COM/vfw

MAILED
01/02/03

Decision 02-12-082 December 30, 2002

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (E 3338-E) for Authority to Institute a Rate Stabilization Plan with a Rate Increase and End of Rate Freeze Tariffs.	Application 00-11-038 (November 16, 2000)
Emergency Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Adopt a Rate Stabilization Plan (U 39 E).	Application 00-11-056 (Filed November 22, 2000)
Petition of THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK for Modification of Resolution E-3527.	Application 00-10-028 (Filed October 17, 2000)

ORDER GRANTING REHEARING OF DECISION 02-11-074

I. SUMMARY

Decision (D.) 02-11-074 was issued in response to several applications for rehearing of D.02-10-063. D.02-10-063 adopted a methodology for setting a bond charge to recover the Department of Water Resource's (DWR) bond-related costs. That methodology applies a per kilowatt-hour (kWh) charge on all consumption that is not specifically excluded from the surcharge. The Commission excluded from the bond charge residential sales up to 130% of baseline in SDG&E's service territory, and all medical baseline and California Alternate Rates Energy (CARE) eligible customer usage statewide. On rehearing, the Commission issued D.02-11-074, which modified D.02-10-

063 in order to exempt from the bond charge residential sales up to 130% of baseline in all three service territories.

The California Manufacturers & Technology Association, the California Industrial Users and the California Large Energy Consumers Association (Applicants) filed a timely application for rehearing of D.02-11-074 (Application). The Application essentially raises two allegations of legal error. First, the Application alleges that the decision to exempt all 130% of baseline usage from the bond charge shifts costs from residential usage to other principally non-residential usage and discriminates against non-exempt customers. Second, the Application argues that D.02-11-074 is arbitrary and capricious in that it was issued without explanation, and without further hearing and opportunity to brief the issues.

PG&E and the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) filed timely Responses to the Application for Rehearing.

After reviewing the Application for Rehearing we are of the opinion that the application for rehearing should be granted in order to impose the bond charge on residential sales up to 130% of baseline in all three service territories.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Bond Charge Rehearing Decision Should Be Modified in Order to Apply the Bond Charge to Residential Sales Of Up To 130% of Baseline Usage in All Three Service Territories.

The Applicants request that the Commission grant rehearing of Decision 02-11-074 (Bond Charge Rehearing Decision) to require inclusion of all residential usage up to 130 percent of baseline in the calculation of the bond charges for each of the three utilities to the maximum extent possible.[1] To the extent that the bond charge cannot be recovered from residential usage below 130 percent of baseline on the San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) system, they propose that that issue be addressed for SDG&E on an intra-utility basis, to avoid shifting SDG&E's proper share of the

[1] CMTA *et al* App for Reh, p. 7.

Department of Water Resources (DWR) bond charge costs onto customers of PG&E and the California Edison Company (SCE).[2] The Applicants argue that the Commission's determination improperly shifts more bond costs to the non-exempt customers solely because of a perceived problem with SDG&E.

The basis for the Commission's Decision on Rehearing was that there was a problem in the fact that SDG&E's customers were treated differently from other utilities' customers, thus resulting in a cost shift between service territories, and that this result was not sufficiently justified. In order to treat these customers the same in all three service territories, the Commission could legally (without any risk of unlawful discrimination between service territories) either 1) exempt all residential usage under 130% of baseline from the bond charge; or 2) impose the bond charge on all such usage. As a matter of policy, as explained in Attachment A to D.02-11-074, the Commission determined to pursue the first option. Although we do not agree with Applicants that there is any legal error in this approach, upon further consideration we have determined that in fact, the bond charge should be imposed on customer usage below 130% of baseline. Our reasoning for including this usage in the calculation of the bond charge is set forth in Appendix A to this decision. We find that the simplest way to achieve this result is to modify the entire text of the Original Bond Charge Decision, D.02-10-063, as we adopted it on October 24, 2002, to read as shown in Appendix A attached to this decision.

We recognize that the modifications we are ordering today will require other charges to be reduced in equal or greater amounts to maintain rates for SDG&E residential customer usage up to 130% of baseline at today's levels. However, Ordering Paragraph 4 of D.02-10-063 already requires the utilities to impose offsetting decreases in charges for electricity energy costs as part of their compliance advice letter filings that impose a per kWh charge on non-exempt bundled consumption to insure that overall rates are not raised at this time.

[2] CMTA *et al* App for Reh, p. 7.

We also note that pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 9 of D.02-10-063 SDG&E is already directed to "establish a balancing account to track the amounts it remits to DWR and thus allow it to seek a rate change, to the extent necessary, to permit recovery of its own authorized costs independent of these increased remittances to DWR. This balancing account will not affect remittances to DWR at any time, but is simply an account to allow SDG&E to recover ultimately its own authorized costs from its own customers entirely independent of its remittances to DWR." Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 9, SDG&E should track the amounts it remits to DWR and seek a rate change, if necessary, to permit recovery of its own authorized costs. SDG&E should file a separate application with the Commission in order to seek a rate change to recover any resulting shortfall. Because of the prospective availability of this relief, it is not necessary for the Commission to address in this decision any potential shortfall in SDG&E's future recovery of its authorized costs. Rather, the Commission will address this issue if and when SDG&E applies for a rate change to make up any such shortfall.

B. The Applicants' Claim That the Decision on Rehearing Was Adopted Without Hearing and Opportunity for Comment Is Without Merit.

The Applicants claim that the Decision on Rehearing is arbitrary and capricious because it was issued without further hearing and opportunity to brief the issues. This argument is without merit. The Decision on Rehearing adopts the same outcome as in the ALJ's Proposed Decision. That Proposed Decision was circulated to the parties for comment, and the Applicants had an opportunity at that time to be heard on the proposal to exempt all residential usage up to 130% of baseline from the bond charge. In addition, in its application for rehearing of the Original Decision, TURN argued that the Commission should exempt all 130% of baseline usage from the bond charge. The Applicants had an opportunity to comment at that time in a response to that application for rehearing. Since the parties had an adequate opportunity to file comments and be heard on the issue of exempting 130% of baseline usage from the bond charge, the Applicants' allegation of legal error is without merit.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Application for Rehearing of Decision 02-11-074 is granted, as discussed herein, in order to include residential sales of up to 130% of baseline usage in all three service territories in the bond charge calculation. As a result, the Original Bond Charge Decision, D.02-10-063, shall be modified pursuant to this Order which incorporates by reference Appendix A.
2. PG&E, SDG&E and SCE shall file new compliance advice letters, no later than five days following the effective date of this decision, that impose a per Kwh charge on non-exempt bundled consumption as defined in Appendix A, and consistent with Ordering Paragraph 4 of Appendix A.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 30, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

HENRY M. DUQUE
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
Commissioners

I dissent.

/s/ LORETTA M. LYNCH
President

I dissent.

/s/ CARL W. WOOD
Commissioner

COM/vfw

MAILED
01/02/03

COM/GFB/DMG/vfw

Appendix A

Decision 02-10-063 as modified by Decision 02-12-082.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) for Authority to Institute a Rate Stabilization Plan with a Rate Increase and End of Rate Freeze Tariffs.	Application 00-11-038 (Filed November 16, 2000)
Emergency Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Adopt a Rate Stabilization Plan. (U 39 E)	Application 00-11-056 (Filed November 22, 2000)
Petition of THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK for Modification of Resolution E-3527.	Application 00-10-028 (Filed October 17, 2000 Bond Charge Phase

(For a list of appearances, see Attachment A)

DECISION ADOPTING METHODOLOGY FOR SETTING CHARGES TO RECOVER BOND-RELATED COSTS INCURRED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title **Page**

DECISION ADOPTING METHODOLOGY FOR SETTING CHARGES TO RECOVER BOND-RELATED COSTS INCURRED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

III. Summary

During the months following the Governor's Proclamation of January 17, 2001, declaring a crisis because exorbitant electricity prices affected the solvency of California's utilities, the Department of Water Resources (DWR) purchased electricity on behalf of the customers in the service territories of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E) and Southern California Edison Company (SCE). DWR incurred debt totaling over $10 billion in order to make these purchases

Shortly, DWR will issue between $11 and $11.95 billion in bonds to refinance an interim loan taken out to cover electricity costs, to repay advances from the State's General Fund and to create financial reserves in connection with the bonds. Sections 80110 and 80134 of the Water Code entitle DWR to recover the revenues needed to repay bond-related costs and require that this Commission impose charges on electric customers to effectuate cost recovery. We call this charge the bond charge.

This decision anticipates that DWR will shortly advise the Commission more precisely of the revenues it needs to repay bond-related costs and adopts a methodology for establishing a charge to repay these bonds. We adopt a simple methodology that applies a per kilowatt-hour (kWh) charge on all consumption that is not specifically excluded from this surcharge. The bond charge is set by dividing the annual revenue requirement for bond-related costs by an estimate of the annual consumption not excluded from this charge.

We adopt a policy that excludes a major block of bundled[3] residential consumption from the bond charge. In particular, based on a consideration of applicable

[3] Bundled electric service consists of electric power, transmission, distribution, and billing services sold together to residential,

law, past Commission precedent and legislative intent, we exclude all medical baseline and California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) eligible customer usage from the bond charges.

On the basis of the evidentiary record in this proceeding, we estimate that this policy will result in a per kWh surcharge between 0.4918 and 0.7848 cents in 2003, and between 0.4402 and 0.6381 in 2004, depending on the level of the bond placement and terms of repayment.[4] For 2003, until a decision in Rulemaking (R.) 02-01-011 becomes final and unappealable, the most probable initial bond charge imposed on the non-excluded consumption of bundled electric service from the local utility will range between 0.5797 and 0.7848 cents per kWh.

Consistent with the terms of the "Rate Agreement By and Between State of California Department of Water Resources and State of California Public Utilities Commission" (Rate Agreement), we establish an advice letter process that, following DWR's determination of a more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement[5] and a compliance filing by PG&E, SCE and SDG&E, sets a bond charge that applies a per kilowatt hour (kWh) surcharge to the non-excluded consumption of all customers receiving bundled electric service from these utilities.[6] To implement our policies, we order DWR to provide the Energy Division with a more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement by November 8, 2002. We order PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to make changes in their billing systems to enable them to set and collect bond charges and to file advice letters complying with this decision within five days of the effective date of this order.

---

commercial and industrial customers.

[4] *See* Table 1, below, for the details of how the charge varies with different borrowing and repayment scenarios.

[5] A "more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement" means the notification to the Commission by DWR, as described in this decision, of the portion of its 2003 revenue requirement that will be needed to pay bond costs.

[6] We also note that pending further determinations under consideration in R.02-01-011, bond charges may be imposed on direct access (DA) customers receiving service from Electric Service Providers (ESP). Also, pending further determination in R.02-01-011, the Commission may also impose bond charges on departing load (DL) customers. This decision should not be interpreted as resolving or prejudging any of the issues in that rulemaking.

The advice letters shall be immediately effective, and will impose a bond charge on all non-excluded electricity delivered from the date of the advice letters. Consistent with past decisions, PG&E, SDG&E and SCE shall add a line item to the electric bill specifying bond charges. Utilities that are unable to show a separate line item immediately may defer the implementation of a line item until February 2003.

In addition, we establish balancing accounts to track over and under payments of bond-charges, with subaccounts to track the payments and obligations of specific customer categories as may be subsequently specified in a decision issued in R.02-01-011. That decision may establish subaccounts, as necessary, applying to unbundled (*i.e.*, direct access) customers, where we can track the payments and responsibilities of specific customer categories for bond-related charges.[7] If and when a decision on the applicability of a bond charge to direct access (DA) customers becomes final and unappealable, we will amortize under and over payments in each subaccount, as necessary. If we determine to impose the bond charge on DA customers, the surcharge on bundled customers will decrease.[8]

Finally, we note that it is possible for the customers of PG&E and SCE to pay the bond charge within current rate levels, i.e. with no rate increase. For the customers of SDG&E, the record in this proceeding is unclear whether current rates will cover these bond charges in addition to other costs. We therefore order SDG&E establish a balancing account to track the amount it remits to DWR and thus allow SDG&E to seek a rate change to the extent necessary to permit recovery of its own authorized costs independent of these increased remittances to DWR. This account should enable SDG&E to show whether and how charges should change to accommodate both the bond charge and other costs in the DWR Revenue Requirement Phase of this proceeding.

