

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



July 18, 2006

Agenda ID #5838
and
Alternate Agenda ID #5842
Ratesetting

TO: PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING (R.) 04-01-025, R.02-06-041,
APPLICATION (A.) 00-06-023 AND A.02-10-040

These are the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Kim Malcolm, previously designated as the principal hearing officer in this proceeding and the alternate proposed decision of President Michael R. Peevey. The proposed decision and the alternate decision will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed.

Pub. Util. Code § 311(e) requires that the alternate item be accompanied by a digest that clearly explains the substantive revisions to the proposed decision. The digest of the alternate proposed decision is attached.

This matter was categorized as ratesetting and is subject to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c). Upon the request of any Commissioner, a Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting (RDM) may be held. If that occurs, the Commission will prepare and publish an agenda for the RDM 10 days beforehand. When an RDM is held, there is a related ex parte communications prohibition period. (See Rule 7(c)(4).)

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

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 19 of the Commission's "Rules of Practice and Procedure," accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 77.3 opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 2.3 and 2.3.1. Electronic copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Malcolm at kim@cpuc.ca.gov. All parties must serve hard copies on the ALJ and the assigned Commissioner, and for that purpose I suggest hand delivery, overnight mail or other expeditious methods of service. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's web site, www.cpsc.ca.gov.

/s/ ANGELA K. MINKIN

Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:hl2

Attachment

ATTACHMENT
Digest of Alternate Proposed Decision

R.04-01-025 et al.: Re: Petitions to modify Decisions (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047, D.02-06-023 and D.03-07-037 regarding gas hedging for the 2006-2007 winter season for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E).

Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Sec. 311(e), the digest of the substantive differences between the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Malcolm and the alternate proposed decision of President Peevey is as follows:

PG&E, SoCalGas, and SDG&E filed petitions for modification of various decisions, proposing to exempt purchases of hedging instruments from the rewards and penalties associated with the incentive mechanisms. The utilities state that they intend to purchase hedging instruments to protect ratepayers from fuel price spikes this coming winter. The petitions also request approval of specific natural gas hedging plans and ask that all of the costs and benefits of the expanded hedging plans, and the gas hedging that has already taken place for the 2006-07 winter season, be allocated directly to core gas procurement customers.

Proposed Decision

The proposed decision declines to approve the confidential hedging plans proposed by PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E. The proposed decision requires that a portion of all purchases of hedging instruments be included as part of each utility's incentive mechanism. The authority provided in the proposed order allows each utility to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside its incentive mechanism and applies to all hedging purchases made for the 2006-07 winter season. The remaining 25% is to be included within the incentive mechanism. This accounting approach is authorized only for hedging purchases that cover gas costs during the winter months of 2006-07. Once selected, each utility must account for all hedging purchases using this allocation approach. Each utility must inform the Commission's Executive Director in writing no later than 15 days from the effective date of this order of whether or not it will take advantage of this option, rather than accounting for all hedging within its incentive mechanism. Once this notice has been provided, the utility's decision shall not be revocable. Each utility is authorized to spend up to but not more than \$14 per customer for hedging purchases if it chooses to account for 75% of

hedging purchases outside of incentive mechanisms. This limitation shall not include hedging instruments commonly known as “swaps.” The proposed decision also requires that reports be submitted to the ALJ and the Energy Division and that these reports be made public.

Alternate Proposed Decision

The alternate proposed decision approves the confidential hedging plans of PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E1 for the 2006/2007 winter season in the manner requested by the utilities. The authorization provided in the alternate proposed decision will result in an increase for average residential customer's monthly bill by approximately \$2.00.

The proposed alternate decision grants the emergency petitions and modifies the impacted decisions to authorize supplemental hedges in 2006-07. The level of the hedges and the expiration dates are contained in the confidential hedging plans. Costs, including costs incurred for hedging already entered into, are allocated to core gas procurement ratepayers. No costs or benefits are allocated to shareholders. In addition, each utility is authorized to spend up to \$14 per core customer for the 2006/2007 winter season, or up to the amount requested in its petition for modification of D.05-10-015 on hedged instruments, whichever is lower. This limit shall not include hedging instruments commonly known as “swaps.” The alternate proposed decision requires that reports be submitted to the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and the Energy Division on a confidential basis.

(END OF ATTACHMENT)

¹ These hedging plans will remain confidential as there is highly sensitive market information involved and if released, could work toward the detriment of utilities' ratepayers.

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ MALCOLM (Mailed 7/18/2006)****BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Policies and Rules to Ensure Reliable, Long-Term Supplies of Natural Gas to California.	Rulemaking 04-01-025 (Filed January 22, 2004)
Order Instituting Rulemaking to Require California Natural Gas and Electric Utilities to Preserve Interstate Pipeline Capacity to California.	Rulemaking 02-06-041 (Filed June 27, 2002)
In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Gas Company Regarding Year Six (1999-2000) Under Its Experimental Gas Cost Incentive Mechanism and Related Gas Supply Matters. (U 904 G)	Application 00-06-023 (Filed June 15, 2000)
In the Matter of the Application of San Diego Gas and Electric Company (U 902 G) to Modify and Extend Permanent Gas Procurement Performance-Based Ratemaking Mechanism.	Application 02-10-040 (Filed October 31, 2002)

(See Appendix A for List of Appearances.)

**OPINION MODIFYING DECISION (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047,
D.02-06-023 AND D.03-07-037 IN RESPONSE TO THE PETITIONS OF
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS
COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
OPINION MODIFYING DECISION (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047, D.02-06-023 AND D.03-07-037 IN RESPONSE TO THE PETITIONS OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY	1
I. Summary	2
II. Background	3
III. The Current Incentive Mechanisms	4
IV. The Utility Proposals	5
V. Parties' Responses to the Proposals	8
VI. Discussion	10
A. Emergency Nature of Petitions	10
B. The Need for Hedging Instruments for Natural Gas Supplies	11
C. Pre-Approval of Utility Hedging Plans	14
D. Appropriate Ratemaking for Hedging Programs	15
E. Utility Reporting	19
VII. Conclusion	20
VIII. Comments on Proposed Decision	21
IX. Assignment of Proceeding	21
Findings of Fact	21
Conclusions of Law	23
ORDER	24
APPENDIX A: APPEARANCES	

**OPINION MODIFYING DECISION (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047,
D.02-06-023 AND D.03-07-037 IN RESPONSE TO THE PETITIONS OF
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS
COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY**

I. Summary

This decision addresses the emergency petitions of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to modify Decision (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047, D.02-06-023 and D.03-07-037. All three utilities seek to modify orders requiring them to account for all costs of natural gas procurement in natural gas purchase incentive mechanisms. The utilities propose to exempt purchases of hedging instruments from the rewards and penalties associated with the incentive mechanisms. The purpose of the proposed modification would be to relieve the utilities of the risks associated with the purchase of hedging instruments for natural gas prices. The utilities intend to purchase hedging instruments to protect ratepayers from fuel price spikes this coming winter. The petitions also request approval of specific natural gas hedging plans and ask that all of the costs and benefits of the expanded hedging plans, and the gas hedging that has already taken place for the 2006-07 winter season, be allocated directly to core gas customers.

The relief that the utilities request is similar to the relief that the Commission approved for all three utilities last winter season, which was sought and granted because of expected natural gas price spikes after Hurricane Katrina, and to a lesser degree from Hurricane Rita.

This decision declines to approve the confidential hedging plans of PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E. It encourages the utilities to purchase cost-effective

hedging instruments to the extent those purchases might protect ratepayers from high natural gas prices for this coming winter. To provide a reasonable incentive for sound management decisions, this order requires that a portion of all purchases of hedging instruments be included as part of each utility's incentive mechanism. Each utility may choose to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside of its incentive mechanism and to account for 25% of the cost and returns from each purchase within the incentive mechanism for purchases of hedging instruments to protect against price spikes during the 2006-07 winter season. This modification substantially reduces the risks of hedging instruments to shareholders while providing some assurance to utility ratepayers that hedging purchasing strategies will be cost-effective. A utility that opts to account for 75% of hedging costs outside its incentive mechanism is authorized to spend up to \$14 per customer on hedging instruments, excluding "swaps."

II. Background

In response to the events affecting the natural gas infrastructure resulting from Hurricane Katrina and because of rising natural gas prices, on September 13, 2005, PG&E filed an emergency petition for modification of its current Core Procurement Incentive Mechanism (CPIM) in D.04-01-047. After taking comments on PG&E's emergency petition, we adopted D.05-10-015 on October 6, 2005. D.05-10-015 authorized PG&E to purchase hedges as set forth in its confidential hedging plan for a total of three years. The order also approved, among other things, PG&E's request that the costs associated with the approved hedges be paid for by PG&E's core customers and that all payouts associated with the hedges flow directly to PG&E's core gas customers.

Similarly, on October 11, 2005, SoCalGas and SDG&E filed an emergency petition to modify D.02-06-023 and D.03-07-037. In response, the Commission

adopted D.05-10-043, which adopted the utilities' hedging plans and allocated all risks, costs, and benefits to their respective ratepayers.

PG&E filed the instant petition on May 5, 2006, seeking an order by June 15, 2006. SoCalGas and SDG&E filed their petitions on May 17, 2006, seeking an order by June 29, 2006. On May 26, 2006, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) filed responses to PG&E's petition. Neither filed responses to the petitions of SoCalGas or SDG&E although both participated in subsequent hearings.

On May 29, 2006, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling in these proceedings that directed the utilities to respond in writing to a number of questions about their respective proposals, decision-making processes, and alternatives. Each utility served responses to the questions presented in the ALJ's ruling. The ALJ subsequently conducted two days of hearings on June 9 and June 16, 2006. At the hearing, the ALJ agreed that some of the information relevant to cross-examination was confidential because its public disclosure might affect the utilities' ability to purchase lowest-cost financial instruments. The ALJ therefore conducted portions of the hearing such that they were closed to the public and parties who had not signed nondisclosure agreements. The associated hearing transcripts were filed under seal.

