JR.
Attorney At Law

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-3109
(916) 447-2166
lmh@eslawfirm.com
For: Dept. of General Services

Andrew Brown
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
abb@eslawfirm.com
For: DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

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
JEANNE BENNETT
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3133
(415) 392-7900
mday@gmsr.com
For: Enron Energy Service, Inc., Enron North America Corp.

Brian T. Cragg
Attorney At Law
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, RITCHIE & DAY
505 SANSOME STREET, NINTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
bcragg@gmsr.com
For: County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles

Clyde Murley
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
cmurley@gralegal.com

C. Susie Berlin

HANNA AND MORTON LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER ST., SUITE 2050
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2922
(213) 430-2510
npedersen@hanmor.com
For: Commonwealth Energy Corp. (Fred Bloom)

William H. Booth
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICE OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH
1500 NEWELL AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 296-2460
wbooth@booth-law.com
For: California Large Energy Consumers Association

Daniel W. Douglass
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
5959 TOPANGA CANYON BLVD., SUITE 244
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
(818) 596-2201
douglass@energyattorney.com
For: Alliance for Retail Energy Markets and Western Power
Trading Forum

John W. Leslie
Attorney At Law
LUCE FORWARD HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP
600 WEST BROADWAY, SUITE 2600
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-2536
jleslie@luce.com

David L. Huard
Attorney At Law
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4247
dhuard@manatt.com
For: City of Corona, Lowe's Home Improvement Warehouse

Randall W. Keen
Attorney At Law
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4361
rkeen@manatt.com
For: Los Angeles Unified School District, Del Taco / Lowe's
Home Improvement Warehouse

Seth Hilton

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

Attorney At Law
MC CARTHY & BERLIN, LLP
2005 HAMILTON AVENUE, SUITE 140
SAN JOSE CA 95125
(408) 558-0950
sberlin@mccarthylaw.com
For: City of San Marcos

Keith E. Mccullough
Attorney At Law
MCCORMICK,KIDMAN & BEHRENS
695 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 400
COSTA MESA CA 92626
(714) 755-3100
kmccullough@mkblawyers.com
For: Laguna Irrigation District

David J. Byers
Attorney At Law
MCCRACKEN, BYERS & HAESLOOP
1528 SO. EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 306
SAN MATEO CA 94402
(650) 377-4890
btenney@landuselaw.com.
For: California City-County Street Light Association

Kevin Mcspadden
Attorney At Law
MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY LLP
601 SOUTH FIGUEROA, 30TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90017
(213) 892-4000
kmcspadden@milbank.com

MOCK ENERGY SERVICES
18101 VON KARMAN AVE STE 1940
IRVINE CA 92612
(949) 863-0600
rclark@coral-energy.com
For: Coral Energy Services

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

Daniel J. Gerald

Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-4087
(925) 295-3371
shilton@mofo.com
For: CALPINE CORPORATION

Peter Hanschen
Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-8130
(925) 295-3450
phanschen@mofo.com
For: New West Energy Corporation / Agriculture Energy
Consumers Assoc.

Kay Davoodi
NAVY RATE INTERVENTION
1314 HARWOOD STREET, S.E.
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD DC 20374-5018
(202) 685-3319
DavoodiKR@efaches.navfac.navy.mil
For: Navy Rate Intervention

Charles Miessner
NEW WEST ENERGY
PO BOX 61868
PHOENIX AZ 85082
(602) 629-7405
cmiessner@newwestenergy.com
For: New West Energy

William T. Bagley
JOSE E. GUZMAN, JR.
Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799
(415) 398-3600
jguzman@nossaman.com
For: Poseidon Resources Corporation

Martin A. Mattes
Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN GUTHNER KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799
(415) 438-7273
mmattes@nossaman.com
For: Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group

Jeffrey M. Parrott

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOW & ELLIOTT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 398-3600
dgeraldi@nossaman.com
For: Jack-in-the-Box and Cargill Incorporated

Adam Chodorow
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30-A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-6673
asc5@pge.com
For: PG&E

John Whitting Boggy
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-8302
j0b5@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Mark R. Huffman
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-3842
mrh2@pge.com
For: PG&E