[7] We note that the establishment of this accounting mechanism does not prejudge determinations that the Commission may make in R.02-01-011.

[8] This may also include a bond charge imposed on DL customers as may be subsequently determined in a decision, separate from the one involving DA customers.

IV. Background

On January 17, 2001, Governor Gray Davis proclaimed a state of emergency when "unanticipated and dramatic increases in the price of electricity [ ] threatened the solvency of California's major public utilities, preventing them from continuing to acquire and provide electricity sufficient to meet California's energy needs..." thereby imperiling the "... safety of person and property within the state."[9] In response to the crisis, Governor Davis ordered the DWR to procure electricity to mitigate the effects of the emergency. The State's General Fund loaned more than $6 billion to DWR, and DWR obtained an Interim Loan in the amount of $4.3 billion to purchase power during the electricity crisis.[10]

On January 19, 2001 Governor Davis signed Senate Bill (SB) 7X, which authorized DWR to purchase electric power for California consumers. On February 1, 2001, Governor Davis signed Assembly Bill (AB) 1X. AB1X, as amended by Senate Bill (SB) 31X (the Act),[11] requires that the Commission impose specific charges on electric customers sufficient to compensate DWR for its costs under the Act, including procuring and delivering power and issuing and paying bond principal and interest. (*See*, Water Code §§ 80110, 80134.)

In Decision (D.) 02-02-051, the Commission adopted the Rate Agreement. The Rate Agreement facilitates DWR's issuance of the bonds authorized by Water Code § 80130, and establishes a framework for discharging DWR's and the Commission's statutory obligations set forth in the Act. According to the terms of the Rate Agreement (and pursuant to the statutory scheme), the Commission will impose charges sufficient to provide for the payment of all bond-related costs incurred by DWR.

---

[9] D.02-02-051 (2002 Cal. PUC LEXIS 170), Appendix B, Proclamation Issued by the Governor of the State of California on January 17, 2001.

[10] D.02-02-051 (2002 Cal. PUC LEXIS 170), Findings of Fact 3-5.

[11] AB 1X (Chapter 4, Statutes of 2001 First Extraordinary Session), as amended by SB 31 (Chapter 9, Statutes of 2001-2002 First Extraordinary Session).

To meet these obligations, on June 6, 2002, the Assigned Commissioner's Ruling (June 6th ACR) initiated a new phase (Bond Charge Phase) in this proceeding for the purpose of setting a bond charge to recover the bond-related costs incurred by DWR. The June 6th ACR further noted that D.02-02-051 did not decide whether a bond charge should be levied on customers to the extent they purchase power from an ESP (namely, DA customers), but directed that the Commission consider this issue in a future decision. The proceeding leading to that future decision would provide an opportunity for parties to present all legal and policy considerations relevant to reaching that decision. The June 6th ACR stated that these policy issues would be addressed in R.02-01-011. Finally, the June 6th ACR noted that there would be coordination between the Bond Charge Phase and R.02-01-011.

On July 23, 2002, a Prehearing Conference (PHC) was held at the Commission in San Francisco, at which time the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) and parties discussed and resolved procedural issues identified in a Joint Case Management Statement.

On July 26, 2002, the ALJ issued a ruling that clarified the scope of this proceeding, including its relationship with R.02-01-011. In particular, expanding upon the ACR, this ruling stated:

> "R.02-01-011 will make the policy determination concerning whether and how DA and departing load (DL) customers bear responsibility for the costs of financing these bonds. This proceeding, in contrast, will determine the bond charge rates and recovery mechanisms for raising the revenues needed to finance the bonds."[12]

The ruling ordered that a workshop should be held on the first date scheduled for hearings in order to allow the parties the chance to resolve some of the outstanding issues and discovery disputes. Furthermore, in response to discussions during the PHC, the ruling addressed the novel situation pertaining to discovery. The ruling explained that Section 80110 of the California Water Code sets forth, along with other duties, DWR

[12] ALJ Ruling, July 26, 2002, p. 3.

responsibility for conducting any review of the reasonableness of the revenues required to finance the bonds. The ruling also noted that the Commission and parties to the proceeding require information to ensure that any bond charge adopted by this Commission is supported by facts. Finally, the ruling noted that in the Rate Agreement, DWR agreed to participate and provide "any other materials necessary to facilitate the Commission's completion of its proceedings, taken in connection with the establishment of Power Charges or Bond Charges by the Commission."[13]

On July 29, 2002, the parties participated in the workshop, discussing the testimony provided by DWR. In addition, the parties discussed how, in light of the clarification of the scope of the proceeding, they could withdraw testimony that pertained to the policies under examination in R.02-01-011. Finally, parties agreed on a series of scenarios that could be used to estimate the charges that would result from alternative policies and methodologies for setting the bond charge.

Three days of hearings were held on July 30, 31 and August 1, 2002. Parties filed opening briefs on August 9, 2002 and reply briefs on August 16, 2002.[14]

In addition, on August 5, 2002, PG&E filed a "Motion to Compel Responses to Data Requests and Production of Documents by DWR" (Motion to Compel). On August 9, 2002, DWR responded to the Motion to Compel with a Memorandum served on all parties to this proceeding. On August 13, the ALJ presided over a telephonic Law and Motion Hearing. On August 16, an ALJ Ruling memorialized the resolution of the various discovery issues and accepted into evidence late-filed Exhibits 2, 3 and 101.

On August 12, the Commission authorized its General Counsel to issue a certificate that financing documents consistent with an "Amended and Restated

[13] Rate Agreement, Section 7.2.

[14] Parties filing opening or reply briefs include: Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AReM); California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA); Energy Producers and Users Coalition, Kimberly Clark Corporation, and Goodrich Aerostructures Group (EPUC); Modesto Irrigation District (Modesto); Merced Irrigation District (Merced); the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA); PG&E; SDG&E; SCE; and The Utility Reform Network (TURN).

Addendum of Material Terms of Financing Documents" comply with Section 7.10 of the Rate Agreement.[15] This addendum permits DWR to increase the amount of net bond proceeds to $11.95 billion.

On August 13, DWR submitted a transmittal note and "Supplemental Testimony of Douglas Montague on behalf of the California Department of Water Resources." The transmittal note states that this is "significant additional material relied upon in proposed determination of a revenue requirement," thereby indicating that the material is part of DWR's administrative proceeding to determine its 2003 revenue requirement. This material deals with DWR's bond-related costs. The cover sheet of the Supplemental Testimony notes that DWR is "voluntarily submitting Prepared Testimony in this proceeding." We will identify this filing as Reference Exhibit 1-a.

On August 14, SCE submitted a copy of comments (dated August 14, 2002) submitted to DWR in its administrative proceedings on DWR's 2003 revenue requirement. SCE noted that it served these comments on participants in this proceeding.

V. Details of DWR's Proposed Bond Sale

DWR, the State Treasurer's Office, and their combined financing team of underwriters, financial and legal advisors began in early 2001 the process of structuring a power supply revenue bond credit that would comply with the provisions of AB1X and receive investment-grade ratings. This group faced a formidable task. The proposed sale of bonds at close to $12 billion will be "the largest municipal bond sale in history."[16] In addition, there are several aspects of this financing, as well as of AB 1X and DWR's power supply program, that make this bond deal complex and unusual:

[15] *See* http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/word_pdf/REPORT/17898.doc

[16] Exhibit 1, p. 5.

- DWR entered into certain contracts for power (called priority contracts) that have a higher priority for payment than bond costs.
- Because several contracts include terms that pass through the costs of natural gas, fluctuations in gas prices will lead to fluctuations in the price paid by DWR for power.
- Unlike a typical municipal bond offering, where the borrowing entity has the power to provide a dedicated stream of revenues, in this particular situation, the Commission must impose bond and power charges on IOU customers.

These characteristics serve to complicate the credit structure of DWR's indenture. DWR, working with rating agencies, has developed an elaborate credit structure that is described in Exhibit 1, pp. 6-13. We will not describe the detailed features of the credit structure or the elaborate flow of funds between the multiple reserve accounts, but will focus on the key features of the financing that drive the costs of the funds.

The most unusual element of the credit structure is the large size of reserve and similar accounts. The balances deposited in these accounts will comprise a significant percentage of total borrowing. The purposes of these reserves, however, are readily described:

- The reserves provide bondholders with additional security in covering the contingency that the revenues designated for repayment of bonds are needed to pay "priority contracts;"
- The reserves help maintain a quality investment-grade credit rating for DWR's bonds, as required by the Act;
- As a result of the additional security and higher credit rating the reserves produce, the reserves can help to lower overall costs of the bonds.

The exact annual revenue requirement needed to support the bonds will not be known until the bond placement is complete. To support this Commission's development of a bond charge methodology, DWR's Exhibit 1 does provide the best estimates of the credit structure and costs as of July 9, 2002. At that date, DWR

estimated that a bond issuance of $11.1 billion would lead to a 2003 revenue requirement in respect to bond costs of $841,965,794, which will rise to $971,256,477 in 2004 and remain at that level through the repayment period.

In Exhibit 1, DWR's estimate anticipates an "A-level" rating, which will then lead to an "all-in average" interest rate of 5.24% for the 20 year bonds.[17] This also includes tax exempt variable rate bonds at 4.61% and tax exempt hedged variable rate bonds at 5.18%.[18]

DWR's Reference Exhibit 1-a contains substantial revisions to Exhibit 1. It increases the size of the bond offering from $11.1 billion to $11.95 billion. DWR states that "The rating agencies are concerned that the Department may be obligated to purchase the Residual Net Short beyond the December 31, 2002 deadline for such purchases contained in Assembly Bill 1X."[19] In addition, DWR proposes a different schedule of debt service payments, resulting in a bond charge revenue requirement of $1.140 billion in 2003, but decreasing to $784 million in 2004. DWR notes that its estimate anticipates an "A-level" rating, which will lead to an "all-in average" interest rate of 5.38%.[20]

A. Discussion: Major Changes between Exhibit 1 and Reference Exhibit 1-a

DWR's estimated 2003 revenue requirement for bond-related costs in its Reference Exhibit 1-a is almost $300 million higher than that contained in its initial testimony (Exhibit 1). In its October 15, 2002 memorandum, DWR explains this increase as resulting from changes in assumptions concerning the receipt of revenues and the uses of funds. In particular, concerning the specific use of funds, DWR states:

[17] Exhibit 1, p. 16.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Reference Exhibit 1-a, p. 5.
[20] Exhibit 1-A, p. 10.

> ". . . in the June 14, 2002 Proposed Determination of Revenue Requirements [Exhibit 1], the Department made an assumption that Bond Charge Revenues would not be adequate to fund ongoing debt service (as provided by the Summary of Material Terms) until mid-2003, and that power charge revenues would be used to supplement Bond Charge revenues until that time. The August 13, 2002 supplemental testimony [Reference Exhibit 1-a] revised this assumption to provide for the full finding of bond related costs from Bond Charges in 2003."[21]

We note that California law assigns responsibility for determining a reasonable revenue requirement, including the bond-related costs, to DWR.[22] In summary, DWR plans to borrow up to $11.95 billion to repay the $6.6 billion to California's General Fund and $3.5 billion to retire an Interim Loan. The exact costs of retiring these bonds, the establishment of annual revenue requirements, and the determination of its reasonableness are, under the provisions of AB1X, the responsibility of DWR. We note that Reference Exhibit 1-a was also filed in DWR's own administrative process; DWR has the statutory authority to determine the reasonableness of the bond-related revenue requirement and has created a separate opportunity for parties to file comments. Moreover, we note that DWR will present this Commission with its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirements following its placement of the bonds according to the implementation procedures described in Section 8 below. Because DWR's August 13, 2002 filing does not constitute a final 2003 revenue requirement, we consider it only as illustrative of DWR's ongoing work in placing the bonds and estimating their costs and identify it as Reference Exhibit 1-a. We stress that we do not use this reference material as probative evidence to determine the reasonableness of the bond-related costs, which is DWR's responsibility. Instead we use these figures to help illustrate the applicability of our bond charge methodology over a range of financing possibilities.