PG&E, SoCalGas, SDG&E, TURN, Coral Energy Resources L.P. (Coral), School Project for Utility Rate Reduction (SPURR) and the ABAG Publicly Owned Energy Resources (ABAG Power), and DRA filed briefs on June 26, 2006 and filed reply briefs on June 30, 2006.

III. The Current Incentive Mechanisms

Each of the three utilities currently purchases natural gas on behalf of core ratepayers and accounts for those purchases in a regulatory mechanism that

allocates liability between utility shareholders and ratepayers, providing an incentive for each to purchase low cost gas supplies. Each utility incentive mechanism differs from the other to some extent but all are intended to provide incentives because shareholders are allocated a share of the gains or losses associated with natural gas purchased compared to a monthly market gas price benchmark. A “deadband” around the benchmark delineates the range of costs to be borne by ratepayers and shareholders. These incentive mechanisms replaced the reasonableness reviews of the utilities’ gas procurement activities that the Commission previously conducted. SoCalGas’ Gas Cost Incentive Mechanism (GCIM) was approved in D.02-06-023 for SoCalGas, and SDG&E’s Performance Based Ratemaking (PBR) was approved in D.03-07-037. The Commission approved the current version of PG&E’s CPIM in D.04-01-047.

All three utilities have argued that their respective gas purchasing incentive mechanisms discourage them from entering into arrangements that fix the prices of natural gas for an extended period of time, or expending dollars to hedge a significant portion of the company’s natural gas purchases on behalf of core gas customers. The utilities have hedged their core gas purchases to some extent for this year and in previous years. However, they contend that if their spending on hedges, such as option premiums, exceeds the upper level of the deadband in their procurement mechanisms, then their shareholders face the risk of large financial penalties.

IV. The Utility Proposals

PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E request substantially similar relief adopted in D.05-10-043 and D.05-10-015 to allocate all costs and benefits of hedging to their respective customers. Their petitions seek approval of specific hedging plans for the upcoming winter season. Each utility explains that it would not be

permitted to depart from the plan adopted here and that their respective investment decisions would not be subject to reasonableness reviews. Each plan identifies a dollar ceiling to be spent on hedging instruments, the types of hedging instruments that would be purchased and generally over what period, exemplary “strike prices” for each purchase and the potential ratemaking impacts. The utilities state that the dollar ceiling may be exceeded in some instances, depending upon market activity.

Although this decision does not disclose which hedging instruments the utilities intend to purchase, the following types of hedging instruments are among those they may decide to purchase:

- *Call Options*: A financial instrument that gives the purchaser the right, but not the obligation, to purchase a New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) Henry Hub natural gas futures contract at a predetermined fixed price (or “strike price”) on or before a specific date (an “expiration date”);
- *Put Options*: A financial instrument that gives the purchaser the right but not the obligation to sell a NYMEX futures contract at a predetermined fixed price on or before a specific date;
- *Futures*: A supply contract whereby the buyer is obligated to take delivery and the seller is obligated to provide delivery of a fixed amount of a commodity at a predetermined price at a specified location;
- *Basis Swaps*: A financial instrument that gives the buyer the obligation to pay or receive the value difference between the purchase price and the settled spread between the NYMEX Henry Hub futures and a defined locational index, such as the Natural Gas Intelligence SoCal index; or
- *Fixed Price Swaps*: A financial instrument that gives the buyer the obligation to pay or receive the value difference between the

purchase price and a natural gas index settlement price. It involves no up-front premium.

The utilities describe their hedging programs as “insurance” against natural gas price spikes. Each utility states it requires this authority in order to better protect its core customers from potential gas price spikes this winter. During the hearing, the utilities provided evidence that natural gas prices are increasing and, more significantly, that prices for natural gas are more volatile and unpredictable than in previous years. One effect of this market volatility is that prices for hedging instruments are substantially higher than in the past.

The utilities seek authority to spend up to specified amounts on hedging instruments during winter 2006-07 and authority to engage in financial transactions that do not require dollar outlays in advance but which might result in additional losses. Without publicly disclosing the liabilities the utilities would incur on behalf of ratepayers, the amounts are substantially larger than amounts authorized in the past and would be used to hedge large portions of their gas supplies. The utilities propose to purchase hedging instruments that would protect against higher prices and also “swaps,” which would permit ratepayers to benefit from market prices that are ultimately lower than the prices the utilities paid for existing gas supplies (and simultaneously expose ratepayers to substantial losses under some scenarios). Storage gas could also be hedged.

The utilities would retain authority to include the costs and benefits of hedging instruments within their existing incentive mechanisms at their discretion. The accounting for each individual instrument would be separate, depending on whether it was purchased within or outside the incentive mechanism.

All three utilities requested emergency treatment of their petitions in light of the impending hurricane season. Each seeks retroactive authority to be relieved of liability for any risks or costs associated with hedging instruments purchased since the lapse of authority the Commission granted last October. PG&E has filed an application for long-term mechanisms for hedging outside its CPIM.

V. Parties' Responses to the Proposals

TURN and DRA filed responses to PG&E's petitions. They did not file responses to the petitions of SoCalGas or SDG&E because the filing date for the responses fell after the evidentiary hearing. TURN and DRA filed briefs to address their concerns and ideas after the hearings.

In its response to PG&E's petition, TURN states it generally supports utility hedging natural gas supplies but raised concerns about the lack of detail concerning the criteria used to determine hedging parameters and the analyses used to determine possible bill impacts. In its brief, TURN stated its support for the utility hedging proposals generally and urged quick approval of them. TURN believes hedging can provide important protection for ratepayers against price spikes. TURN proposes the Commission address the longer-term issue in a rulemaking or the application PG&E recently filed for authority to adopt a long-term hedging plan, Application (A.) 06-05-007.

In its response to PG&E's petition, DRA opposes PG&E's proposal, believing PG&E should conduct hedging activities within the context of its CPIM. It believes the dollar amounts PG&E wishes to spend on hedging instruments is "excessive" and the percentage of total gas supplies PG&E would hedge is too high. If the Commission permits PG&E to hedge outside the CPIM, DRA would propose the following conditions:

1. PG&E's dollar authority should be capped;
2. PG&E should not be allowed to hedge utilizing swaps;
3. The amount of gas PG&E should be permitted to hedge should be reduced substantially;
4. PG&E's lower CPIM deadband would be expanded to two percent; and
5. The Commission should order PG&E to provide the Commission with a report no later than April 1, 2007 that would provide an ex post review of how PG&E's hedging program affected gas customers.

In addition, DRA proposes a compromise hybrid CPIM approach whereby the cost and returns associated with 25% of all hedges would be included in the CPIM and 75% be allocated outside the CPIM.

In its brief, DRA also opposes SDG&E's proposal. DRA believes SDG&E's budget for hedging is excessive and unwisely includes an unknown amount of potential losses associated with purchase of "swaps" or futures. It proposes the Commission limit SDG&E's spending on hedging instruments to a lower amount than requested, prohibit SDG&E from hedging in non-winter months and require SDG&E to submit a report that provides details about the results of hedging activities. DRA opposes any hedging outside of incentive mechanisms but proposes increases to the tolerance bands as a way of limiting shareholder exposure to risk. Alternatively, DRA proposes that 25% of hedging costs and returns be included in SDG&E's PBR, with the remaining 75% allocated directly to ratepayers.

DRA also filed a brief in opposition to SoCalGas' proposal. DRA recommends expanding the lower GCIM tolerance band to reduce shareholder exposure to risk and that SoCalGas be required to file a report detailing the results of its hedging activities. As for the other utilities, DRA opposes any

hedging outside of incentive mechanisms but proposes a compromise that would include 25% of hedging costs and returns in the GCIM, with the remaining 75% allocated directly to core ratepayers.

SPURR/ABAG Power oppose the utilities' proposals to be shielded from the risk of hedging. They observe that the utilities' proposals are not founded on information about what customers would be willing to pay for this type of insurance, and that hedging outside of incentive mechanisms eliminates the motivation for sound decision-making and transparent transactions.

SPURR/ABAG Power also raise concerns that DRA and TURN are not in a position to judge the merits of utility hedging strategies and do not necessarily represent the interests of non-residential customers. They propose that the utilities be required to disclose what they intend to hedge and the average cost at the beginning of each month and to disclose what they spent and gained or lost shortly after the winter 2006-07 period.

Coral Energy does not oppose the utilities' proposals but raises concerns that the gas incentive mechanisms may require modification to permit the utilities to make commitments for gas supplies in long-term contracts. It also believes the Commission should explore the option of pre-approving annual gas procurement plans.

VI. Discussion

A. Emergency Nature of Petitions

We first address whether in fact the petitions make the case for emergency action by the Commission, as the utilities propose. We find that they do not. Last year, the Commission took emergency action on related utility petitions following an extraordinary event, namely, the devastation by Hurricane Katrina to the Gulf Coast, an area that produces and refines a substantial portion of the

country's petroleum supplies. D.05-10-015 and D.05-10-043 found that Hurricane Katrina "had a major adverse impact on natural gas markets," disrupting 16 percent of the natural gas production for the United States and resulting in a dramatic rise in gas prices. On this basis, we took emergency action to relieve the utilities of liabilities associated with hedging and to encourage their purchase of hedging instruments to protect ratepayers. No events have occurred this year that would create an emergency circumstance and none is anticipated except to the extent there is always some probability of events that could disrupt gas supplies or affect market prices. Although PG&E states that it needs expedited action on its petition because of the impending hurricane season, the onset of the hurricane season is not news and is certainly not unforeseen.