Peter Ouburg
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-2286
pxo2@pge.com
For: PG&E

Julio Ramos
Legal Division
RM. 5130
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-4742
jur@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ORA

Steven P. Rusch

MARK W. WARD
Attorney At Law
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
HQ-13
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5063
jparrott@sempra.com

Kelly M. Morton
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 W. ASH STREET, HQ13
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 696-4287
kmorton@sempra.com

Beth A. Fox
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, RM. 535
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6897
beth.fox@sce.com
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

James P. Shotwell
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE., ROOM 337
ROSEMEAD CA 91770-0001
(626) 302-4531
shotwejp@sce.com

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

Angela N. O'Rourke
WILLIAM MOGEL
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY, LLP
ONE MARITIME PLAZA, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 954-0200
aorourke@ssd.com
For: 7-Eleven, Inc.

Bill Julian

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

STOCKER RESOURCES, INC.
5640 S. FAIRFAX
LOS ANGELES CA 90056
(323) 298-2223
srusch@stockerresources.com
For: Stocker Resources

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

Robert Finkelstein
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE., SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
bfinkelstein@turn.org
For: TURN

Michel Peter Florio
ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
mflorio@turn.org
For: TURN

Jeanne Mckinney
Attorney At Law
THELEN REID & PRIEST
101 SECOND STREET, 1800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 369-7226
jmckinney@thelenreid.com
For: Kaiser Permanente

Paul C. Lacourciere
Attorney At Law
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 369-7601
placourciere@thelenreid.com
For: Kaiser Permanente

John Larrea

Attorney At Law
UTILITIES & COMMERCE
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 2117
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 492-9194

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

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

Robert A. Barnett
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5008
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1504
rab@cpuc.ca.gov

Christopher J. Blunt
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1779
cjb@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ORA

Anthony Fest
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4205
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5790
adf@cpuc.ca.gov

Donald J. Lafrenz
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1063
dlf@cpuc.ca.gov

Matt Tennis

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

Legal Division
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 327-1418
jgl@cpuc.ca.gov

Chloe Lukins
Consumer Protection & Safety Division
AREA 2-D
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5264
clu@cpuc.ca.gov

Maria E. Stevens
Executive Division
RM. 500
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7012
mer@cpuc.ca.gov

Ourania M. Vlahos
Legal Division
RM. 5037
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2387
omv@cpuc.ca.gov

Helen W. Yee
Legal Division
RM. 5034
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2474
yee@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Jerry Lahr
Program Manager
ABAG POWER
101 EIGHT STREET
OAKLAND CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7900
JerryL@abag.ca.gov

Marc D. Joseph
Attorney At Law
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
651 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 900
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080
(650) 589-1660

Director, Public Affairs
AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' ASSO.
925 L ST. 800
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-6206
mtennis@dolphingroup.org

Mona Patel
BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 CALIFORNIA STREET, 50TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 772-1265
mpatel@sidley.com

Pete Garris
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, SUITE 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 653-6055

Derk Pippin
CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
9 ROSCOE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110-5921
(415) 824-3222
derkp@newsdata.com

Jason Mihos
CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
9 ROSCOE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110
(415) 824-3222
jasonm@newsdata.com

Lulu Weinzimer
CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
517B POTRERO AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110
(415) 552-1764
luluw@newsdata.com

Kevin Duggan
CAPSTONE TURBINE CORPORATION
21211 NORDHOFF STREET
CHATSWORTH CA 91311
(818) 734-5455
kduggan@capstoneturbine.com

Chris S. King
Vice President
CELLNET DATA SYSTEMS, INC.
125 SHOREWAY ROAD
SAN CARLOS CA 94070
chrisk@cellnet.com

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com

Christopher A. Hilen
Attorney At Law
DAVIS, WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 276-6533
chrishilen@dwt.com

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

Dian M. Grueneih, J.D.
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 102
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
dgrueneich@gralegal.com
For: University of California and California State University

Jack Mc Gowan
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
docket-control@gralegal.com
For: THE IRVINE CO.