[21] DWR, Memorandum to The Honorable Loretta Lynch and The Honorable Timothy J. Sullivan, October 15, 2002, p. 2.
[22] California Water Code Section 80110.

VI. Issues in Proceeding

The evidence and briefs make clear that a series of policy, legal and implementation questions require resolution in order for the Commission to impose a bond charge. These include the following:

1. Should the Commission exempt specific bundled electric customers and usages, such as residential consumption less than 130% of lifeline amounts or CARE-eligible and Medical Usage, from the bond charge?
2. What methodology should the Commission use to calculate a bond charge?
3. What are the likely consequences of the various policies under consideration in R.02-01-011 for bond charge amounts?
4. How should the Commission implement the methodology adopted to allocate and collect bond-related costs?

Answering these questions will enable the Commission to meet its statutory obligation of imposing bond charges sufficient to ensure the timely repayment of bond-related costs. We therefore address each question in turn.

VII. Should the Commission Exclude Specific Bundled Customers or Electricity Consumption from the Bond Charge?

A central issue to the development of a surcharge to recover bond-related costs is determining who should pay these costs. As noted above, R.02-01-011 is determining whether and how DA and departing load (DL) customers should bear responsibility for bond-related costs. This proceeding, in contrast, will set the methodology for calculating a bond charge that those responsible for bond-related costs should pay. As a consequence, legal and policy arguments concerning whether DA or DL customers should pay bond-related surcharges fall outside the scope of this proceeding.

We do address whether certain bundled customers should pay for bond-related costs. In particular, we must determine the responsibility of CARE-eligible customers, residential customer usage below 130% of baseline, and medical baseline customers for the payment of bond charges.

Currently, these customers (and associated usage) are exempt from the 3 cents / kWh surcharge the Commission adopted for PG&E and SCE customers[23] and from the 1.46 cents / kWh rate increase the Commission adopted for SDG&E customers.[24] Furthermore, California Water Code Section 80110 states:

> " . . . In no case shall the commission [California Public Utilities Commission] increase the electricity charges in effect on the date that the act that adds this section becomes effective for residential customers for existing baseline quantities or usage by those customers of up to 130 percent of existing baseline quantities, until such time as the department has recovered the costs of power it has procured for the electrical corporation's retail end use customers as provided in this division. . ."

As the July 26 ALJ Ruling noted, the interpretation of this statute may be critical to determining the size of the bond charges and the methodology for setting such charges. The ALJ Ruling also set the issue for briefing and resolution in this proceeding.

We therefore turn to the question of whether to exclude this usage from bond charges, and whether this exclusion rests on policy or legal grounds.

A. Positions of Parties

SCE, ORA, and TURN urge the Commission to exempt residential sales below 130% of baseline, medical baseline, and CARE customer usage from the bond charge.[25]

Concerning the interpretation of Water Code Section 80110, SCE, PG&E, California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA) and Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC) state that it would be possible to assign responsibility for the bond charge to residential sales below 130% of baseline as long as some other charge is reduced. SCE and PG&E note that it would be possible to dedicate a revenue stream within their current rates to pay for the bond charge and to adopt offsetting decreases in

[23] D.01-05-064 (2001 Cal. PUC LEXIS 419)

[24] D.01-09-059 (2001 Cal. PUC LEXIS 857)

[25] SCE, Opening Brief, p. 12; ORA, Opening Brief, p. 6; TURN, Opening Brief, p. 6. Subsequently SCE modified its position.

charges, thereby complying with the statute. CLECA and EPUC argue more broadly that all utilities can accommodate a bond charge within their current charges. PG&E, CLECA, and EPUC argue that the bond charge should apply to all usage.

SDG&E also argues that the bond charge should apply to all residential usage, but it does not argue that it can accommodate such a policy within its current charges. Instead, SDG&E concludes that Water Code § 80110 no longer applies:

> "Once the bonds are sold, DWR will have recovered those costs, to wit, the costs of power it has procured for the electrical corporation's retail end use customers. Buyers of the bonds will have provided the costs of power procured by DWR. Thus, this provision of Water Code 80110 will no longer restrict the Commission after the bonds are sold."[26]

SDG&E then states that exempting customers using less than 130% of baseline has no basis in costs. SDG&E further argues that such a policy will cause "an additional $16 million in annual residential commodity shortfalls."[27] SDG&E concludes that such a policy may increase the existing business to residential subsidy "to well over $50 million per year."[28]

ORA, TURN and SCE take exception to SDG&E's interpretation of Water Code § 80110. SCE argues:

> "Paying back the general fund and interim loan from bond proceeds is not 'recovery' of those amounts; collection from end-use customers of the Bond Charge is the actual 'recovery.' SDG&E thus incorrectly interprets Water Code Section 80110, when it concludes that issuance of bonds is tantamount to DWR's recovery of the cost of power it procured and will continue to procure for electrical corporations' retail end-use customers."[29]

---

[26] SDG&E, Opening Brief, p. 4.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[29] SCE, Reply Brief, p. 4.

Then, in a case of rhetorical convergence, ORA, TURN and SCE each develop an analogy with the purchase of a home and the obtaining of a mortgage. ORA succinctly argues "[a]nyone knows that the house is not owned until the mortgage is paid off."[30]

B. Discussion

Section 80110 of the Water Code became effective on February 1, 2001. On May 15, 2001, the Commission both interpreted and discussed at length how to implement rate design changes consistent with this statute:

> "This statute exempts from additional rate increases all residential electricity usage that falls within 130% of "baseline" usage. Baseline usage is defined in Section 739(a). That section requires the Commission to establish a quantity of natural gas and electricity that is necessary to supply a "significant portion of the reasonable energy needs of the average residential customer." The "baseline quantity" is defined to be between 50 and 60 percent of average residential consumption, with allowances for seasonal and climatic variations, Section 739(d)(1). The Commission is further directed to require the utilities to file residential rate schedules that provide for the baseline quantity to be the first or lowest block in an increasing block rate structure. Section 739(c)(1). In addition, the Commission is directed to "establish an appropriate gradual difference between the rates for the respective blocks of usage." Section 739(c)(1). In 1986, the Commission determined the initial baseline quantities in D.86087, 80 CPUC 182. Subsequent revisions and updates to the baseline quantities and applicable rates have been made in the utilities' general rate cases."[31]

As it interpreted this statute, the Commission noted that the statutory exemption sharply constrained its freedom to design rates:

> "Taken together, new Water Code § 80110 and Pub. Util. Code § 739, exempt over 60% of residential sales from the 3 [cents] / kWh rate surcharge we authorized March 27th. The resulting shortfall is significant: 64% of all Edison residential sales are exempt, and 62% of all PG&E residential sales are exempt. These use exemptions

[30] ORA, Reply Brief, p. 3; *See* also SCE, Reply Brief, p. 4 and TURN Reply Brief, p. 3.

[31] D.01-05-064 (2001 Cal. PUC LEXIS 419, *32-*33)

> result in half of all residential customers--those who use less than 130% of baseline--being protected by statute from further rate increases."[32]

Subsequently, the Commission adopted a rate design that allocated the substantial revenue shortfall that arises from the exemption to all other consumption. In D.01-09-059, the Commission adopted a similar approach to allocating a rate increase for SDG&E's customers.

We plan to once again follow the policy as required by statute of excluding from additional rate increases residential sales below 130% of baseline, as well as medical baseline and CARE-eligible customer usage. However, this restriction does not strictly preclude imposition of bond charges on some or all of this usage, as long as such imposition does not result in a rate increase. Such a result could occur if newly-imposed bond charges are offset by equal or greater decreases in other changes. Currently, these customers may pay rates in excess of URG costs and other rate elements. Therefore, if bond charges are imposed, it may be possible to do so without raising rates. Further, CLECA, SCE, and PG&E, and EPUC state that the Commission could apply a bond charge to all customers as long as this action does not lead to an increase in rates for the consumption excluded from electricity charge increases by Water Code § 80110.

The policy question is whether these customers should pay the bond charges. In general, all customers who took power from DWR after February 1, 2001 have some responsibility for DWR's costs, from a direct cost-causation perspective. In R.02-01-011, we consider a decision to impose bond charges on direct access customers who took power from DWR after February 1, 2001 because they directly benefited from DWR power purchases.[33] Similarly, from a cost-causation perspective, CARE customers,

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] As D.02-02-051 (Rate Agreement Decision) stated: "There is no doubt that the impostion of Bond Charges on the electric power sold by ESP's would help ensure the recovery of DWR's Bond-Related Costs and thereby improve the security of the bondholders. It would also be good public policy to impose Bond Charges on ESP power , since all customers benefited from the debt that was incurred by DWR to procure power during the height of the electricity crisis." (D.02-02-051, p. 33) However, the legality of such charges was deferred to a future proceeding (ultimately, R.02-01-011).

medical baseline customers, and residential bundled customer usage below 130% of baseline all should bear responsibility for payment of bond charges, because they also received power from DWR.[34] From an equity perspective, we note that DA (and possibly DL) customers will see rate increases due to the imposition of bond charges, if imposed in R.02-01-011. However, the residential customers discussed herein would not face rate increases even with the imposition of bond charges.

Imposing a bond charge on all bundled customers would have beneficial impacts. First, the remainder of bundled customers would pay a lower bond charge due to the larger customer base which pays the charge. Second, direct access customers would face a lower bond charge for the same reason, if a bond charge is imposed on them. Third, just as imposing the bond charge on direct access customers provides a larger customer base, including all bundled customers provides additional assurance that bond charges will be fully paid.

Therefore, as long as rates do not increase in contravention of AB1X, we should impose bond charges on all bundled customers. However, we will continue to exempt CARE customers and Medical baseline customers from the bond charge, as suggested by AReM/WPTF in their comments on the draft Alternate Decision. As AReM/WPTF notes, there is a "clear and continuous policy of the Commission to protect the interests of CARE and medical baseline customers so that they are…exempt from rate increases arising from the wholesale market price disruptions".

A bond charge on all kWh usage except for CARE and medical baseline customers is possible to achieve without a rate increase for AB1X-protected customers, according to PG&E and SCE. We will require PG&E and SCE, when they file Advice Letters implementing the bond charge, to show that imposition of a bond charge does not result in a net rate increase for residential usage up to 130% of baseline.

[34] We note that residential usage up to 130% of baseline is about 25% of total bundled customer usage, while direct access constitutes less than 20% of total bundled customer usage (i.e., under 15% of the total of both bundled and DA usage).

As noted above, in response to this dilemma, SDG&E claims that the law does not preclude raising charges on any customers. SDG&E proposes a novel legal theory – that Water Code § 80110 will not apply once the bond sale is complete because at that time DWR will have recovered the costs of the power it has procured. In rebuttal, ORA and SCE convincingly argue that a house is not paid for until the mortgage is paid off, and that DWR will not have recovered its costs until the bonds are repaid. Further, CLECA, SCE, PG&E and EPUC state that the Commission could apply a bond charge to all customers as long as this action does not lead to an increase in rates for the consumption excluded from electricity charge increases by Water Code Section 80110.

We find that SDG&E's interpretation does not comport with a reasonable reading of the statute. However, we do not believe that we can legally allocate a bond charge that applies to all non-exempt residential customers without also adopting some offsetting adjustment to ensure that charges do not increase on usage by residential customers up to 130% of baseline. We have discussed this with regard to PG&E and SCE above. We order SDG&E to show whether the bond charge can be incorporated into rates for residential usage up to 130% of baseline (except for CARE and medical baseline usage) without necessitating a rate increase. If this is not possible, SDG&E is authorized to create a balancing account to track any under collections and propose a method to amortize the shortfalls in the Revenue Requirement Phase of this proceeding that will not lead to a net increase in payments for those protected by the statute.