By seeking Commission decisions only weeks after the filing of their petitions, the utilities seek extraordinary treatment of their petitions with little justification. The utilities themselves waited to file their petitions for seven months following last year's decisions. Moreover, the utilities already have authority to purchase hedging instruments within their respective incentive mechanisms, and, in the case of PG&E, to purchase hedging instruments outside their respective incentive mechanisms for this year and next. These petitions merely seek authority to spend additional ratepayer funds on hedging instruments outside existing regulatory mechanisms. Although we appreciate the need for the utilities to purchase hedging instruments now if they are going to purchase them at all, a request for additional ratepayer funds to spend on hedging instruments hardly constitutes an emergency under the circumstances.

B. The Need for Hedging Instruments for Natural Gas Supplies

The utilities have developed plans for purchasing hedging instruments on behalf of their respective core ratepayers, believing that hedging is a type of

insurance against the price impacts of catastrophic events such as Hurricane Katrina and market volatility generally. The utility petitions explain why existing incentive mechanisms do not provide motivation for them to purchase what they believe are optimal investments in hedging instruments, namely, that hedging instruments generally present shareholders with too much risk. Each utility has purchased hedging instruments over the years as part of its natural gas portfolios and subject to its incentive mechanism. Each utility intends to continue to purchase some hedging instruments within its incentive mechanisms.

In October 2005, the Commission approved the utilities' emergency requests for authority to purchase hedging instruments outside of their incentive mechanisms following a devastating hurricane that affected national prices for natural gas. During that extraordinary period, the ratepayers of two of the utilities received no benefit from utility investments in hedges. The ratepayers of the third received almost no benefit. This year, the utilities want to spend considerably more on hedging instruments and plan to hedge much larger proportions of their total portfolios. Unlike last year, the market for natural gas is relatively stable and there is no expectation of natural catastrophe. On the other hand, the utilities did demonstrate that natural gas markets are more volatile than they have been for many years.

Although market conditions are in recent years less stable than they have been historically, market conditions alone do not justify spending enormous sums on insurance for substantial portions of the utilities' gas portfolios. The utilities did not support their proposals by demonstrating that they were consistent with best practices, prevailing financial theory or statistics about the effects of purchasing such financial instruments on natural gas rates in other

jurisdictions. Neither did the utilities provide an evaluation of what ratepayers would be willing to pay for various levels of protection from price spikes. The only justification the utilities provide is their wish to reduce the risk of price spikes and higher rates. The lack of supporting analysis is of particular concern because the utilities are proposing much higher levels of hedging purchases and spent large sums last year that provided almost no benefit to ratepayers. Moreover, the utilities are proposing that ratepayers assume all of the risk for these investments absent any regulatory incentive mechanism and without any reasonableness review.

In effect, the utilities seek authority to spend hundreds of millions of dollars of ratepayer funds at their discretion on financial products they themselves describe as expensive and in financial markets they describe as highly volatile. Viewed from this perspective, our approval of the utilities' proposals as they are presented to us would be irresponsible.

On the other hand, we understand the utilities' concerns, which we share, that ratepayers be protected from price spikes in gas markets. Hedging is a form of insurance. Most individuals in the state's economy purchase insurance as a way to protect themselves from loss associated with fire, catastrophe, accidents or illness. Whether they are willing to purchase insurance against higher natural gas costs and how much they would be willing to spend are open questions. With the appropriate ratepayer protections, the utilities should be able to make those decisions on behalf of ratepayers, just as they must decide when and where to purchase gas, and when to inject gas into storage and use it. The question, therefore, is how to motivate strategies for the purchase of hedging instruments that are cost-effective and provide appropriate incentives for the utilities to make

wise decisions on behalf of ratepayers. We discuss the utilities' common proposal for how the Commission would oversee their purchases below.

C. Pre-Approval of Utility Hedging Plans

Each utility petition provides an outline of a hedging plan. Each plan provides some information about the types of instruments the utilities might purchase, the dollars they might spend, strike prices, the amount and type of gas they would hedge and the impact on utility rates. Each utility presented highly qualified and credible experts at the Commission hearing who explained each program element in response to questions and described the various hedging instruments they might purchase.

The utilities seek Commission approval of these hedging plans and propose that this approval would represent adequate regulatory protection for ratepayers in the utilities' use of ratepayer funds. The utilities ask us to forego any retrospective review of the purchasing decisions of utility managers, although they state their intent to provide ongoing program information to Energy Division, DRA and TURN.

The information provided by the plans and the expert witnesses, however, is not adequate for the Commission to approve the plans. That is, the plans could permit the utilities to use very poor judgment about the instruments they might purchase and there would be no recourse for ratepayers who fund those purchases. Although the utilities' state the Commission could monitor the purchases for problems, they propose to be excused from retroactive reasonableness reviews. In responses to related questions, the utilities' witnesses refer to a "compliance" process, which they distinguish from a "reasonableness review." The utilities suggest at least inferentially that they would not be held

accountable to ratepayers even if the Commission uncovered evidence of fraud or abuse.

The utility plans are broad outlines of the utilities' hedging programs, providing almost no detail about purchasing strategies. The plans do not provide any assurance as to how the utility's purchasing strategy would be optimal for ratepayers as time passes and market circumstances change. Making a decision about whether to buy a hedging instrument requires judgment not implied in purchasing utility equipment. Unlike a contract for a utility product or service, purchasing hedging instruments requires knowledge of future purchasing decisions that we cannot evaluate in advance. Thus, our approval of these plans in advance is not comparable to our advance review and pre-approval of pipeline capacity contracts, advanced metering equipment or incremental gas storage service. We could not regard our approval of these plans as adequate regulatory oversight in light of the costs involved and the fact that specific hedging decisions are determined after we render our opinion.

Moreover, our responsibility is not to supervise day-to-day utility operations but to provide appropriate incentives for efficient and effective utility management. For the same reason, we would not delegate to Commission staff or any intervenor responsibility to oversee utility investments in financial instruments as a substitute for enforceable regulatory protections for ratepayers.

We therefore decline to pre-approve any utility hedging plans and proceed to determine other options for regulatory oversight of utility hedging strategies.

D. Appropriate Ratemaking for Hedging Programs

The utilities claim their existing incentive mechanisms do not provide adequate motivation for them to invest in hedging mechanisms at a level that might be optimal to protect ratepayer interests. Their witnesses explained that

hedging has become increasingly risky and expensive. They also state that the incentive mechanisms do not align ratepayer interests with shareholder interests; that is, shareholders may be in a position of “winning” when market prices go up.

The utilities have the authority to implement their hedging plans within existing incentive mechanisms. In fact, they have considerable experience hedging within the parameters of existing hedging mechanisms. SoCalGas in particular has used hedging very effectively and benefited substantially in recent years. PG&E in particular argues that under the incentive mechanisms, utility and ratepayer interests are misaligned with regard to the effects of hedging because hedging rewards shareholders when market prices go up. SPURR makes a reasonable argument that when a utility realizes returns on hedging within the incentive mechanism, ratepayers in fact also “win” because they are not saddled with higher gas prices. Moreover, if there were a potential “misalignment of interests” that would present a substantive conflict for shareholders, we would *prohibit* the utilities from purchasing hedging instruments through their incentive mechanisms. This is a restriction the utilities explicitly do not propose and, given SoCalGas’ favorable investments with hedging instruments, would probably not be wise.

Overall, we find that existing incentive mechanisms may not be designed to accommodate hedging activities that might be reasonable given changing market conditions. On the other hand, those mechanisms provide essential protections for ratepayers. We are not willing to abandon those protections on the basis of the record we have before us and considering the costs to ratepayers of last year’s hedging strategies.

We have stated our view that hedging may represent one element of a good procurement strategy and also that this Commission is not in a position to judge the details of day-to-day financial transactions. These two important elements of our thinking motivate us to provide the utilities with some freedom to purchase hedging instruments. On the other hand, we are not willing to give the utilities what is tantamount to a blank check to purchase high risk financial instruments, while taking no risk for the management of their purchasing strategies and absent any meaningful regulatory oversight of those strategies.

The utilities make a reasonable case that they may not be able to justify the shareholder risk that could be implicated if they were to engage in an optimal amount of hedging within their respective incentive mechanisms. The utilities have generally opposed increasing the tolerance bands for their incentive mechanisms on the basis that the change could reduce their prospects for shareholder awards. The record here provides little analysis of the potential impacts of increasing the tolerance bands under different scenarios and, because this aspect of the incentive mechanisms is complex, we are not prepared to increase the tolerance bands at this juncture, as DRA proposes. This and other ratemaking alternatives may deserve additional consideration in the utilities' applications for a permanent hedging ratemaking mechanism.

The option that has considerable appeal for us at this point is DRA's compromise suggestion that some portion of the costs and benefits of hedging positions be included in the incentive mechanisms, with the remainder allocated directly to ratepayers. This option limits shareholder exposure to risk but creates enough risk that the utility will be motivated to purchase only those instruments that appear most likely to provide some ratepayer benefit. Because the utilities state that all hedging instruments have an expected value of zero – and that the

utilities cannot affect or game the market – this modification to our ratemaking policy for hedging is fair and will promote conservative, thoughtful purchasing strategies.

We will direct the utilities to account for all hedging purchases the same. That is, each utility may choose to allocate either 100% or a 25% share of the costs to their respective incentive mechanisms. They may not allocate 100% of some purchases to the incentive mechanisms and 25% of others to the incentive mechanism. This restriction will eliminate any concerns that the utilities might treat high risk investments differently from lower risk investments in ways that skew risk toward ratepayers and potential reward toward shareholders.