Ralph Smith
LARKIN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
15728 FARMINGTON ROAD
LIVONIA MI 48154
(734) 522-3420
filings@hotmail.com
For: Larkin & Associates, Inc.

Andrew J. Skaff
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW J. SKAFF
1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 2700
OAKLAND CA 94612-3572
(510) 874-4370
andy@skafflaw.com

Gregory Klatt
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
212 SAN ANTONIO ROAD

Diane I. Fellman
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF DIANE I. FELLMAN
234 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 703-6000
difellman@fellmanlaw.com

Karen Lindh
LINDH & ASSOCIATES
7909 WALERGA ROAD, NO. 112, PMB 119
ANTELOPE CA 95843
(916) 729-1562
karen@klindh.com
For: California Manufacturers & Technology Association /
Industrial Customers

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

Gordon P. Erspamer
Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-8130
(925) 295-3300
gerspamer@mofo.com
For: AES NewEnergy, Inc.

Jill H. Feldman
MORRISON & FORESTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 268-6474
jfeldman@mofo.com

Robert B. Weisenmiller
Phd
MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1999 HARRISON STREET, STE 1440
OAKLAND CA 94612-3517
(510) 834-1999
mrw@mrwassoc.com

Sara Steck Myers
Attorney At Law
122 - 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121

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

**Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026**

ARCADIA CA 91007
(626) 991-9455
klatt@energyattorney.com
For: Western Power Trading Forum / Alliance for Retail Energy
Markets

(415) 387-1904
ssmyers@worldnet.att.net

NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6026
(916) 631-4055
kcann@navigantconsulting.com

Boyd Wilson
ROBERTSON-BRYAN, INC.
9766 WATERMANN RD., SUITE L-2
ELK GROVE CA 95624
(916) 714-1801
wilson@robertson-bryan.com

Janie Mollon
Manager Regulatory & Legislative Affairs
NEW WEST ENERGY COMPANY
PO BOX 61868
PHOENIX AZ 85082-1868
(602) 629-7758
jsmollon@newwestenergy.com

Rob Roth
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
6201 S STREET MS 75
SACRAMENTO CA 95817
(916) 732-6131
rroth@smud.org

Kris Cheh
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 430-6463
kcheh@omm.com

Tracy Saville
300 CAPITOL MALL STE. 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 325-2500

Charles C. Read
Attorney At Law
O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 430-7500
cread@omm.com

Michael Rochman
SCHOOL PROJECT UTILITY RATE REDUCTION
1430 WILLOW PASS ROAD, SUITE 240
CONCORD CA 94520
(925) 743-1292
rochmanm@spurr.org

Valerie Winn
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177-0001
(415) 973-3839
vjw3@pge.com

William Blattner
Administrator State Reg. Relations
SEMPRA ENERGY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
wblattner@sempra.com

Don Wolven
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670
(916) 852-1300

Linda Wrazen
SEMPRA ENERGY REGULATORY AFFAIRS
101 ASH STREET, HQ15G
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 696-4272

Stuart Robertson
ROBERTSON-BRYAN, INC
9766 WATERMAN ROAD, SUITE L2
ELK GROVE CA 95624
(916) 714-1801

Lynn G. Van Wagenen
SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530
(858) 654-1752
lvanwagenen@semprautilities.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

Judy Peck

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

Last Update on 29-APR-2003 by: LIL
A9807003 LIST
A9807006,A9807026

stuart@robertson-bryan.com

SEMPRA UTILITIES
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 202-9986
jpeck@semprautilities.com
For: Sempra Energy

Andrew Ulmer
Attorney At Law
SIMPSON PARTNERS LLP
900 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 773-1790
andrew@simpsonpartners.com

Joma R. Jones
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
685 MARKET STREET, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 882-5000
jjones@sonnenschein.com
For: SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL

Joma R. Jones
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
685 MARKET STREET, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 882-5000
jjones@sonnenschein.com
For: SONNERSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL

Case Administration
Law Department
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 321
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-1711
case.admin@sce.com

Bruce Foster
Regulatory Affairs
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, STE. 2040
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 775-1856
fosterbc@sce.com