SDG&E, in its comments on the draft Alternate Decision, states that it cannot amortize such a shortfall because "this type of excess headroom is not available" and "will not be there each and every year for two decades hence." Therefore, SDG&E believes creating a balancing account to track any undercollection violates AB1X. SDG&E is not technically correct. It is possible to impose a bond charge on SDG&E residential usage up to 130% of baseline, because other charges could be reduced in

equal or greater amounts to maintain rate levels at today's level. Therefore, the bond charge should be imposed on all non-exempt usage for each utility.

VIII. What Methodology Should the Commission Use to Allocate and Collect the Revenue Requirement for Bond-Related Costs?

Almost all parties propose that the revenue requirement for bond-related costs be allocated based on some measure of kWh. However, parties differ on which kWh should be included in the allocation and whether the allocation should be adjusted to reflect certain specific factors.

A. PG&E, CLECA, SDG&E, ORA: Allocate and Collect Bond Costs Based on kWhs

The simplest position of parties is to allocate and collect, on a uniform statewide basis, per kWh charges for all bond-related costs. Of the parties in this proceeding, PG&E, CLECA and SDG&E support a per kWh charge with no exemptions.[35] Although ORA proposes certain adjustments to the calculation of bond charges (as do CLECA and PG&E), ORA characterizes its position as allocating "the bond charge on a simple equal cent per kWh basis across the vast majority of kWh forecast to be sold in the service territory of investor-owned utilities (IOUs) in 2003, and 2004."[36] SCE similarly characterizes its position as a uniform allocation, yet it supports ORA's proposed adjustments to the assessment of bond charges.[37]

Moreover, ORA provides several rationales for assessing the bond charge on a simple equal cents per kWh basis. In particular, ORA notes the expected duration of the

[35] As discussed above, PG&E, and CLECA and SDG&E believe (albeit for different reasons) that an allocation of a bond surcharge to all customers would be consistent with the provisions of Water Code § 80110.

[36] ORA, Opening Brief, p. 5.

[37] There are essentially two adjustments: one is their proposed exclusion of bond charges on certain DA customers (this issue is beyond the scope of this proceeding and not considered here) and the second is a proposed adjustment to PG&E's per kWh surcharge based on power provided to the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA).

bond charges of 20 years. ORA concludes that with the "inevitable changes in customers and circumstances"[38] that will occur over this time period, these charges will be paid by customers who did not even live in California during the crisis and that some who did will not pay these charges if they move away. In light of the inability to link bond costs to a customer's consumption, ORA concludes that a simple per kWh charge is fairest.

In a similar vein, PG&E states:

> "The California Legislature and the Commission have determined that DWR's actions during the energy crisis were undertaken 'for the health, welfare, and safety of the people of this state' and on behalf of all ratepayers 'to ensure reliable electricity service and, therefore, all ratepayers should contribute to the effort to pay down the unprecedented debt incurred by the state to help weather the energy crisis.' (*See* AB X1, Section 7; D.01-09-060, mimeo at pp. 3, 6). PG&E's approach is consistent with this policy because it shares the burden of the cost of the 'energy crisis' on each customer based on usage. It is easy to explain to customers. It treats all California ratepayers equally."[39]

CLECA, in addition to the arguments listed above, notes that the bond charge will be small in relation to the overall cost of DWR power, and that this reduces "the need for utility specific allocation."[40]

B. ORA: Adjust PG&E's Rates in Light of WAPA Contracts

ORA proposes one specific departure from a per kWh allocation of bond charges in this proceeding. ORA recommends "that the dollar impact of the forecast net sales by PG&E to the WAPA be assigned to PG&E's ratepayers."[41] ORA states that it "assumes that PG&E's ratepayers benefited from the contract between PG&E and WAPA"[42] and concludes that they should bear WAPA-related costs. Noting that PG&E

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 4.
[39] Exhibit 100, p. 3-2.
[40] CLECA, Opening Brief, p. 3.
[41] ORA, Opening Brief, p. 6.
[42] ORA, Opening Brief, p. 8.

must provide WAPA with substantial amounts of power in 2003 and 2004, ORA recommends inclusion of these amounts in the allocation of revenue requirement between utilities, and the subsequent assignment of this revenue requirement to PG&E's other retail customers. Thus, under ORA's proposal, PG&E's customers would pay a higher bond charge than customers in the service areas of SCE or SDG&E. SCE supports this adjustment. PG&E opposes this position, arguing that it is simply an allocation based on a modified "net short" position, and, after citing ORA's own arguments for an equal allocation, argues that fairness requires the rejection of this position.

C. TURN: Allocate Revenue Requirement Per D.02-02-052

TURN takes a very different approach. TURN states that "[w]hile the equal cents methodology has the advantage of simplicity, it ignores any and all differences among the three companies that resulted in their making very different contributions to the accrual of the DWR 'undercollection' during the first nine months of 2001."[43] TURN argues on behalf of the allocation factors previously used in D.02-02-052, stating that the allocation factors are "generally consistent with cost causation."[44] Finally, concerning ORA's proposed WAPA adjustment, TURN states "no WAPA adjustment is needed if that methodology [*i.e.* that of D.02-02-052] is followed here."

D. PG&E: Adjust Bond Charge to Reflect Line Losses

PG&E also proposes an adjustment in the allocation of revenue requirement to different customer categories. PG&E states "DWR bond charges should be differentiated by voltage to reflect differential line losses for different service level voltages, but otherwise set equally on all included load."[45] PG&E argues that differentiating bond charges by service voltage appropriately reflects that less energy is needed "to serve a given quantity of electric consumption at transmission service

[43] TURN, Opening Brief, p. 3.
[44] *Ibid.*, p.5.
[45] PG&E, Opening Brief, p. 12.

voltage levels, relative to service at primary and secondary distribution service voltages."[46] CLECA supports PG&E's proposed voltage-based adjustments for line losses, and SCE states that it does not object to such an adjustment.

E. EPUC, CLECA and Modesto: Adjust Bond Charge on Departing Load Customers to Exclude Revenue Requirements

Although issues associated with DL were assigned to R.02-01-011, certain parties, including EPUC, Modesto and CLECA proposed adjustments to bond charges based on the structure of the bond financing. We have not addressed the elaborate discussion from these parties regarding DL customers, as well as the responses by TURN, PG&E, and SCE, because the issues raised are outside the scope of this proceeding. We note that pursuant to the August 13, 2002 ALJ Ruling, the evidentiary record of this proceeding was incorporated into R.02-01-011. That is the proper forum for these arguments, and we make no determinations of these issues in today's decision.

F. Discussion: Allocate and Collect Bond Charges Based on All Non-Excluded kWh Consumption

We will allocate and collect the bond-related costs on a simple per-kWh basis, spread over all customer usage, with the exceptions of all medical baseline and CARE-eligible customer usage. This policy makes sense for several reasons. First, as ORA points out, the long period over which the bond charges will be collected breaks the linkage between those for whom the power was purchased and those responsible for repayment. In addition, these bond-related costs were incurred to stabilize the grid, which benefited everyone. Thus, the assessment of a bond charge is simply a mechanism for raising the revenues needed to repay these bond-related costs. In light of these considerations, absent a rational reason to exclude particular usage or customers, it is reasonable and equitable to allocate these bond-related costs over the largest base of customers on a simple per kWh usage basis.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Second, because the purpose of the bond charge is simply to raise revenues to pay for bond-related costs, the simplicity of the per-kWh fee recommends it. It is transparently fair to all who must pay it.

Third, the one thing that the Commission knows from the period of the energy crisis is that the prices paid for power had little relationship to the cost of producing that power. Thus, strict use of the principle of "cost causation" to allocate bond-related costs at this level of detail, as recommended by TURN, is unwarranted, for this principle assumes a relationship between cost and price that may not have existed at that time

In particular, TURN suggests that we allocate these bond-related costs consistent with a modified "net short" position, as adopted in D.02-02-052. TURN fails to note, however, that D.02-02-052 did not allocate past responsibility for energy purchases, but instead allocated responsibility for current and ongoing purchases by DWR on behalf of the customers in the service territories of investor-owned utilities. Moreover, unlike the crisis period in which these bond-related costs were incurred, the current relationship between power prices and power costs better meets the principles of "cost causation" ratemaking.

Moreover, as we observed in D.02-02-051, we are not dealing with routine costs arising from utility operations:

> "The establishment of a separate Bond Charge also recognizes the nature of the costs that DWR will finance with its bond transaction. These are costs that DWR incurred at the height of the crisis. . . Because the costs that DWR incurred to save the grid have future benefits, they should be amortized over time."[47]

In addition, as we noted in D.02-02-051, we have broad discretion in assessing a Bond Charge:

> "The Commission's authority under Pub. Util. Code § 451 and § 701 to impose rate mechanisms such as Bond Charges extends to situations where the charge is not in proportion to the direct

[47] D.02-02-051, p. 49.

> benefit received by each customer paying the charge. (Footnote omitted) This would be the case, for example, for future ratepayers who will pay Bond Charges despite the fact that they only received the benefits of DWR's grid-stabilizing activities, and did not receive any of the electric power that was procured by DWR during the height of the electricity crisis."[48]

From this discussion, it is clear that the Commission did not contemplate a strict adherence to the economic principle of "cost causation" in allocating responsibility for bond-related costs. We believe that it would not be equitable to do so.

PG&E's argument (which SCE and CLECA support) to make a voltage-related adjustment to the bond charge because it took less power to serve high voltage customers is not persuasive. In our view, this argument does not warrant a departure from the equitable principle of assigning bond responsibility to each kWh of bundled consumption not otherwise excluded. As noted in D.02-02-051, some people who have never lived in California will pay these costs even though they consumed no power during the crisis period. In light of this harsh fact, making an adjustment based on a customer's service voltage lacks a reasonable basis.

Even ORA, whose testimony and brief state that the purpose of this charge is to fund bond-related costs, succumbs to the temptation to allocate WAPA-related costs based on the notion that PG&E's customers obtained some benefit from these WAPA contracts, and therefore should pay a higher share of bond-related costs. As PG&E and TURN point out, ORA's proposal to allocate a revenue requirement based on power provided to WAPA and then collect it from other PG&E customers introduces a revenue requirement allocation based on one factor contributing to the "net short" position. We reject a strict adherence to the principle of "cost causation," for the reasons stated above. Thus, we find that this argument does not warrant a departure from our equitable

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

decision to allocate the Bond Charge on all non-excluded consumption by bundled customers.

IX. Consequences of Other Commission Policies on the Bond Charge: What are the Key Projected Bond Surcharge Scenarios Pending Policy Determinations in R.02-01-011?

Through discussions at the PHC and the Workshop, it became clear that the issuance of the bonds would require that the Commission adopt a methodology for setting bond surcharges before the details of the bond financing could be completely determined. Moreover, key decisions concerning whether any bond charge should be imposed on DA customers are to be considered in R.02-01-011 and consequently fall outside the scope of this proceeding. As a consequence, this proceeding should calculate the bond-related charges associated with a range of plausible policy scenarios. The purpose of this analysis is to estimate bond charges in order to guide the Commission; the purpose is not to adopt specific bond charges. Setting the bond charge to recover bond-related costs can only be done after the details of the bond placement are clearer and DWR has determined its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement.

In this proceeding, parties provided updated estimates of usage and revenue requirements that are key to setting bond charges. Exhibits 201 (of SCE) and 304 (of SDG&E) were received into evidence during the course of the hearings. Exhibit 101-Revised (of PG&E) was received into evidence as a late-filed exhibit via an ALJ Ruling on August 15, 2002. Exhibit 101 updates Exhibits 201 and 304 by including an estimate of PG&E's 2003 DL (which was unavailable in Exhibits 201 and 304) and revises PG&E's forecast of baseline load to reflect higher baseline amounts adopted in D.02-04-026. In all other major elements, the data in the exhibits is identical. These estimates of electric consumption provide the basis for setting the methodology to calculate the initial bond charges.

Table 1 below provides the estimates of the bond charges needed to cover a range of bond-related costs under a variety of policy related assumptions. We develop three different scenarios representing four different levels of bond-related costs. These assumptions do not prejudge our decision in R.02-01-011 whether to impose bond charges on DA and DL customers, but do illustrate the likely range of bond charges under four different cases. Pursuant to the Rate Agreement, bond charges may be imposed on DA customers only after a Commission order providing for such charges becomes final and unappealable under California law.[49]

Case 1 models the 2003 revenue requirement contained in DWR's Exhibit 1. This exhibit projects that the annual bond-related revenue requirement will total $842 million in 2003. Case 1 includes a total of $11.1 billion of bonds.