We do not adopt the utilities' proposed dollar caps on spending for hedging instruments at this time, partially because the record is unclear as to what amounts the utilities are proposing and the associated liabilities ratepayers would assume. Instead, we limit increases to each utility's rates for hedging in winter 2006-07 to \$14 per customer if the utility chooses to allocate 75% of hedging costs outside of its incentive mechanism. The amount would not include instruments commonly known as "swaps," which do not have pre-paid premiums. This amount provides adequate funding for hedging and is reasonable until and unless we have information about utility customers' willingness to pay for gas hedging. If a utility chooses to account for 100% of hedging purchases in its incentive mechanism, this limit on rate increases would not apply. We also have no objection to the utilities' plans to engage in "swaps." However, we adopt DRA's suggestion that the utilities limit their hedging to the winter period for 2006-07. If the goal is to limit risk of price spikes, this limitation is reasonable. The utilities may address how year-round hedging

purchases are compatible with a sound procurement strategy in applications for permanent hedging programs.

The authority provided in this order to each utility to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside its incentive mechanism applies to all hedging purchases made for the 2006-07 winter season. Each utility must inform the Commission's Executive Director in writing no later than 15 days from the effective date of this order whether or not it intends to take advantage of this option, rather than accounting for all hedging within its incentive mechanism. Once this notice has been provided, the utility's option shall not be revocable.

E. Utility Reporting

We agree with DRA that each utility should be directed to provide a report of the results of its hedging programs. The reports will provide some evidence to evaluate the merits of the programs and may be useful in guiding future ratemaking and policy in this area. The utilities have not made a compelling case for retaining the confidentiality of past hedging activities in light of our commitment to an open and transparent ratemaking process. The utilities' reports should therefore be made public and provided to any interested party who requests a copy. The reports should provide the following information:

- Total funds spent on hedging instruments;
- Total losses and gains for each category of hedging instrument;
- Amount of natural gas supplies hedged monthly; and
- Impact of hedging program on utility rates.

The utilities should be prepared to provide more detailed information to DRA and the Commission's Energy Division upon request and the reports

should be filed by April 1, 2007. The utilities should notify parties to these proceedings of the availability of the reports and provide paper copies to the ALJ and the Commission's Energy Division.

VII. Conclusion

In sum, this order resolves the utilities' petitions as follows:

- Denies the utilities' requests to pre-approve hedging plans;
- Denies the utilities' requests for authority to account for 100% of the costs and benefits of hedging instruments outside their respective incentive mechanisms at their discretion;
- Permits each utility to account for up to 75% of the costs of hedging instruments outside its incentive mechanisms, with a corresponding share of returns similarly accounted for outside the incentive mechanisms. This modification applies only to the 2006-07 winter season;
- Authorizes each utility to spend up to the amounts requested in its respective petitions on hedged instruments, subject to the shared allocation of risk and reward;
- Requires that all hedging instruments for each utility shall be subject to the same ratemaking treatment during the 2006-07 season, whether fully included in the incentive mechanism or partially accounted for outside the incentive mechanism, as described herein; and
- Requires each utility to provide the Commission and interested members of the public a report no later than April 1, 2007 that provides information about the costs and benefits of the program in the aggregation, funds expended by category of purchase, impacts on utility rates and the amounts of gas hedged in each purchasing period.

We proceed to consider these matters further for PG&E in its application for a longer-term ratemaking program for natural gas hedging activities in A.06-05-007.

VIII. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311(d) of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____.

IX. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the Assigned Commissioner. Kim Malcolm is the assigned ALJ in R.04-01-025, R.02-06-041, A.00-06-023, and A.02-10-040 for the purpose of resolving the emergency petitions.

Findings of Fact

1. The utilities requested a schedule for expedited action in this proceeding that would require the Commission to make exceptions to procedural requirements of the Public Utilities Code and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.
2. The utilities have not made a compelling showing that any emergency exists that requires immediate authorization of the utilities' petitions.
3. The utilities already have authority to engage in hedging activities as long as they are accounted for within their respective incentive mechanisms.
4. Ratepayers received very little benefit from the utilities' purchase of hedging instruments in 2005-06 that were accounted for outside of the incentive mechanisms. The total amount spent on hedging instruments for which there was no monetary benefit to ratepayers was substantial.
5. The utilities provided evidence that natural gas markets have become increasingly volatile, which has increased the costs of and risks associated with purchasing hedging instruments.

6. The utilities did not provide evidence that their plans to spend large sums on hedging instruments are consistent with best practices, industry standards or financial theory or practice.

7. Compared to last winter, the utilities propose to spend much larger sums on hedging instruments and to insure much larger portions of their natural gas supply portfolios.

8. The utilities have not provided evidence that their ratepayers would be willing to pay the sums they propose on insurance against gas price spikes.

9. Exempting hedging purchases from regulatory incentive mechanisms and retrospective reasonableness reviews does not provide ratepayers with adequate protection. It is not reasonable to grant the utilities authority to spend large sums of ratepayer funds without some regulatory protections for ratepayers.

10. The hedging plans the utilities presented in this proceeding do not provide adequate detail to determine their reasonableness. Any assessment of how the utilities purchase hedging instruments according to those plans would need to be made in the context of the utilities' broader gas supply strategies and uncertain and unknowable future market conditions.

11. The Commission may not delegate to intervenors the task of overseeing and determining the reasonableness of ongoing management of utility operations.

12. The utilities state their existing incentive mechanisms are not structured in ways to motivate optimal purchases of hedging instruments on behalf of ratepayers.

13. SoCalGas and its shareholders have benefited substantially from its purchase of hedging instruments within its GCIM.

14. There is no meaningful misalignment of interests between shareholders and ratepayers with regard to the purchase of hedging instruments within existing incentive mechanisms, as long as the utility cannot influence market gas prices.

15. Including portions of hedging costs and benefits within each utility's incentive mechanism would substantially reduce shareholder liability while providing reasonable protection for ratepayers.

16. Because the utilities state their hedging programs are designed to guard against price spikes during winter 2006-07, there is no reason to authorize different accounting treatment for hedging that covers gas costs during non-winter months.

17. The record does not provide clear information about the amounts of ratepayer funds they propose to use for hedging.

18. Information about the costs, benefits and nature of each utility's hedging activities would be useful in designing future policy and ratemaking for hedging activities, and assuring utility hedging activities adequately protect ratepayers.

Conclusions of Law

1. The utilities should be permitted to purchase hedging instruments at their discretion, as part of their portfolio management strategies, and as long as they have the appropriate regulatory incentives to spend ratepayer funds wisely.

2. The Commission should not pre-approve utility hedging plans because it does not have the information on the record of this proceeding to be assured that those plans are reasonable.

3. The Commission should authorize the utilities the choice of accounting for 75% of each hedging purchase and associated benefits outside of incentive

mechanisms, with the remaining 25% to be included within the incentive mechanisms.

4. The utilities should be authorized to account for hedging activities outside the incentive mechanisms only for purchases that cover gas costs during winter months.

5. The utilities should be authorized to spend up to \$14 per customer if they choose to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside of incentive mechanisms.

6. The utilities should not be authorized to account for different hedging purchases in different ways. If a utility chooses to account for 75% of hedging costs outside of its incentive mechanism, all hedging purchases for winter 2006-07 should be accounted for in that way.

7. Each utility should be ordered to submit to the ALJ and Energy Division a public report no later than April 1, 2007 that provides information about its hedging programs as set forth herein.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The May 17, 2006 emergency petition of Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), the May 17, 2006 emergency petition of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and the petition of Pacific Gas and Electric Company filed May 5, 2006 to modify Decision (D.) 05-10-043, D.05-10-015, D.04-01-047, D.02-06-023 and D.03-07-037 are denied except as follows:

- Each utility may account for up to 75% of each hedging purchase, including hedging instruments commonly known as “swaps,” outside of its incentive mechanism, with the remaining 25% to be included within the incentive mechanisms. This accounting is authorized only for hedging

purchases that cover gas costs during the winter months of 2006-07. If a utility chooses to use this allocation of risk, it must account for all hedging purchases using this allocation of risk and may not treat different purchases with different accounting during the period in question;

- Each utility is authorized to spend up to but not more than \$14 per customer for hedging purchases if it chooses to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside of incentive mechanisms. This limitation shall not include hedging instruments commonly known as “swaps;”
- Each utility shall submit a report to the Administrative Law Judge and the Energy Division no later than April 1, 2007 that provides information about its hedging programs as set forth herein. Each utility shall notify parties to these proceedings of the availability of the report; and
- The cost of each utility’s hedging activities should continue to be calculated and collected as it is currently, through each utility’s Purchased Gas Account. Costs should be allocated to all core customers and the amounts included in the monthly core procurement advice letters filed by each utility.

2. The authority provided in this order allows each utility to account for 75% of hedging purchases outside its incentive mechanism and applies to all hedging purchases made for the 2006-07 winter season. Each utility must inform the Commission’s Executive Director in writing no later than 15 days from the effective date of this order of whether or not it will take advantage of this option, rather than accounting for all hedging within its incentive mechanism. Once this notice has been provided, the utility’s decision shall not be revocable.

3. Rulemaking 02-06-041, Application (A.) 00-06-023, and A.02-10-040 are closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX A
APPEARANCES**

Seth Hilton
Attorney At Law
STOEL RIVES
111 SUTTER ST., SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 617-8943
sdhilton@stoel.com
For: El Paso Natural Gas Company

Keith Mccrea
JAMES M. BUSHEE
Attorney At Law
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415
(202) 383-0705
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com
For: California Industrial Group and California
Manufacturers & Technology Asso.

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

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

Michel Peter Florio
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE., SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 (302)
mflorio@turn.org

Margaret Crossen
TRANSCANADA PIPELINES LIMITED
450 1ST STREET S.W.
CALGARY AB T2P 5H1
CANADA
(403) 920-2153
margaret_crossen@transcanada.com

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

Joyce Alfton
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2616
alf@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ENERGY DIVISION

Nilgun Atamturk
Executive Division
RM. 5303
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-4953
nil@cpuc.ca.gov

Carol A. Brown
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5103
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2971
cab@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Andrew Ulmer
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCE
1416 NINTH STREET, SUITE 1118
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 653-8826
aulmer@water.ca.gov

Colleen Hicks
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, SUITE 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
chicks@water.ca.gov

Eugene Cadenasso
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1214
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov

Andrew Campbell
Executive Division
RM. 5304
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2501
agc@cpuc.ca.gov

Laurence Chaset
Legal Division
RM. 5131
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 355-5595
lau@cpuc.ca.gov

David R. Effross
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1567
dre@cpuc.ca.gov

Roy Evans
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4205
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1095
rle@cpuc.ca.gov

David K. Fukutome
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5042
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2403
dkf@cpuc.ca.gov

Jack Fulcher
Energy Division
REA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1711
jef@cpuc.ca.gov

Diana L. Lee
Legal Division
RM. 4300
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-4342
dil@cpuc.ca.gov

Kelly C. Lee
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1795
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov
For: The Office of Ratepayer Advocates

James Loewen
Energy Division
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 620-6341
loe@cpuc.ca.gov

Scott Logan
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1418
sjl@cpuc.ca.gov

Kim Malcolm
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5005
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2822
kim@cpuc.ca.gov

Ariana Merlino
Energy Division
1350 FRONT ST., STATE BLDG. ROOM 4006
San Diego CA 92101
(619) 525-4220
ru4@cpuc.ca.gov

Harvey Y. Morris
Legal Division
RM. 5036
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1086
hym@cpuc.ca.gov

Steven A. Weissman
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5107
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2195
saw@cpuc.ca.gov

John S. Wong
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5019
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-3130
jsw@cpuc.ca.gov

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

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

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

Dated July 18, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ELIZABETH LEWIS
Elizabeth Lewis

***** APPEARANCES *****

Marc D. Joseph
Attorney At Law
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080
(650) 589-1660
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
For: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY EMPLOYEES

Evelyn Kahl
NORA SHERIFF
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
120 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2200
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
ek@a-klaw.com
For: Chevron U.S.A., Inc.

Michael P. Alcantar
Attorney At Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 1750
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 402-9900
mpa@a-klaw.com
For: BP Energy Company

Edward G. Poole
Attorney At Law
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94108-2818
(415) 956-6413
epoole@adplaw.com
For: State of New Mexico

John Tisdale
REPRESENTED BY H. PATRICK
Attorney At Law
ARCLIGHT ENERGY PARTNERS FUND I, LP
200 CLARENDON STREET, 55TH FLOOR
BOSTON MA 02117
(617) 531-6316
jtisdale@arclightcapital.com
For: Arclight Energy Partners Fund I, LP

Roger Berliner
Attorney At Law
BERLINER LAW PLLC
1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. N.W., STE 825
WASHINGTON DC 20006
(202) 365-4657
roger@berlinerlawpllc.com
For: County of Los Angeles

John Jimison
Attorney At Law
BERLINER, CANDON & JIMISON
1225 - 19TH STREET, NW, SUITE 800
WASHINGTON DC 20036-2489
(202) 955-6067
johnj@bcjlaw.com
For: Pan Candian Energy Services

Charles Scolastico
Deputy County Counsel
BERNARDINO COUNTY
385 NORTH ARROWHEAR AVE., 4TH FLOOR
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92415
(909) 387-5481
cscolastico@cc.sbcounty.gov
For: County of San Bernardino

John Burkholder
BETA CONSULTING
2023 TUDOR LANE
FALLBROOK CA 92028
(760) 723-1831
burkee@cts.com

Matthew Brady
BRADY & ASSOCIATES
2339 GOLD MEADOW WAY, SUITE 230
GOLD RIVER CA 95670
(916) 442-5600
matt@bradylawus.com

Cory J. Briggs
BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION
99 EAST C STREET, SUITE 111
UPLAND CA 91786
(909) 949-7115
cory@briggslawcorp.com
For: RATEPAYERS FOR AFFORDABLE CLEAN ENERGY
Rob Neenan
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF FOOD PROCESSORS
980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 230
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-9260
rob@clfp.com
For: California League of Food Processors

Patrick L. Gileau
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
770 L STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95689
(916) 324-8685
plg@cpuc.ca.gov

Avis Kowalewski
CALPINE CORPORATION
3875 HOPYARD ROAD, SUITE 345
PLEASANTON CA 94588
(925) 479-6640
kowalewskia@calpine.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Mark Pinney
CANADIAN ASSN. OF PETROLEUM PRODUCERS
2100 - 350 SEVENTH AVENUE, S.W.
CALGARY AB T2P 3N9
CANADA
(403) 267-1173
pinney@capp.ca
For: Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers

Raveen Maan
Resource Planning
CITY OF PALO ALTO
UTILITIES DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 10250
PALO ALTO CA 94303
(650) 329-2343
raveen_maan@city.palo-alto.ca.us

Tamlyn M. Hunt
Energy Program Director
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
26 W. ANAPAMU ST., 2/F
SANTA BARBARA CA 93101
(805) 963-0583 122
thunt@cecmail.org
For: The Community Environmental Council

Amy Gold
CORAL ENERGY RESOURCES, L.P.
909 FANNIN, SUITE 700
HOUSTON TX 77010
(713) 230-7812
agold@coral-energy.com
For: Coral Energy Resources, L. P.

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

Dan L. Carroll
Attorney At Law
DOWNEY BRAND, LLP
555 CAPITOL MALL, 10TH FLOOR
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-1000
dcarroll@downeybrand.com
For: Lodi Gas Storage, L.L.C.

Monica Mccrary
Attorney At Law
CPUC
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 703-1288
mlm@cpuc.ca.gov
For: The Office of Ratepayer Advocates

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

Christopher Hilen
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 276-6573
chrishilen@dwt.com
For: Lodi Gas Storage

Shyletha A. Williams
DEFENSE ENERGY SUPPORT CENTER
8725 JOHN J KINGMAN RD. SUITE 4950
FORT BELVOIR VA 22060-6222
(703) 767-8559
swilliams@desc.dla.mil

Steven A. Greenberg
DISTRIBUTED ENERGY STRATEGIES
4100 ORCHARD CANYON LANE
VACAVILLE CA 95688
(707) 446-3801
steveng@destrategies.com
For: DISTRIBUTED ENERGY STRATEGIES

Donald C. Liddell
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
(818) 593-3939
liddell@energyattorney.com
For: TRANSWESTERN PIPELINE COMPANY

Gregory Klatt
Attorney At Law
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
411 E. HUNTINGTON DRIVE, SUITE 107-356
ARCADIA CA 91007
(626) 294-9421
klatt@energyattorney.com
For: Transwestern Pipeline Company

L. Carroll
Attorney At Law
DOWNEY BRAND, LLP
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-1000
dcarroll@downeybrand.com
For: Lodi Gas Storage, L.L.C.

James W. Mctarnaghan
REPRESENTED BY H. PATRICK
Attorney At Law
DUANE MORRIS LLP
ONE MARKET, SPEAR TOWER 2000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-1104
(415) 957-3088
jwmctarnaghan@duanemorris.com
For: Arclight Energy Partners Fund I, LP

Joe Paul
Attorney At Law
DYNEGY MARKETING & TRADE
5976 W. LAS POSITAS BLVD., NO. 200
PLEASANTON CA 94588
(925) 469-2314
joe.paul@dynegy.com
For: Dynegy, Inc.

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

David K. Brooks
Assistant General Counsel
ENERGY MINERALS & NATURAL RESOURCES DEPT
STATE OF NEW MEXICO
1220 SOUTH SAINT FRANCIS DRIVE
SANTA FE NM 87505
(505) 476-3450
david.brooks@state.nm.us
For: State of New Mexico

Douglas W. Rasch
Attorney At Law
EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION
800 BELL STREET, RM. 3497-O
HOUSTON TX 77002
(713) 656-4418
douglas.w.rasch@exxonmobil.com
For: Exxon Mobil Corporation

W. Lee Biddle
CHRIS MATKIN
Attorney At Law
FERRIS & BRITTON
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 1600
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 233-3131
lbiddle@ferrisbritton.com
For: COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM, LLC

Jeanne B. Armstrong
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
jarmstrong@gmsr.com
For: Wild Goose Storage Inc., Sound Energy Solutions

Michael B. Day
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 392-7900
mday@gmsr.com
For: Kern River Gas Transmission Co./Questar Southern Trails Pipeline

Alana Steele
Attorney At Law
HANNA AND MORTON, LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, SUITE 1500
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2916
(213) 430-2502
asteel@hanmor.com
For: The Southern California Generation Coalition

Norman A. Pedersen
Attorney At Law
HANNA AND MORTON, LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 430-2510
npedersen@hanmor.com
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GENERATION COALITION

Kevin Lipson
Attorney At Law
HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP
555 13TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20004
(202) 637-5614
kjlipson@hhlaw.com
For: So. Cal. Edison Co.

Jeff Nahigian
JBS ENERGY, INC.
311 D STREET
WEST SACRAMENTO CA 95605
(916) 372-0534
jeff@jbsenergy.com
For: TURN

Richard N. Stapler, Jr.
KERN RIVER GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY
2755 E. COTTONWOOD PARKWAY, STE. 300
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121
(801) 937-6068
richard.stapler@kernrivergas.com
For: KERN RIVER GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Enrique Gallardo
Attorney At Law
LATINO ISSUES FORUM
160 PINE STREET, SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 284-7220
enriqueg@lif.org
For: Latino Issues Forum

William H. Booth
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH
1500 NEWELL AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 296-2460
wbooth@booth-law.com
For: Woodside Natural Gas Inc.

Randall W. Keen
Attorney At Law
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4361
pucservice@manatt.com
For: BHP BILLITON LNG INTL. INC.