Case 2 models the estimated 2003 revenue requirement for bond-related costs contained in DWR's Reference Exhibit 1-a. This reference exhibit increases the revenue requirement to $1,140, almost $300 million above Case 1. Under this proposal, DWR increases its reserves by $850 million -and increases the total net bond proceeds to $11.95 billion.[50]

Case 3 models the 2004 revenue requirement contained in DWR's Exhibit 1. It is based on a revenue requirement for bond-related costs of $971 million and a total of $11.1 billion in bonds.

Case 4 models the estimated 2004 revenue requirement contained in DWR's Reference Exhibit 1-a. The revenue requirement is $784 million for bond-related costs.

As we are proposing to allocate the costs of these bonds over all non-excluded kWh, the exercise to calculate the bond-related surcharges is straightforward once we have estimates of electricity consumption. Each row in Table 1 corresponds to a

[49] As noted previously, the Commission will address the issue related to the departing load customer in a separate opinion from the decision regarding the direct access customers.

[50] We note that this increase in the size of the bond issue is consistent with the Amended and Restated Addendum to Summary of Material Terms of Financing Documents, dated August 8, 2002.

different assumption of the number of gigawatt-hours (GWh) that will be responsible for paying bond-related costs.

Row C (Total Load Minus Excluded Residential) corresponds to the total California load, but follows the policy adopted in this decision, of excluding medical baseline, and CARE-eligible customer usage. Row C assumes that the bond charge would also be imposed on both DA and DL customers.[51] Under this assumption, there would be an estimated load of 171,193 GWh over which to spread the bond related costs. As Table 1 indicates, such a policy would lead to bond charges ranging from 0.4580 cents / kWh (corresponding to Case 4) to 0.6659 cents / kWh (corresponding to Case 2).

Row B (Total Load Minus Excluded Residential and DL) corresponds to the total California load, but excludes medical baseline and CARE-eligible customer usage and excludes projected DL from the bond charge. Under this assumption, there would be an estimated load of 170,100 GWh over which to spread the bond related costs. As Table 1 indicates, such a policy would lead to bond charges ranging from 0.4609 cents per kWh (corresponding to Case 4) to 0.6702 cents per kWh (corresponding to Case 2). Thus, at least initially, policies to either exclude or include DL in paying for bond-related costs will impact bond-related charges of less than .005 cents per kWh.[52]

Row A (Total Load Minus Excluded Residential, DA and DL) corresponds to the total California load, but excludes medical baseline and CARE-eligible customer usage from the bond charge. In addition, it does not apply the bond charge to DA and projected DL (policies under consideration in R.02-01-011). This leaves an estimated load of 145,257 GWh over which to spread the bond-related costs. Table 1 indicates that under this assumption bond charges will range from 0.5397 cents per kWh (corresponding to Case 4) to 0.7848 cents per kWh (corresponding to Case 2).

[51] As discussed earlier, these scenarios are purely illustrative and we are in no way prejudging any decisions that will be issued in R.02-01-011. Nevertheless, parties did provide information on this matter, and we have included it in our analysis.

[52] This figure is the difference between the bond charges in Row B and Row C.

Row A is most representative of the initial bond charges. D.02-02-051 states, "absent such a decision that has become final and unappealable, ESP power will not be included in the determination of Bond Charges."[53] Since it may take at least a few months for such a determination concerning DA customers and their receipt of electricity from ESPs to become final and unappealable, it is most likely that the bond charge will start at levels close to those contained in Row A. Finally, we conclude this discussion by once again noting that the exhibits used to create Table 1 were incorporated into the record of R.02-01-011.

In summary, our analysis indicates that the methodology that we have adopted to set initial bond surcharges – a cents per kWh charge applying to all bundled customers with the exemption of medical baseline, CARE-eligible customer usage – will result in per kWh charges along the lines of entries in Row A of Table 1. This analysis is purely illustrative – the exact charges will be determined only after the details of the bond placement are clearer, DWR has determined and submitted its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement, and the utilities have filed conforming advice letters.

[53] D.02-02-051, *mimeo.*, p. 90, (2002 Cal. PUC LEXIS 170, *171) cited in PHC 10, TR 404:11-28. The ultimate source of this language is the Rate Agreement by and Between State of California DWR and State of California, Public Utilities Commission, Section 4-3, which is Appendix C to D.02-02-051 and may be found at 2002 Cal. PUC LEXIS 170, *196.

Table 1: Bond Charge Scenarios

	Total[a]	Case 1[b]	Case 2[c]	Case 3[d]	Case 4[e]
	(GWh)	$842 Rev. Req. ($MM)	$1,140 Rev. Req. ($MM)	$971 Rev. Req. ($MM)	$784 Rev. Req. ($MM)
		Bond Charge (cents/kWh)	Bond Charge (cents/kWh)	Bond Charge (cents/kWh)	Bond Charge (cents/kWh)
A. Total Non-excluded Load Minus DA and DL (includes all non-excluded bundled consumption)	145,257	0.5795	0.7848	0.6685	0.5397
B. Total Non-excluded Load Minus DL (includes all non-excluded bundled and all DA)	170.100	0.4950	0.6702	0.5708	0.4609
C. Total Non-excluded Load (includes all non-excluded bundled, all DL and all DA)	171,193	0.4918	0.6659	0.5672	0.4580

Case 1 corresponds to the 2003 revenue requirement request of DWR as described in Exhibit 1.

Case 2 corresponds to the 2003 revenue requirement request of DWR as described in Reference Exhibit 1-a (based on a bond indenture of $11.95 billion).

Case 3 corresponds to the 2004 revenue requirement projected by DWR in Exhibit 1.

Case 4 corresponds to the 2004 revenue requirement projected by DWR in Exhibit Reference 1-a (based on a bond indenture of $11.95 billion)

Row A best describes the likely range of initial changes, which will remain in effect until a decision in R.02-01-011 becomes final.

[a] Entries in this column are based on information provided in Exhibits 101, 201, and 304.

[b] Entries in this column are based on revenue requirements in Exhibit 1 for year 2003. The cents per kWh surcharge results from division of the revenue requirements by total consumption included in a row.

[c] Entries in this column are based on revenue requirements in Exhibit 1-a for year 2003. The cents per kWh surcharge results from division of the revenue requirements by total consumption included in a row.

[d] Entries in this column are based on revenue requirements in Exhibit 1 for year 2004. The cents per kWh surcharge results from division of the revenue requirements by total consumption included in a row.

[e] Entries in this column are based on revenue requirements in Exhibit 1-a for year 2004. The cents per kWh surcharge results from division of the revenue requirements by total consumption included in a row.

X. How Should the Commission Implement the Methodology Adopted to Allocate and Collect Bond-Related Costs?

This decision has adopted a methodology of allocating and collecting bond-related costs from all kWh except from those customers and usage not held responsible for this charge. At this time, several uncertainties remain. In particular, we do not have a more precise figure specifying the exact level of bond-related costs since the bonds have not yet been issued and DWR has not yet submitted its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement. Moreover, we have not reached a final determination on which kWh we will include in recovering bond-related charges.

We do, however, know that we have excluded all medical baseline usage, and CARE-eligible customer usage from the bond surcharge, consistent with previous Commission decisions and permitted by our statutory authority. The latest estimate of the non-excluded bundled consumption is 145,257 GWh.

Because R.02-01-011 is still examining whether the DA and/or DL customers will be made responsible for bond charges in whole or in part, the total electric usage and/or customer base that will bear the bond charge is currently uncertain. In addition, as we noted previously, under the terms of the Rate Agreement, the electric consumption by DA customers will not be included in the determination of the bond charges until a decision ordering such a charge "has become final and unappealable."[54]

To ensure smooth implementation of the bond surcharges consistent with this provision of the Rate Agreement, an ALJ Ruling of August 8, 2002 solicited parties' ideas on: 1) whether the bond-related costs allocated to non-bundled customers in R.02-01-011 should depend on when the decision becomes final and unappealable; 2) if the answer to 1 was no, then what ratemaking treatment

[54] D.02-02-051, *mimeo*., p. 90.

would best ensure this outcome; and 3) which regulatory accounting treatments and amortization of balances the Commission should use?

Thus, an implementation process must accomplish several things. To finance the bonds, the Commission must adopt a bond charge that will produce revenues sufficient to cover DWR's bond-related costs. Moreover, the implementation process must permit the investor owned utilities to file tariffs and modify their billing systems to implement the adopted bond charge methodologies. Finally, we must adopt a process that permits the modification of bond surcharges and balancing accounts to reflect the determinations reached in R.02-01-011, while recognizing that collection of these charges will not begin until that decision has become final and unappealable.

A. Positions of Parties: Create Balancing Accounts

In reply briefs, Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AReM), PG&E, TURN, SCE and SDG&E all agreed that responsibility for bond-related costs should not depend upon the date when a decision in R.02-01-011 becomes final and unappealable. No party argued otherwise.

Concerning which process would best meet the goal of holding categories of customers responsible for bond-related costs consistent with the policy determinations of this Commission, parties made different proposals. SCE proposed a balancing account structure that refrains from charging non-bundled customers until a final and unappealable decision is reached, but tracks bond-cost responsibilities in sub-accounts. Following a final decision in R.02-01-011, the sub-accounts in surplus are distributed and sub-accounts in deficit are recovered through modifications of bond charge amounts.

PG&E recommends a similar approach, but asks that DWR have responsibility for tracking under and over payments. PG&E also recommends amortization of surpluses / deficits on a 1 to 6 basis – *i.e.,* that a one-month

surplus or deficit be either amortized or made up over the subsequent 6 months. SDG&E supports avoidance of under or over payments, but sees no unusual ratemaking needed to reach this result. AReM similarly recommends tracking through regulatory accounts.

TURN also favors tracking, but recommends the initial imposition of a charge on DA customers with rebates to follow when the decision on non-exemption, if made, becomes final and unappealable, unless the Commission believes the Rate Agreement prevents this policy. In the case that the Commission finds that the Rate Agreement prevents the immediate collection from DA customers, TURN recommends policies similar to those proposed by other commenting parties.

Concerning the billing system implementation of billing changes, SDG&E states that it can implement a system with no exemptions in 30 days, but it will require 45 days to make billing changes that make "simple exemptions." More complicated exemptions will take longer. PG&E states that it could implement changes in time to permit the transmission of funds to DWR in a timely fashion, but will need more time to add a line item on customer bills. SCE states that it can implement a bond-charges line on customer bills by January 1, 2003.

Finally, we note that SDG&E proposed adopting a surcharge that averaged 2003 and 2004 projected revenue requirement.

B. Discussion: Use Advice Letter Process with Balancing Accounts to Implement Policies Adopted

One of our main goals is to adopt regulatory procedures that set an initial charge and provide revenues to DWR starting by January 1, 2003. In addition, our goal is to adopt regulatory procedures that will hold consumers responsible for the bond-related costs from the moment the Commission assigns

responsibility. We note that all parties agree that this is the appropriate course of action for the Commission to take.

Because the Rate Agreement prevents the imposition of a charge for bond-related costs based on electric power provided to customers by ESPs until a decision to do so becomes final and unappealable, our implementation will initially assess a charge on all non-excluded consumption of bundled customers sufficient to raises all the revenues needed to repay the bond costs. We will set this initial charge by dividing DWR's more precise 2003 revenue requirement for bond-related costs by 145,257 GWh, the consensus forecast of non-excluded bundled consumption for 2003.

In addition, we will create a balancing account to track all payments to DWR so that we can subsequently adjust total under or over payments by customer categories. We therefore order SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E to create Bond-Charge Balancing Accounts (BCBA) and to share data on total non-excluded consumption and remittances to DWR. Although each utility is creating its own balancing account, over and under payments are determined on a common, statewide basis.