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

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

Sheryl Carter
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 875-6100
scarter@nrdc.org
For: NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

Noel Obiora
Legal Division
RM. 4107
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5987
nao@cpuc.ca.gov

Brian K. Cherry
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B10C/1093
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-4977
bkc7@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Frank R. Lindh
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442, MS-B30A
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442
(415) 973-2776
frl3@pge.com
For: PG&E

Jonathan D. Pendleton
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-2916
j1pc@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Keith T. Sampson
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET (PO BOX 7442)
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-5443
kts1@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Robert B. McLennan
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LAW DEPARTMENT B30A
77 BEALE STREET, ROOM 3133
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-2069
rbm4@pge.com
For: PG&E

Peter A. Casciato
Attorney At Law
PETER A. CASCIATO P.C.
355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107
(415) 291-8661
pcasciato@sbcglobal.net
For: TIME WARNER TELECOM OF CALIFORNIA, LP

James Ross
Thums
REGULATORY & COGENERATION SERVICES, INC.
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320
CHESTERFIELD MO 63017
(636) 530-9544
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
For: BP Energy Company

Steven Cohn
Chief General Counsel
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
6201 S STREET, M.S.B406 PO BOX 15830
SACRAMENTO CA 95852-1830
(916) 732-6121
scohn@smud.org

Joe Kloberdanz
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, ML:CP32D
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 654-1771
jkloberdanz@semprautilities.com
For: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC and SOCALGAS

John R. Ellis
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
555 W. 5TH STREET, SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-2978
jellis@sempra.com
For: So. Cal. Gas Company

Judith L. Young
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
555 WEST FIFTH STREET, 14TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
(213) 244-2955
jlyoung@sempra.com
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

Lisa G. Urick
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
555 W. FIFTH ST., M.L. GT14E7
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-2955
lurick@sempra.com
For: SoCal Gas Co/San Diego Gas & Electric

Michael Thorp
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
555 W. FIFTH STREET, SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-2981
mthorp@sempra.com
For: Southern California Gas Co. & San Diego Gas & Electric Co.

Kurt R. Wiese
Attorney At Law
SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT
21865 COPELY DRIVE
DIAMOND BAR CA 91765
(909) 396-3460
kwiese@aqmd.gov
For: South Coast Air Quality Management District

Gloria M. Ing
DOUGLAS K. PORTER
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PO BOX 800
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-1999
gloria.ing@sce.com
For: So. Cal. Edison Company

Seth Hilton
Attorney At Law
STOEL RIVES
111 SUTTER ST., SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 617-8943
sdhilton@stoel.com
For: El Paso Natural Gas Company

Keith Mccrea
JAMES M. BUSHEE
Attorney At Law
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2415
(202) 383-0705
keith.mccrea@sablaw.com
For: California Industrial Group and California Manufacturers & Technology Assn

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

Steve Rahon
Sempra Energy Utilities
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8315 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 654-1773
srahon@semprautilities.com
For: SoCal Gas/San Diego Gas & Electric

Beth Musich
Regulatory Case Manager
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC
555 W. FIFTH STREET, GCT14D6
LOS ANGELES CA 90013
(213) 244-3697
bmusich@semprautilities.com

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

Aimee M. Smith
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET HQ13
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5042
amsmith@sempra.com
For: Southern California Gas Company and San Diego Gas & Electric

David J. Gilmore
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
555 W. FIFTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
(213) 244-2945
dgilmore@sempra.com
For: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY and SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

Georgetta J. Baker
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA ENERGY
101 ASH STREET, HQ13
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5064
gbaker@sempra.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Walker A. Matthews
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-6879
walker.matthews@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison Company

June A. Suwara
Case Administrator
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST FIFTH STREET, GT-20G2
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
(213) 244-3504
jsuwara@sempira.com

Meredith E. Allen
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ13D
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5050
meallen@sempira.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Anita Hart
Senior Specialist/State Regulatoryaffair
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS NV 89150
(702) 364-3047
anita.hart@swgas.com

Randall P. Gabe
Manager/Gas Resources Planning
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS NV 89150
(702) 876-7319
randy.gabe@swgas.com
For: Southwest Gas Corporation

Mark Fogelman
Attorney At Law
STEEFEL, LEVITT & WEISS, P.C.
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 30TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 788-0900
mfogelman@steefel.com
For: PG&E

Laura J. Tudisco
Legal Division
RM. 5032
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2164
ljt@cpuc.ca.gov

Cathy Reheis-Boyd
Chief Operating Officer
WESTERN STATES PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION
1415 L STREET, SUITE 600
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-9981
creheis@wspa.org

Alisa Nochomovitz
Attorney At Law
WHITE & CASE, LLP
4 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 544-1106
anochomovitz@whitecase.com
For: Calpine

Joe Karp
Attorney At Law
WHITE & CASE, LLP
4 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 24TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 544-1103
jkarp@whitecase.com
For: Mirant Americas, Inc. & California Cogeneration Council

Michel Peter Florio
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE., SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 (302)
mflorio@turn.org

Margaret Crossen
TRANSCANADA PIPELINES LIMITED
450 1ST STREET S.W.
CALGARY AB T2P 5H1
CANADA
(403) 920-2153
margaret_crossen@transcanada.com

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

Dean Simeroth
Chief, Criteria Pollutants Branch
AIR RESOURCES BOARD
PO BOX 2815
SACRAMENTO CA 95812
(916) 322-6020
dsimerot@arb.ca.gov
For: AIR RESOURCES BOARD

Susanne Phinney, D.Env.
Senior Assoc. Energy And Infrastructure
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
8801 FOLSOM BLVD., SUITE 290
SACRAMENTO CA 95826-3250
(916) 379-0350
Sphinney@aspeneg.com

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

Joyce Alfton
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2616
alf@cpuc.ca.gov
For: ENERGY DIVISION

Nilgun Atamturk
Executive Division
RM. 5303
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-4953
nil@cpuc.ca.gov

Carol A. Brown
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5103
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2971
cab@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Andrew Ulmer
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCE
1416 NINTH STREET, SUITE 1118
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 653-8826
aulmer@water.ca.gov

Colleen Hicks
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, SUITE 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
chicks@water.ca.gov

Jeannie S. Lee
Office Of Chief Counsel
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, ROOM 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-2220
jslee@water.ca.gov

John Pacheco
California Energy Resources Scheduling
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
jpacheco@water.ca.gov

Lynda Harris
California Energy Resources Scheduling
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVE, RM. 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-2212
lharris@water.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Jairam Gopal
Fuels Office
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-23
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5512
(916) 654-4880
jgopal@energy.state.ca.us

Mike Purcell
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS 48
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
mpurcell@energy.state.ca.us

Monica A. Schwebs
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET, MS 14
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 654-5207
Mschwebs@energy.state.ca.us

Todd Peterson
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-48
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 654-4838
tpeterso@energy.state.ca.us

Eugene Cadenasso
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1214
cpe@cpuc.ca.gov

Andrew Campbell
Executive Division
RM. 5304
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2501
agc@cpuc.ca.gov

Laurence Chaset
Legal Division
RM. 5131
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 355-5595
lau@cpuc.ca.gov

David R. Effross
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1567
dre@cpuc.ca.gov

Roy Evans
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4205
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1095
rle@cpuc.ca.gov

David K. Fukutome
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5042
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2403
dkf@cpuc.ca.gov

Jack Fulcher
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1711
jef@cpuc.ca.gov

Belinda Gatti
Executive Division
RM. 5303
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 355-5523
beg@cpuc.ca.gov

Maryam Ghadessi
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1183
mmg@cpuc.ca.gov

Jacqueline Greig
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1079
jnm@cpuc.ca.gov
For: The Office of Ratepayer Advocates

Julie Halligan
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5101
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2027
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov

Martin Homec
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4205
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1213
mxh@cpuc.ca.gov

Sepideh Khosrowjah
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4101
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1190
skh@cpuc.ca.gov

Dorris Lam
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5284
dnl@cpuc.ca.gov

Diana L. Lee
Legal Division
RM. 4300
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-4342
dil@cpuc.ca.gov

Kelly C. Lee
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1795
kcl@cpuc.ca.gov
For: The Office of Ratepayer Advocates

James Loewen
Energy Division
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 620-6341
loe@cpuc.ca.gov

Scott Logan
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1418
sjl@cpuc.ca.gov

Kim Malcolm
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5005
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2822
kim@cpuc.ca.gov

Ariana Merlino
Energy Division
1350 FRONT ST., STATE BLDG. ROOM 4006
San Diego CA 92101
(619) 525-4220
ru4@cpuc.ca.gov

Harvey Y. Morris
Legal Division
RM. 5036
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1086
hym@cpuc.ca.gov

Richard A. Myers
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1228
ram@cpuc.ca.gov

Bill Julian
OFFICE OF STATE SENATOR MARTHA ESCUTIA
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 5080
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 651-4030
bill.julian@sen.ca.gov

Wendy M. Phelps
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2311
wmp@cpuc.ca.gov

Robert M. Pocta
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4205
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2871
rmp@cpuc.ca.gov
For: OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES

Ramesh Ramchandani
Division of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2765
rxr@cpuc.ca.gov

Jim Campion
Division Of Oil Gas Geothermal Resources
TECHNICAL SERVICES MANAGER
801 K STREET, MS 20-20
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 323-1779
Jim.Campion@conservation.ca.gov

Glen Walker
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5106
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1232
gew@cpuc.ca.gov

Steven A. Weissman
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5107
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2195
saw@cpuc.ca.gov

John S. Wong
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5019
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-3130
jsw@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Gerald L. Lahr
ABAG
101 EIGHTH STREET
OAKLAND CA 94607
(510) 464-7908
JerryL@abag.ca.gov

M. Phyllis Bourque
SCOTT KOMINIAK
ABQ ENERGY GROUP LTD.
3022 CORRALES ROD
CORRALES NM 87048
(505) 341-9069
Phyllis@abqenergy.com

James Weil
Director
AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE
PO BOX 37
COOL CA 95614
(530) 885-5252
jweil@aglet.org

Kirk T. Morgan
Vice President & Project Manager
ALASKA GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY
2755 E. COTTONWOOD PARKWAY, SUITE 300
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121
(801) 937-6244
kirk.morgan@kernrivergas.com
For: ALASKA GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY

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

Liz Westby
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE, STE 1750
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 402-8709
egw@a-klaw.com
For: INDICATED PRODUCERS

Carolyn A. Baker
Attorney At Law
7456 DELTAWIND DRIVE
SACRAMENTO CA 95831
(916) 399-8611
cabaker906@sbcglobal.net
Catherine E. Yap
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.
PO BOX 11031
OAKLAND CA 94611
(510) 450-1270
ceyap@earthlink.net
For: Barkovich and Yap

Curt Barry
717 K STREET, SUITE 503
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 449-6171
curt.barry@iwpnews.com

Ben Ho
Global Lng Business Unit
BP
501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD.
HOUSTON TX 77079
(281) 366-2369
hobs@bp.com
For: BP

Martin J. Marz
BP AMERICA INC.
501 WESTLAKE PARK BLVD.
HOUSTON TX 77079
(281) 366-5126
marzmj@bp.com
For: BP AMERICA INC.