If the Commission decides to assess bond-related costs on additional customer categories in R.02-01-011, each utility should create relevant subaccounts in its BCBA effective on the date when the bond charge is first implemented or when a decision is first adopted deciding this matter in R.02-01-011, whichever is latest. For each customer category held responsible for bond charges, there will be a subaccount tracking the category's cost responsibility, consumption, billed charges, and under or over payments.

If at the time of the initiation of the bond charges (as discussed below), the Commission has decided to hold both bundled and DA customers equally responsible for bond-related costs, then the BCBA would operate as follows:

Table 2: Proposed Operation of BCBA

Assumptions	Bundled	DA	Total
Load	900	100	1000
Bond Related Revenue Requirement			$10
Actual Initial Bond Charges ($/kWh) while awaiting finalization of decision	$.0111	0.0	
Ratemaking-related Bond Charges			$.01/kWh

Operation of the BCBA:

Bundled Customer Subaccount			
Bundled Customer Cost Responsibility			900 x $.01/kWh = $9
Actual Bundled Customer Billed Charges			900 x $.011/kWh = $10
Bundled Customer Overpayment			$1
Direct Access Customer Subaccount			
Direct Access Cost Responsibility			100 x $.01/kWh = $1
Actual DA Billed Charges			100 x $.00/kWh = $0
DA Customer Underpayment			$1

Note: subaccounts will include interest.

When a Commission decision that determines whether and which ESP customers are responsible for bond costs becomes final and unappealable, the actual billed bond charge will be revised. In the example above, the new billed charge applying to both bundled and DA customers would be $.01/kWh. The balance in the Bundled Service Customer Subaccount would be refunded to bundled service customers through a surcredit. Similarly, the underpayments in the Direct Access Customer Subaccount would be made up through a surcharge. PG&E's suggestion that surcharges and surcredits be made up in a one to six ratio (the undercollection arising from one month of no charges be made up over 6 months) seems reasonable, but we will not decide this matter now. Instead, parties should make amortization proposals in the advice letter filing, discussed below, which shall be made 10 days after a Commission decision that assigns responsibility to DA customers becomes final and unappealable. At that time, the Commission will have information concerning the size of the under and overpayments and can directly consider the consequences of different amortization programs on electric charges.

To implement this decision, DWR should file its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement for bond-related costs with the Energy Division once the bonds have been placed and DWR has determined its bond-related charges. This submission should be based on DWR's final debt service projections (including an assumed all-in interest rate for its variable rate bonds consistent with the terms of its bond indenture). If the bonds have not yet been placed, then DWR should submit its best determination of the more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement to the Energy Division by November 8, 2002, using information gained from its placement of bonds and estimating the bond-related costs for the bonds awaiting placement.

The three investor-owned utilities should make changes in their billing systems immediately so as to facilitate the implementation of this decision by November 15, 2002. The Commission long ago required the IOUs to create these customer categories, and we cannot delay until January 1, 2003. The modifications to the billing systems should enable the printing of the bond charge on a separate line on the customer's bill.[55] We note that SDG&E stated that it could implement simple changes within 30 days of a Commission order, and should do so. In any event, SDG&E should comply with Ordering Paragraph 5, which gives any utility additional time to implement the line item on the customer's bill, if needed.

PG&E requests that the Commission authorize a delay in the implementation of a new line on the customer's bill until the completion of its installation of a new billing system. PG&E states that it will offer consumers an

[55] We note that the Commission first approved servicing agreements between DWR and SDG&E (D.01-09-013), DWR and SCE (D.01-09-014) and a servicing arrangement between DWR and PG&E (D.01-09-015). Subsequently, the Commission approved modifications to DWR's agreements with SDG&E (D.02-04-048) and SCE (D.02-04-047). At DWR's request, pursuant to Water Code § 80106(b), the Commission subsequently ordered PG&E to comply with the terms of a servicing arrangement (D.02-05-048). Finally, the Commission approved amendments to the Servicing Agreements for SCE (D.02-07-039) and SDG&E (D.02-07-040). The current servicing agreements and the PG&E servicing order each provide for a separate line item on the Consolidated Utility Bill for bond charges.

explanation via a bill insert that a bond charge has been imposed, and will implement a separate line on the bill as soon as possible. PG&E's approach seems reasonable, and we authorize it to postpone implementation of the billing line until February 1, 2003, at the latest. In the interim, PG&E (and all other utilities not adding a specific line item on the bill) must include with its bills either a bill insert or bill message informing each customer that a bond charge for DWR (based on non-exempt bundled consumption from and after November 15) is included in the bill.

A utility that is unable to show a separate line item for the bond charge on customers' bills when the first bills for electricity consumed on or after November 15, 2002 are prepared, must still impose and collect the bond charge and remit bond charge collections to DWR. After DWR submits its more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement (on or before November 8, 2003), the utilities shall make a compliance advice letter filing within 5 days after the effective date of this decision. SDG&E, SCE and PG&E shall file compliance advice letters that impose a per kWh hour charge on non-exempt bundled consumption delivered on and after the date of the advice letters. SDGE, SCE, and PG&E shall calculate a uniform per kWh charge by dividing the more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement by 145,257 GWh. The advice letters will be effective on filing, subject to post-filing review by the Energy Division. Remittances to DWR pursuant to the Servicing Agreements and Orders should commence with the receipt of bond charges.

As mentioned above, the filing should also establish a Bond Charge Balancing account for each utility to track bond-related charges and cost responsibilities as described above. In addition, if it is ultimately determined that cost responsibility for bond-related costs will be imposed on DA customers, the utilities should immediately create subaccounts for each customer category

held responsible for bond-related costs. These subaccounts will track costs and payments until a decision imposing cost responsibility on DA customers becomes final and unappealable.

Within 10 days of a decision assigning cost responsibilities on DA customers becoming final and unappealable, the utilities should make a new advice letter filing to impose payments on those held responsible for bond-related costs and to amortize over and under payments in BCBA sub-accounts. These changes will go into effect when adopted by the Commission. This amortization will not adjust previously billed DWR bond charges, rather it will assign future cost responsibility for DWR's overall bond charges in an equitable fashion.

In subsequent years, consideration of the bond charge will be part of the annual proceeding to set a charge to recover DWR's retail revenue requirements. Further, we note that the bond charge may change at other times, pursuant to Article V of the Rate Agreement.

Concerning the implications of this decision for charges to customers, we note that PG&E has stated "incorporating the DWR bond charge will not affect bundled customers' overall rates."[56] Thus, this bond charge should not raise the rates paid by PG&E's bundled customers, at least initially.

SCE notes that it "operates under the Settlement Rates adopted in D.01-05-064."[57] This indicates that this bond charge should not affect the rates paid by SCE's bundled customers, at least initially.

SDG&E's testimony does not directly address this point, but seems to presume that the bond charge will be a separate levy, with no offsetting

[56] PG&E, Brief, p. 7.

[57] Exhibit 200, p. 7.

reductions in charges elsewhere.[58] It is also unclear to us whether there is sufficient room in SDG&E's current rates to recover all of SDG&E's authorized costs and the bond charge without affecting the overall rate levels. For this reason, we will order SDG&E to establish a balancing account to track the amount of its remittances to DWR and to seek a rate change to recover any resulting shortfall in its own collections due to these remittances in the DWR Revenue Requirement Phase of this proceeding. This balancing account will not affect remittances to DWR at any time. In that Phase, we will simultaneously consider whether any changes are needed to accommodate DWR bond charges on an ongoing basis.

Further, when imposing the bond charge, SCE, SDG&E and PG&E shall also impose offsetting decreases in charges for electricity costs as part of this initial filing to insure that charges are not raised at the time of the initial imposition of bond charges. As noted previously, the advice letters implementing those charges will be effective upon filing, subject to review by the Energy Division for compliance with this order. To facilitate the Energy Division's review, within ten days of the date of this decision, SCE, SDG&E and PG&E shall each submit to the Commission's Energy Division drafts of the advice letters that they intend to submit to comply with this decision. These drafts, of necessity, will omit any numerical data that is not yet available.

Finally, we decline SDG&E's suggestion to create an average charge to cover the revenue requirements for 2003 and 2004. Properly calculated, DWR's revenue requirement shows both how much money DWR needs and when it needs it. If DWR needs more money in 2003 than 2004 to pay bond-related costs, we cannot delay recovery to a date after the money is needed.

[58] *See* Exhibit 302, pp. 2-4.

XI. Comments

The alternate decision of Commissioner Brown was mailed to the parties in accordance with § 311(d) of the Pub. Util. Code and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Opening comments were filed on October 17, 2002 by TURN, ORA, SCE, SDG&E, California Industrial Users (CIU), PG&E and CLECA. DWR provided a clarifying memo that responded to questions raised in the proposed decision.

ORA, SCE, SDG&E, PG&E, CIU, California Manufacturers and Technology Association (CMTA) filed reply comments on October 22, 2002.

Changes to the alternate decision were made as addressed herein.

XII. Assignment of Proceeding

Commissioner Lynch is the assigned Commissioner and ALJ Sullivan is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

XIII. Rehearing and Judicial Review

This decision construes, applies, implements, and interprets the provisions of AB 1X (Chapter 4 of the Statutes of 2001-02 First Extraordinary Session). Therefore, Section 1731(c) (applications for rehearing are due within 10 days after the date of issuance of the order or decision) and Section 1768 (procedures applicable to judicial review) are applicable.

Findings of Fact

1. The California DWR owes approximately $6.5 billion to the General Fund and $3.5 billion on an interim loan. The debts were incurred in the months following the January 17, 2001 declaration of a state of emergency which required DWR to purchase electricity for California consumers.
2. DWR plans to refinance these debts through a bond offering of up to $11.95 billion.

3. The "Rate Agreement By and Between State of California Department of Water Resources and State of California Public Utilities Commission" (Rate Agreement) states that the Commission will impose charges sufficient to provide for the payment of all bond-related costs incurred by DWR.
4. The proposed sale of bonds at close to $12 billion will be the largest municipal bond sale in history.
5. Certain DWR contracts for power, called priority contracts, have a higher priority for repayment than bond costs.
6. Several DWR contracts include terms that pass through the costs of natural gas, and fluctuations in the price of gas will lead to fluctuations in the price of power.
7. In a typical municipal bond offering, the borrowing entity has the power to provide a dedicated stream of revenues.
8. The Commission, not DWR, will set bond charges.
9. The factual circumstances listed in Findings of Fact 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, have resulted in a complicated credit structure with multiple reserve accounts.
10. The exact annual revenue requirement needed to support the bonds will not be known until the bond financing is complete. A more precise 2003 bond revenue requirement will be available in November after a large proportion of the bonds are placed.
11. It is possible to determine the reasonableness of methodologies for setting charges to recover bond-related costs based on the preliminary financing information presented by DWR in Exhibit 1 and Reference Exhibit 1-a.
12. DWR will present the Commission with its more precise revenue requirement for bond-related costs after a large proportion of the bonds are placed with investors.

13. The Rate Agreement provides that the Commission shall impose bond charges "sufficient to provide moneys so that the amounts available for deposit in the Bond Charge Payment Account from time to time, together with amounts on deposit in the Bond Charge Payment account, are at all times sufficient to pay or provide for the payment of all Bond Related Costs when due in accordance with the Financing Documents."
14. The Rate Agreement requires that bond charges be imposed based on the aggregate amount of electric power sold to customers in the service areas of PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E, regardless of whether the power is sold by DWR, the utility, or under particular circumstances, by an ESP.
15. D.01-05-064 exempted the consumption of CARE-eligible customers, residential usage below 130% of baseline, and usage by medical baseline customers of PG&E and SCE from the 3 cents per kWh surcharge.
16. D.01-09-059 exempted the consumption of CARE-eligible customers, residential usage below 130% of baseline, and usage by medical baseline customers of SDG&E from a 1.46 cents per kWh rate increase.
17. The long period over which the bond charges will be collected breaks the link between those for whom the power was purchased and those responsible for repayment.
18. The bond charge is a mechanism to raise revenues to pay for bond-related costs.
19. Imposing the bond charge on residential usage up to 130% of baseline lowers the bond charge to all other non-exempt bundled customers and all non-exempt Direct Access customers, and increases the base of bond charge-paying customers.