Dave Smith
Director, Regulatory Affairs Fuels
BP AMERICA, INC.
6 CENTERPOINTE DRIVE
LA PALMA CA 90623
(714) 670-5475

Bruce McLaughlin
BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1420
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 326-5812
mclaughlin@braunlegal.com

Scott Blaising
Attorney At Law
BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.
915 L STREET, STE. 1420
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 682-9702
blaising@braunlegal.com

Fredric C. Fletcher
Assistant General Manager
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK CA 91502
(818) 238-3557
ffletcher@ci.burbank.ca.us
For: BURBANK WATER & POWER

Lianne Parker
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK CA 91502
(818) 238-3700
lparker@ci.burbank.ca.us
For: BURBANK WATER & POWER

Bruno Jeider
BURBANK WATER AND POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BOULEVARD
BURBANK CA 91502
(818) 238-3700
bjeider@ci.burbank.ca.us
For: City of Burbank

J.A. Savage
CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT
3006 SHEFFIELD AVE.
OAKLAND CA 94602
(510) 534-9109
editorial@californiaenergycircuit.net

Lulu Weinzimer
CALIFORNIA ENERGY CIRCUIT
695 9TH AVE. NO.2
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118
(415) 387-1025
lisaweinzimer@sbcglobal.net

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

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

John A. Cioffi
CARDINAL COGEN
288 CAMPUS DRIVE
STANFORD CA 94305
(650) 723-1781
John.cioffi@ps.ge.com

David Jones
Attention David Jones Corp. Real Estate
CATHOLIC HEALTHCARE WEST
3033 NOTH 3RD AVENUE
PHOENIX AZ 85013
(602) 307-2417
djones2@chw.edu
For: CATHOLIC HEALTHCARE WEST

Robert W. Ramage Jr.
CHERRY POINT ENERGY LLC
PO BOX 627
CENTERPORT NY 11721-0627
ramage@pwlng.com

Jennifer Chamberlain
CHEVRON ENERGY SOLUTIONS
345 CALIFORNIA ST., 32ND FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 733-4661
jnnc@chevron.com
For: Chevron Energy Solutions

R.E. Green
Regulatory Specialist
CHEVRON PIPE LINE COMPANY
2811 HAYES ROAD, ROOM 2336R
HOUSTON TX 77082

Richard J. Morillo
Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF BURBANK
POST OFFICE BOX 6459
BURBANK CA 91510-6459
(818) 238-5702
rmorillo@ci.burbank.ca.us
For: CITY OF BURBANK

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

Tim Nichols
CITY OF REDDING, ELECTRIC DEPARTMENT
PO BOX 496071
REDDING CA 96049-6071

Peter Frost
BRUCE CONNELL-BRUCE.A.CONNELL@CONOCO.COM
CONOCO INC.
PO BOX 2197
HOUSTON TX 77252
pete.frost@conoco.com

Jeffrey F. Beck
COOPER WHITE & COOPER LLP
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 263-7300
smalllecs@cwclaw.com
For: Evans Telephone Company; Happy Valley Telephone Company; Hornitos Telephone Company, et al.

Patrick M. Rosvall
Attorney At Law
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER, LLP
201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 433-1900
smalllecs@cwclaw.com
For: RCS Digital Services

Marcie Milner
CORAL POWER, L.L.C.
4445 EASTGATE MALL, SUITE 100
SAN DIEGO CA 92121
(858) 526-2106
mmilner@coral-energy.com
For: CORAL POWER, LLC

Peter G. Esposito
CRESTED BUTTE CATALYSTS, LLC
PO BOX 668
CRESTED BUTTE CO 81224
(970) 349-2080
pesposito@cbcatalysts.com

Salle E. Yoo
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 276-6564
salleyoo@dwt.com
For: Calpine Corporation

Edward W. O'Neill
Attorney At Law
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834
(415) 276-6582
edwardoneill@dwt.com

Judy Pau
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 600
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834
(415) 276-6500
judypau@dwt.com

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

Daniel W. Douglass
GREGORY S. G. KLATT
Attorney At Law
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367
(818) 961-3001
douglass@energyattorney.com
For: Transwestern Pipeline Company

Melanie Gillette
DUKE ENERGY NORTH AMERICA
980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 1420
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 441-6233
mlgillette@duke-energy.com

Steve Lavigne
Director, Regulatory Affairs
DUKE ENERGY TRADING AND MARKETING LLC
257 E 200 S 1000
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111-2174
(801) 531-4410
sslavigne@duke-energy.com

Michael A. Crumley
EL PASO CORPORATION
PO BOX 1087
2 NORTH NEVADA AVE.
COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80903
(719) 520-4663

michael.crumley@elpaso.com

For: El-Paso Natural Gas Company and Mojave Pipeline Company

Stephen G. Koerner
EL PASO CORPORATION
PO BOX 1087
COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80944
(719) 520-4443
steve.koerner@elpaso.com

William W. Tomlinson
EL PASO CORPORATION
2 NORTH NEVADA AVE.
COLORADO SPRINGS CA 80903
(719) 520-4579
william.tomlinson@elpaso.com

For: El Paso Natural Gas Company&Mojave Pipeline Company

Michael Crumley
Consultant-Market&Project Analysis
EL PASO PIPELINE GROUPE-WESTERN DIVISION
PO BOX 1087
COLORADO SPRINGS CO 80944
(719) 520-4463
Michael.crumley@elpaso.com

Douglas K. Kerner
Attorney At Law
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 447-2166
dkk@eslawfirm.com

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

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

William S. Garrett, Jr.
President
ENERGY SERVICES&INVESTMENTS, LLC
5501 TILBURY DR.
HOUSTON TX 77056-2017
wgarrettesi@aol.com

Clarence Binninger
Deputy Attorney General
ENERGY TASK FORCE
455 GOLDEN GATE AVE., SUITE 11000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-7004
(415) 703-5528
clarence.binninger@doj.ca.gov
For: ENERGY TASK FORCE

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

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

David White
GAS TRANSMISSION NORTHWEST
1400 SW FIFTH AVE.
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 833-4321
david_white@transcanada.com
For: TRANSCANADA'S GTN AND NORTH BAJA

Leslie Ferron-Jones
Director, Pricing And Business Analysis
GAS TRANSMISSION NORTHWEST
1400 SW 5TH AVE., SUITE 900
PORTLAND OR 97201
(503) 833-4350
leslie_ferron-jones@transcanada.com
For: GAS TRANSMISSION NORTHWEST

Jack McNamara
GEO-ENERGY PARTNERS-1983 LTD.
PO BOX 1380
AGOURA HILLS CA 91376
(818) 865-8515
jackmack@suesec.com

Curtis Kebler
GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO.
2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS
LOS ANGELES CA 90067
(310) 407-5619
curtis.kebler@gs.com

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

James W. Mc Tarnaghan
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 765-8409
jmct@gmsr.com
For: Wild Goose Storage, Inc.

James A. Boothe
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 28TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 743-6961
james.booth@hklaw.com

Daniel W. Fessler
HOLLAND & KNIGHT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 2800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 743-6900
daniel.fessler@hklaw.com

Orlando B. Foote, Iii
Attorney At Law
HORTON, KNOX, CARTER & FOOTE
895 BROADWAY, SUITE 101
EL CENTRO CA 92243
(760) 352-2821
ofoote@hkcf-law.com
For: Horton, Knox, Carter & Foote

John Steffen
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
333 EAST BARIONI BOULEVARD
IMPERIAL CA 92251
(760) 339-9224
jsteffen@iid.com
For: Imperial Irrigation District

Gary Hoffman
Santa Barbara County Air Pollution
INNOVATION TECHNOLOGIES GROUP
260 NORTH SAN ANTONIO ROAD, STE. A
SANTA BARBARA CA 93110
(805) 961-8818
hoffmang@sbcapcd.org
For: INNOVATION TECHNOLOGIES GROUP

Kurt J. Kammerer
K. J. KAMMERER & ASSOCIATES
PO BOX 60738
SAN DIEGO CA 92166-8738
(619) 546-6175
kjk@kjkammerer.com

John R. Smith
Vice President, Mktg & Reg. Affairs
KERN RIVER GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY
2755 E. COTTONWOOD PARKWAY, STE. 300
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84121
(801) 937-6087
john.smith@kernrivergas.com
For: KERN RIVER GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Bud J. Becker
Assistant General Counsel
KINDER MORGAN INTERSTATE GAS
370 VAN GORDON STREET
LAKEWOOD CO 80228
(303) 763-3496
bud_becker@kindermorgan.com

Laura J. Scott
LANDS ENERGY CONSULTING, INC.
2366 EASTLAKE AVENUE EAST, SUITE 322
SEATTLE WA 98102
(206) 726-3695
lscott@landsenergy.com
For: LANDS ENERGY CONSULTING, INC.