20. A bond charge imposed equally on all non-exempt kilowatt-hours has a simple structure that is easy to implement and is transparent and fair to all that must pay it.
21. Since the bond-related costs will be repaid over almost twenty years, over time those paying the surcharges will frequently be different than those for whom the costs were incurred.
22. D.02-02-052 did not allocate responsibility for past energy purchases, but instead allocated responsibility for current and ongoing purchases by DWR on behalf of the investor owned utilities.
23. D.02-02-051 noted that the Commission has broad discretion in assessing a bond charge.
24. It is not reasonable to make departures from a methodology of allocating bond-related costs on an equal-cents-per-kWh basis to reflect the voltage of a consumer's power.
25. It is not reasonable to make departures from a methodology of allocating bond-related costs on an equal-cents-per-kWh basis to impose WAPA-related costs on PG&E's customers.
26. The Rate Agreement states that absent a decision that has become final and unappealable, power provided to customers by Energy Service Providers will not be included in the determination of bond charges.
27. If DWR borrows $11.95 billion, it projects a 2003 revenue requirement for bond-related costs of $1,140 million, and a 2004 revenue requirement of $784 million.
28. Based on DWR's assumptions, if all medical baseline and CARE-eligible customer usage are excluded from the bond charges, we estimate that all other bundled consumption will pay a projected charge of between 0.5797 and 0.7848 cents per kWh in 2003 and between 0.5397 and 0.6685 cents per

kWh in 2004. This result also assumes the adoption of a methodology that assigns a uniform charge to all non-excluded consumption. Bond charges at this level will remain in effect until a decision concerning whether Direct Access customers should pay bond-related costs becomes final and unappealable.

29. PG&E and SCE have the ability to impose a bond charge on residential usage below 130% of baseline without raising rates for that usage. For SDG&E, imposing a bond charge on this usage may require an equivalent reduction in other charges.

30. Incorporating a bond charge into PG&E's rates need not raise customers' overall rates.

31. SCE operates under Settlement Rates and incorporating a bond charge into SCE's rates need not raise customers' overall rates.

32. It is practical and in the public interest to implement a bond charge on non-excluded electric consumption that occurs on or after November 15, 2002.

33. It is in the public interest to inform customers of the bond charges.

34. It is practical and in the public interest to include a line item on customer bills identifying the amount of the bond charge as soon as possible but no later than February 1, 2003.

35. To impose a bond charge on non-excluded consumption occurring on or after November 15, 2002, DWR must provide a more precise bond revenue requirement for 2003 (as defined herein) to the Commission, and to SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E by November 8, 2002.

36. A reasonable estimate of the 2003 non-excluded bundled consumption of customers in the service territories of SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E is 145,257 gigawatt hours.

37. It is reasonable and practical to establish balancing accounts and subaccounts, consistent with the discussion herein, to facilitate implementation of the policies adopted in this decision and under active consideration in the other proceedings before this Commission.

38. It is reasonable and practical to require SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E to make a new advice letter filing within 10 days after a decision assigning cost responsibilities for DA customers becomes final and unappealable that imposes bond charges on those held responsible for bond-related costs and to amortize over and under payments in the sub-accounts of the Bond Charge Balancing Account.

Conclusions of Law

1. It is reasonable to adopt a uniform bond-related surcharge on all non-excluded consumption.
2. Pursuant to Water Code Section 80110, the determination of the reasonableness of the costs associated with DWR's bond offering rests with DWR, not the Commission.
3. Pursuant to the Public Utilities Code, the authority to set a bond charge rests with the Commission, not DWR.
4. Pursuant to Section 80110 of the Water Code, DWR is entitled to recover as a revenue requirement amounts necessary to pay off the proposed bonds that will be issued by DWR.
5. The Commission should adopt bond charges in amounts sufficient to comply with statutory requirements of Sections 80110 and 80134 of the Water Code and the Commission's covenants in Article V of the Rate Agreement, negotiated pursuant to Section 80110 of the Water Code.

6. Under AB1X, a bond charge can be imposed on residential usage up to 130% of baseline, if this charge does not increase rates.
7. It is reasonable to exclude all PG&E, SCE and SDG&E medical baseline and CARE customer usage from the bond charges.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Department of Water Resources' (DWR) Supplemental Testimony of August 13, 2002 is identified as Reference Exhibit 1-a.
2. San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Edison (SCE) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) shall make changes to their billing systems to impose bond charges consistent with the methodology of collecting an equal-cents-per-kilowatt-hour (kWh) on all non-excluded bundled electricity consumption, as defined herein, with bond charges to be reflected as a separate line item on customer's bills.
3. No later than November 8, 2002 the Department of Water Resources (DWR) shall submit to the Commission its more precise bond revenue requirement for 2003, and simultaneously serve it on SDG&E, SCE, and PG&E. This submission shall be based upon DWR's final debt service projections (including an assumed all-in interest rate for its variable rate bonds consistent with the terms of its Bond Indenture). If the terms of all of the Department's bonds are not known by that date, DWR shall base its submission on its most recent estimates of interest rates and bond size, based on consultations with its senior managing underwriter and financial advisors.
4. No later than five days following the effective date of this decision, SDG&E, SCE and PG&E shall file compliance advice letters that impose

a per kWh charge on non-exempt bundled consumption (as defined herein). This bond charge shall apply to all such consumption (regardless of whether the electricity is supplied by the utility or by DWR). SDG&E, SCE, and PG&E shall calculate a uniform per kWh charge by dividing DWR's more precise bond revenue requirement for 2003 by 145,257 gigawatt-hours (GWh). SDG&E, SCE and PG&E shall impose offsetting decreases in charges for electricity energy costs as part of this initial filing to insure that rates are not raised at the time of the initial imposition of bond charges. The advice letters will be effective upon filing, subject to review by the Energy Division for compliance with this order.

5. SCE, SDG&E and PG&E shall implement a separate line item for the bond charge on the customer's bill. Any utility that is unable to show this line item on customers' bills when the first bills for electricity consumed on or after November 15, 2002 are prepared, must still comply with Ordering Paragraph
No. 4 and must still collect and remit to DWR the bond charges associated with electricity consumed on and after November 15, 2002. In addition, any such utility must implement the separate bond charge line item on its customer's bills no later than February 1, 2003. In the interim each such utility must include with its bills a bill insert, or bill message, informing each customer that a bond charge for DWR (based on non-exempt bundled consumption from and after 11/15) is included on the bill.

6. SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E shall establish Bond Charge Balancing Accounts consistent with the discussion herein to track payments of bond-related charges by customer categories. The details of these

accounts should be described in the advice letters filed pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 4.

7. SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E shall establish sub-accounts to track bond charge payments and responsibilities consistent with the customer usage that R.02-01-011 deems responsible for paying bond-related costs.

8. Within 10 days after a decision assigning cost responsibilities on Direct Access customers becomes final and unappealable, the utilities shall make a new advice letter filing to impose bond charges on those held responsible for bond-related costs and to amortize over and under payments in the sub-accounts of the Bond Charge Balancing Account. These changes shall be effective as of the date adopted by the Commission.

9. SDG&E shall establish a balancing account to track the amount it remits to DWR and thus allow it to seek a rate change, to the extent necessary, to permit recovery of its own authorized costs independent of these increased remittances to DWR. This balancing account will not affect remittances to DWR at any time, but is simply an account to allow SDG&E to recover ultimately its own authorized costs from its own customers entirely independent of its remittances to DWR.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 30, 2002, at San Francisco, California

HENRY M. DUQUE
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
MICHAEL R. PEEVEY

Commissioners

I dissent.

/s/ LORETTA M. LYNCH
President

I dissent.

/s/ CARL W. WOOD
Commissioner

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

ANNETTE GILLIAM
Law Department
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 Walnut Grove Ave., Bldg. G.0.1, Rm. 359
Rosemead, CA 91770-0800
(626) 302-4880
Fax # (626) 302-3990
Appearing for Southern California Edison
Applicant
Gilliaa@sce.com

SCOTT BLAISING
Attorney at Law
BRAUN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
8980 Mooney Road
Elk Grove, CA 95624
(916) 682-9702
Fax # (916) 682-1005
Appearing for Ca Municipal Util. Assoc.
Interested Party
blaising@braunlegal.com

DAN L. CARROLL
Attorney at Law
DOWNEY BRAND SEYMOUR & ROHWER, LLP
555 Capitol Mall, 10th Fl.
Sacramento, CA 95864
(916) 441-0131
Fax # (916) 441-4021
Appearing for Ca Industrial Users
Interested Party
dcarroll@dbsr.com

BETH W. DUNLOP
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 Market Street, Ste. 1020
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
Fax # (415) 834-2310
Appearing for The Irving Co.
Interested party
bdunlop@gralegal.com

DIAN M. GRUENEICH
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 Market Street, Ste. 1020
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
Fax # (415) 834-2310
Appearing for The University of CA and
Ca State University
Interested Party
dgrueneich@gralegal.com

MARK R. HUFFMAN
Attorney at Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 770000-B30A
San Francisco, CA 94177
(415) 973-3842
Fax # (415) 973-0516
Interested Party
mrh2@pge.com

MICHAELS S. MCCORMICK
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 Market Street, Ste. 1020
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
Fax # (415) 834-2310
Appearing for Applied Materials
Interested Party
mmccormick@gralegal.com

NORA SHERIFF
Attorney at Law
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
120 Montgomery Street, Ste. 2200
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 421-4143
Fax # (415) 989-1263
Appearing for EPUC/KCC/GAG
Interested Party
filings@a-klaw.com

CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
Attorney at Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Mail Code, B30A
P.O. BOX 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177
(415) 973-3842
Fax # (415) 973-5520
Interested Party
Cjw5@pge.com

STEVE RAHON
SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES
8315 Century Park Court
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 654-1773
Appearing for San Diego Gas & Electric
Respondent
srahon@semprautilities.com

STATE SERVICE:

ANDREW ULMER
Attorney at Law
SIMPSON PARTNERS LLP
900 Front Street, Third Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 773-1790
Fax # (415) 773-1791
Appearing for CA Dept. of Water Resources
Andrew@simpsonpartners.com

**************ADDITIONAL APPEARANCES **************

Katherine S. Poole
Attorney
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
651 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 900
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080
(650) 589-1660
kpoole@adamsbroadwell.com
For: The Coalition of California Utility Employees

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

For: The Coalition of California Utility Employees

William P. Adams
ADAMS ELECTRICAL SAFETY CONSULTING
716 BRETT AVENUE
ROHNERT PARK CA 94928-4012
(707) 795-7549
For: SELF

Aaron Thomas
AES NEWENERGY, INC.
350 S. GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 2950
LOS ANGELES CA 90071
(213) 996-6136
athomas@newenergy.com
For: New Energy Ventures, Inc.

Patrick Mcdonnell
AGLAND ENERGY
2000 NICASIO VALLEY ROAD
NICASIO CA 94946
(415) 662-6944
aglandenergy@earthlink.net
For: Enserch Energy Services

James Weil
AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE
PO BOX 1599
FORESTHILL CA 95631
(530) 367-3300
jweil@aglet.org
For: AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE

Chris King
Executive Director
AMERICAN ENERGY INSTITUTE
842 OXFORD ST.
BERKELEY CA 94707
(510) 435-5189
ckingaei@yahoo.com

Lon W. House
Energy Advisor
ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES
4901 FLYING C ROAD
CAMERON PARK CA 95682
(530) 676-8956
lwhouse@innercite.com
For: Regional Council of Rural Counties

Barbara R. Barkovich
BARKOVICH AND YAP, INC.
31 EUCALYPTUS LANE
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901
(415) 457-5537
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
For: California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA)

Reed V. Schmidt
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY CA 94703
(510) 653-3399

rschmidt@bartlewells.com
For: California City County Streetlight Association (CAL-SLA)

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

Roger Berliner
BERLINER, CANDON & JIMISON
1225 19TH STREET, N.W., SUITE 800
WASHINGTON DC 20036
(202) 955-6067
rogerberliner@bcjlaw.com
For: Internal Services Department of Los Angeles County (LACISD)

Jennifer Tachera
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-14
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-5504
(916) 654-3870
jtachera@energy.state.ca.us

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

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

Ed Yates
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF FOOD PROCESSORS
980 NINTH STREET, SUITE 230
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 444-9260
ed@clfp.com
For: California League of Food Processors

Susan Rossi
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA POWER EXCHANGE CORPORATION
200 S. LOS ROBLES AVENUE, SUITE 400
PASADENA CA 91101-2482
(626) 685-9857
sdrossi@calpx.com
For: CALIFORNIA POWER EXCHANGE

William Dombrowski

CALIFORNIA RETAILERS ASSOCIATION
980 9TH STREET, SUITE 2100
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-2741
(916) 443-1975

Tom Smegal
CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE
1720 NORTH FIRST STREET
SAN JOSE CA 95112
(408) 367-8200
tsmegal@calwater.com
For: California Water Association

Alvin B. Colley
3920 GREENSTONE ROAD
PLACERVILLE CA 95667
(530) 642-8367
acolley@laurelglenfarms.com
For: Self

William Ahern
Senior Policy Analyst
CONSUMERS UNION
1535 MISSION STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103
(415) 431-6747
aherbi@consumer.org
For: CONSUMERS UNION

Howard Choy
Energy Management Division Manager
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT
1100 NORTHEASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES CA 90063
(323) 881-3939
hchoy@isd.co.la.ca.us
For: COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Patrick G. Mcguire
TOM BEACH
CROSSBORDER ENERGY
2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 316
BERKELEY CA 94710
(510) 649-9790
patrickm@crossborderenergy.com
For: Watson Cogeneration Company

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

Robert C. Cagen
Legal Division
RM. 5026
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2197
rcc@cpuc.ca.gov

For: Office of Ratepayers Advocate

Thomas M. Berliner
Attorneys At Law
DUANE MORRIS & HECKSCHER
100 SPEAR STREET, SUITE 1500
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 371-2200
tmberliner@duanemorris.com
For: Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Ron Knecht
ECONOMICS & TECH ANALYSIS GROUP
1465 MARLBAROUGH AVENUE
LOS ALTOS CA 94024-5742
(650) 968-0115
ronknecht@aol.com
For: SELF

Lynn M. Haug
ANDY BROWN
Attorney At Law
ELLISON & SCHNEIDER
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95814-3109
(916) 447-2166
lmh@eslawfirm.com
For: East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD)

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

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

Andrew J. Skaff
Attorney At Law
ENERGY LAW GROUP, LLP
1999 HARRISON STREET, 27TH FLOOR
OAKLAND CA 94612
(510) 874-4370
askaff@energy-law-group.com
For: New York Mercantile Exchange/Dynegy, Inc.

Michael B. Day
Attorney At Law
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI RITCHIE & DAY LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3133
(415) 392-7900
mday@gmssr.com

For: ENRON ENERGY SERVICES, INC., ENRON NORTH AMERICA

Anne C. Selting
Attorney At Law
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
aselting@gralegal.com

Beth W. Dunlop
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
bdunlop@gralegal.com
For: The Irving Co.

Dian M. Grueneich
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
dgrueneich@gralegal.com
For: The University of California and California State University

Jack Mcgowan
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
docket-control@gralegal.com
For: The Irvine Company

Michael S. Mccormick
GRUENEICH RESOURCE ADVOCATES
582 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1020
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104
(415) 834-2300
mmccormick@gralegal.com
For: Applied Materials

Morten Henrik Greidung
HAFSLUND ENERGY TRADING, LLC
101 ELLIOT AVE., SUITE 510
SEATTLE WA 98119
(206) 436-0640
mhg@hetrading.com
For: HAFSLUND ENERGY TRADING, LLC

Daniel L. Rial
KINDER MORGAN ENERGY PARTNERS
1100 TOWN & COUNTRY ROAD
ORANGE CA 92868
(714) 560-4854
riald@kindermorgan.com
For: Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, SFPP, L.P., CALNEV

Thomas S. Knox
Attorney At Law
KNOX, LEMMON & ANAPOCSKY, LLP
ONE CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 700
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

(916) 498-9911
tknox@klalawfirm.com
For: Leprino Foods

Susan E. Brown
Attorney At Law
LATINO ISSUES FORUM
785 MARKET STREET, 3RD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103-2003
(415) 284-7224
lifcentral@lif.org
For: LATINO ISSUES FORUM

Daniel W. Douglass
Attorney At Law
LAW OFFICES OF DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
5959 TOPANGA CANYON BLVD., SUITE 244
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367-7313
(818) 596-2201
douglass@energyattorney.com
For: ALLIANCE OF RETAIL MARKETS and WESTERN POWER TRADING 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: California Large Energy Consumers Assn.

Christopher Hilen
Attorney At Law
LEBOEUF LAMB GREENE & MACRAE LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 951-1100
chilen@llgm.com
For: RELIANT ENERGY POWER GENERATION, INC.

Jeffrey H. Goldfien
Assistant City Attorney
MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON
777 DAVIS STREET, SUITE 300
SAN LEANDRO CA 94577
(510) 351-4300
jhg@meyersnave.com
For: City of San Leandro

Christopher W. Reardon
MFRS COUNCIL OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY
PO BOX 1564
MODESTO CA 95353
(209) 523-0886
cwrmccv@worldnet.att.net
For: Manufacturers Council of the Central Valley (MCCV)

Kevin R. Mcspadden
Attorney At Law
MILBANK TWEED HADLEY & MCCLOY
601 SOUTH FIGUEROA, 30TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90017
(213) 892-4563

kmcspadden@milbank.com
For: MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & MC CLOY

Scott T. Steffen
Attorney At Law
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
1231 ELEVENTH STREET
MODESTO CA 95352
(209) 526-7387
scottst@mid.org
For: MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT (MID)

Seth D. Hilton
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 295-3300
shilton@mofo.com
For: New West Energy

Seth Hilton
Attorney At Law
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
PO BOX 8130
101 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, SUITE 450
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596-8130
(925) 295-3371
shilton@mofo.com
For: El Paso Natural Gas Company

Jose E. Guzman, Jr.
Attorney At Law
NOSSAMAN, GUTHNER, KNOX & ELLIOTT, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4799
(415) 398-3600
jguzman@nossaman.com
For: Cargill Corporation/Clarus Energy Corporation

Christine Ferrari
Depurty City Attorney
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL ROOM 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-4682
(415) 554-4634
christine_ferrari@ci.sf.ca.us

Joseph M. Malkin
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
400 SANSOME STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3143
(415) 773-5505
jmalkin@orrick.com
For: THE AES CORPORATION

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

William H. Edwards
KELLY M. MORTON, JAMES L. LOPES
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.
77 BEALE STREET
PO BOX 7442, RM 3115-B30A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120-7442
(415) 973-2768
whe1@pge.com
For: PG&E

Cecilia Montana
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-1595
cfm3@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Patrick J. Power
Attorney At Law
1300 CLAY STREET, SUITE 600
OAKLAND CA 94618
(510) 446-7742
pjpowerlaw@aol.com
For: City of Long Beach; Universal Studios Inc.

Don Schoenbeck
RCS CONSULTING, INC.
900 WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE 1000
VANCOUVER WA 98660
(360) 737-3877
dws@keywaycorp.com
For: Coalinga Cogenerator

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

Steven Greenberg
REALENERGY
300 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 300
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 325-2500
sgreenberg@realenergy.com
For: RealEnergy

Keith M. Sappenfield Ii
RELIANT ENERGY RETAIL, INC.
PO BOX 1409
HOUSTON TX 77251-1409
(713) 207-5570
keith-sappenfield@reliantenergy.com
For: Reliant Energy Retail, Inc.

Randy Britt
ROBINSONS-MAY
6160 LAUREL CANYON BLVD.
NORTH HOLLYWOOD CA 91606

(818) 509-4777
randy_britt@robinsonsmay.com
For: Robinsons-May

Arlin Orchard
Attorney At Law
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
PO BOX 15830, MAIL STOP-B406
SACRAMENTO CA 95852-1830
(916) 732-5830
aorchar@smud.org
For: Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Steve Rahon
SEMPRA ENERGY UTILITIES
8315 CENTURY PARK COURT
SAN DIEGO CA 92123
(858) 654-1773
srahon@semprautilities.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

Theodore E. Roberts
LYNN G. VAN WAGENEN
Attorney At Law
SEMPRA FIBER LINKS, INC.
101 ASH STREET
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017
(619) 699-5111
troberts@sempra.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Andrew Chau
Attorney At Law
SHELL ENERGY SERVICES COMPANY, L.L.C.
1221 LAMAR STREET, SUITE 1000
HOUSTON TX 77010
(713) 241-8939
anchau@shellus.com

Justin D. Bradley
SILICON VALLEY MANUFACTURING GROUP
224 AIRPORT PARKWAY, SUITE 620
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 501-7864
jbradley@svmg.org
For: Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group

Annette Gilliam
Sce Law Department
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE,BLDG.G.O.1,RM 359
ROSEMEAD CA 91770-0800
(626) 302-4880
gilliaa@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison Company

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

For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (SCE)

Denis George
Energy Manager
THE KROGER COMPANY
1014 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI OH 45202
(513) 762-4538
dgeorge@kroger.com
For: The Kroger Company

Matthew Freedman
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 EX314
freedman@turn.org
For: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)

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

Robert Finkelstein
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 X-301
bfinkelstein@turn.org
For: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)

Christopher Conkling
General Counsel
USS-POSCO INDUSTRIES
900 LOVERIDGE ROAD
PITTSBURG CA 94565
(925) 439-6507
cconklin@ussposco.com
For: USS-POSCO INDUSTRIES

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

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

For: Energy Division

Truman L. Burns
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2932
txb@cpuc.ca.gov
For: OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES

Diana Johnston
CALIF DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE ROOM 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
djohnsto@water.ca.gov

Michael W. Neville
Attorney At Law
CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, SUITE 11000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-7004
(415) 703-5523
michael.neville@doj.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY

Diana Johnson
Cal Energy Resources Scheduling Division
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, ROOM 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
djohnsto@water.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESROUCES

John Pacheco
California Energy Resources Scheduling
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES
3310 EL CAMINO AVENUE, ROOM 120
SACRAMENTO CA 95821
(916) 574-0311
jpacheco@water.ca.gov
For: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Sean F. Casey
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1667
sfc@cpuc.ca.gov
For: Office of Ratepayer Advocates

Amy W Chan
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1509
amy@cpuc.ca.gov
For: Energy Division

Christopher Danforth
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1481
ctd@cpuc.ca.gov
For: Office of Ratepayer Advocates

Joseph R. DeUlloa
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5105
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-3124
jrd@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Faline Fua
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2235
fua@cpuc.ca.gov

Laura L. Krannawitter
Executive Division
RM. 5210
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2538
llk@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Steve Linsey
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1341
car@cpuc.ca.gov
For: Office of Ratepayer Advocates

Kimberly Lippi
Legal Division
RM. 4107
505 VAN NESS AVE

San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-5822
kjl@cpuc.ca.gov

Jeanette Lo
Energy Division
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1825
jlo@cpuc.ca.gov
For: Energy Division

Chloe Lukins
Consumer Protection & Safety Division
AREA 2-D
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1353
clu@cpuc.ca.gov

Steven C Ross
Office of Ratepayer Advocates
RM. 4209
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2140
sro@cpuc.ca.gov

Randy Chinn
SENATE ENERGY UTILITIES & COMMUNICATIONS
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 4040
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 445-9764
randy.chinn@sen.ca.gov

Andrew Ulmer
Attorney At Law
SIMPSON PARTNERS LLP
900 FRONT STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111
(415) 773-1791
andrew@simpsonpartners.com
For: California Department of Water Resources

Linda Serizawa
Communications & Pubic Information Divis
RM. 2102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1383
lss@cpuc.ca.gov

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

Timothy J. Sullivan
Administrative Law Judge Division

RM. 5007
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1463
tjs@cpuc.ca.gov

Laura J. Tudisco
Legal Division
RM. 5001
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2164
ljt@cpuc.ca.gov

(END OF ATTACHMENT A)