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

Robert L. Pettinato
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER
NATURAL GAS GROUP ENERGY CONTROL CENTER
PO BOX 51111, RM. 1148
LOS ANGELES CA 90051-0100
(818) 771-6715
robert.pettinato@ladwp.com
For: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Elizabeth Douglass
Staff Writer
LOS ANGELES TIMES
202 WEST FIRST STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
(213) 237-5799
elizabeth.douglass@latimes.com

John W. Leslie
Attorney At Law
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP
11988 EL CAMINO REAL, SUITE 200
SAN DIEGO CA 92130-2592
(858) 720-6300
jleslie@luce.com

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

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: MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS

S. Nancy Whang
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
11355 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD.
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
(310) 312-4377
pucservice@manatt.com
For: BHP BILLITON LNG INTL. INC.

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

Gregory R. Pohl
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
MODESTO CA 95352-4060
(209) 526-7463
gregp@mid.com

Peter W. Hanschen
Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 295-3450
phanschen@mofo.com

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

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

Devra Wang
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 875-6100
dwang@nrdc.org

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

Ronald G. Oechsler
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078
(916) 631-3266
roechsler@navigantconsulting.com

Victoria P. Fleming
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.
3100 ZINFANDEL DRIVE, SUITE 600
RANCHO CORDOVA CA 95670-6078
(916) 631-3287
vfleming@navigantconsulting.com

Steven C. Nelson
Attorney For Sempra Energy
101 ASH STREET HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017
(619) 699-5136
snelson@sempra.com
For: Sempra Global
Karl W. Meyer
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY
180 CIRBY WAY
ROSEVILLE CA 95678
(916) 781-4274
karl@ncpa.com

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

Larry Jenkins
OCCIDENTAL OIL & GAS
5 GREENWAY PLAZA
HOUSTON TX 77046-0504
(713) 215-1000
Larry_Jenkins@oxy.com

Daniel Mcclafferty
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105-1814
(415) 973-2592
mdm8@pge.com

Darcy Morrison
Case Coordinator
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-5813
d2mr@pge.com

John C. Stewart
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC:B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105

John P. Armato
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
MAIL CODE: B5F
POST OFFICE BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177-0001
(415) 973-7022
jpa3@pge.com

Kenneth J. Brennan
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MAILCODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-0017
kjbh@pge.com
For: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
Kwanyu Helen Yu
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-3477
khy2@pge.com

Law Department File Room
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442
cpuccases@pge.com

Lisa Lieu
Case Management
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-4376
lkl1@pge.com

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

Eric Klinkner
PASADENA DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER
150 LOS ROBLES AVENUE, SUITE 200
PASADENA CA 91101-2437
(626) 744-4478
eklinkner@ci.pasadena.ca.us
For: City of Pasadena

Ned Greenwood
QUESTAR SOUTHERN TRAILS PIPELINE
PO BOX 45360
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84145-0360
(801) 324-2713
Ned.Greenwood@questar.com
For: Questar Southern Trails Pipeline

Paul Fenn
RATEPAYERS FOR AFFORDABLE CLEAN ENERGY
4281 PIEDMONT AVENUE
OAKLAND CA 94611
(510) 451-1727
paulfenn@local.org
For: INTERVENOR RATEPAYERS FOR AFFORDABLE CLEAN ENERGY

Michael Briggs
RELIANT ENERGY INC
1901 N MOORE ST STE 802
ARLINGTON VA 22209-1717
(202) 783-7220
mbriggs@reliant.com
For: Reliant Energy Incorporated

Gary Hinners
RELIANT ENERGY, INC.
PO BOX 148
HOUSTON TX 77001-0148
(713) 497-4321
ghinners@reliant.com
For: RELIANT ENERGY, INC.

Edward C. Remedios
33 TOLEDO WAY
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94123-2108
(415) 474-4253
ecrem@ix.netcom.com

Barry Brunelle
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
PO BOX 15830
SACRAMENTO CA 95852-1830
(916) 732-6523
bbrunel@smud.org

Yvonne Gross
Regulatory Policy Manager
SEMPRA ENERGY
HQ08C
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92103
(619) 696-2075
ygross@sempraglobal.com

Linda Wrazen
SEMPRA ENERGY REGULATORY AFFAIRS
101 ASH STREET, HQ16C
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 696-4272
lwrazen@sempraglobal.com

Judy Peck
SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 202-9986
jpeck@semprautilities.com

Walter Tobin
SEMPRA GLOBAL
101 ASH STREET, HQ08C
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 696-4868
wtobin@sempraglobal.com

Edgar Kuipers
SHELL TRADING GAS & POWER
909 FANNIN, PLAZA LEVEL 1
HOUSTON TX 77010
(713) 230-1723
edgar.kuipers@shell.com

David M. Norris
Attorney At Law
SIERRA PACIFIC POWER COMPANY
6100 NEIL ROAD, PO BOX 10100
RENO NV 89520-0024
(775) 834-5696
dnorris@sppc.com
For: Sierra Pacific Power Company

Ray Camacho
SILICON VALLEY POWER
1500 WARBURTON AVENUE
SANTA CLARA CA 95050
(408) 261-5225
rcamacho@ci.santa-clara.ca.us

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

Michael S. Alexander
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
2244 WALNUT GROVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-2029
Michael.Alexander@sce.com
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

Bruce Foster
Vice President
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, STE. 2040
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 775-1856
bruce.foster@sce.com

Case Administration
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
ROOM 370
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-4875
case.admin@sce.com

David E. Van Iderstine
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 345
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-3121
david.vaniderstine@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison

Douglas Porter
GLORIA ING
Attorney At Law
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-3964
douglas.porter@sce.com

Central Files
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 W. FIFTH STREET, GT14D6
LOS ANGELES CA 90013-1011
centralfiles@semprautilities.com
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPANY

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

Gregory Healy
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
555 WEST FIFTH STREET
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
(213) 244-3314
ghealy@semprautilities.com

Marzia Zafar
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 2060
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 346-3215
mzafar@semprautilities.com
For: SoCalGas/SDG&E

Andy Bettwy
Attorney At Law
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS NV 89150
(702) 876-7107
andy.bettwy@swgas.com
For: Southwest Gas Corporation

Edward B. Giesecking
Director/Pricing And Tariffs
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
5241 SPRING MOUNTAIN ROAD
LAS VEGAS NV 89150
(702) 364-3271
ed.giesecking@swgas.com
For: Southwest Gas Corporation

Roger C. Montgomery
Vice President, Pricing
SOUTHWEST GAS CORPORATION
PO BOX 98510
LAS VEGAS NV 89193-8510
(702) 867-7321
roger.montgomery@swgas.com

Ronald M. Giteck
Assistant Attorney General
STATE OF MINNESOTA
NCL TOWER, SUITE 900
445 MINNESOTA STREET
ST. PAUL MN 55101-2127
(651) 284-4066
ron.giteck@state.mn.us
For: STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

James M. Bushee
Attorney At Law
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
WASHINGTON DC 20004
(202) 383-0643
jbushee@sablaw.com
For: California Manufacturers & Technology Assn.

David A. Schlissel
Senior Consultant
SYNAPSE ENERG ECONOMICS
22 PEARL STREET
CAMBRIDGE MA 02139
(617) 661-3248
DSchlissel@synapse-energy.com

Carrie Camarena
Attorney At Law
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE. 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4002
carriec@greenlining.org
For: THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

Robert Gnaizda
Attorney At Law
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SECOND FLOOR
BERKELEY CA 94704
(510) 926-4006
robertg@greenlining.org

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

Nina Suetake
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVE., STE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876
nsuetake@turn.org

David E. Novitski
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
101 SECOND STREET, STE. 1800
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
For: WOODSIDE NATURAL GAS INC.

Paul C. Lacourciere
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP
SUITE 1800
101 SECOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 369-7601
placourciere@thelenreid.com

Kelly Allen
Regulatory Analyst
TRANSWESTERN PIPELINE COMPANY
RM. WT 608, PANHANDLE ENERGY TOWER
5444 WESTHEIMER RD.
HOUSTON TX 77056
(713) 989-2023
kelly.allen@panhandleenergy.com
For: TRANSWESTERN PIPELINE COMPANY

Willie Manuel
TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 949
TURLOCK CA 95382-0949
(209) 883-8348
wgmanuel@tid.org

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

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

Charles R. Toca
UTILITY SAVINGS & REFUND, LLC
1100 QUAIL, SUITE 217
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660
(949) 474-0511
ctoca@utility-savings.com

J. Curtis Moffatt
VAN NESS FELDMAN, P.C.
7TH FLOOR
1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007
(202) 298-1800
jcm@vnf.com
For: Kinder Morgan Interstate Gas Transmission LLC

Paul I. Korman
VAN NESS FELDMAN, P.C.
7TH FLOOR
1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON STREET, NW
WASHINGTON DC 20007
(202) 298-1800
pik@vnf.com
For: Kinder Morgan Interstate Gas Transmission LLC

Elaine M. Duncan
Attorney At Law
VERIZON CALIFORNIA INC.
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 474-0468
elaine.duncan@verizon.com
For: Verizon Inc.

Alex Goldberg
WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC.
ONE WILLIAMS CENTER, SUITE 4100
TULSA OK 74172
(918) 573-3901
alex.goldberg@williams.com
For: Williams Companies, Inc.

Kevin Woodruff
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES
1100 K STREET, SUITE 204
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 442-4877
kdw@woodruff-expert-services.com