

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Rate Cases and Cost of Service Proceedings	3
A. SCE General Rate Case – Phase I	
B. SCE General Rate Case – Phase II	
C. Sierra Pacific Power Company General Rate Case	
D. PG&E 2007 General Rate Case – Phase I	
E. PG&E 2007 General Rate Case – Phase II	
F. PacifiCorp General Rate Case	
II. Other Ratemaking Proceedings	12
A. DWR Bond Charge	
B. DWR Revenue Requirement	
C. SoCalGas Native Gas	
D. SoCalGas Native Gas Access	
E. SoCalGas/SDG&E System Integration-Firm Access Rights	
F. Agricultural Internal Combustion Equipment (ICE) – Incentives for Conversion to Electric Service	
G. Southwest Gas GCIM	
H. PG&E Incremental Core Storage	
I. PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and SoCalGas Application for Approval of 2006-2008 Energy Efficiency Programs	
J. Contra Costa 8 Generation – PG&E	
K. SoCalGas Long-term Gas Transportation Agreement Application	
L. SCE and SDG&E Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding – NDCTP	
M. PG&E Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding - NDCTP	
N. SCE for Authority to Add City of Anaheim’s Share of SONGS Units 2 & 3 to SCE’s Rates and Associated Relief.	
O. SDG&E for Authority to Participate in the SONGS 2 & 3 Steam Generator Replacement Project (SGRP) and to Retain its 20% share of SONGS 2 & 3.	
P. Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding	
III. Major Rulemaking Proceedings	33
A. Long Term Procurement Plan (LTPP) Rulemaking	
B. Resource Adequacy Rulemaking	
C. Procurement Rulemaking	
D. Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Rulemaking.	
E. Direct Access (DA) and Departing Load (DL) Cost Responsibility Surcharge (CRS)	
F. Demand Response Rulemaking and Associated Proceedings	
G. Distributed Generation Rulemaking	
H. Energy Efficiency Rulemaking I	
I. Energy Efficiency Rulemaking II	
J. Low Income Programs	
K. Reliable Long-Term Natural Gas Supplies (Gas Market OIR)	
L. Community Choice Aggregation (CCA)	
M. Avoided Cost / QF Pricing Rulemaking	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

- N. Gain on Sale Rulemaking
- O. Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) Rulemaking
- P. Holding Companies and Affiliate Relationships

IV. Transmission Proceedings	64
A. Transmission OII	
B. Mission-Miguel	
C. Jefferson-Martin	
D. Otay-Mesa	
E. Antelope-Pardee (Tehachapi Phase 1: SCE Segment 1 of 3)	
F. Antelope-Tehachapi-Vincent 500kV Line (Tehachapi Phase 1: SCE Segments 2 and 3)	
G. Devers-Palo Verde #2 Transmission Project	
H. Sunrise PowerLink Project	
I. Economic Assessment Methodology (T.E.A.M) OII	
J. Renewable Transmission OII	
V. Other Issues	75
A. Qualifying Facilities (QFs)	
B. Border Price Spike Investigation (Border Price OII)	
C. Sempra Affiliate Investigation	
D. 206 Complaint Case / DWR Contract Renegotiation	
VI. Petroleum Pipeline Proceedings	82
A. SFPP (Kinder Morgan Petroleum Pipeline Subsidiary) Cost of Service Review	
B. SFPP's North Bay Expansion	
C. ARCO Products Company vs. SFPP	
D. SFPP Intrastate Transportation Rates	
E. ARCO, Mobil Oil and Texaco vs. SFPP	
F. SFPP (Kinder Morgan) Application to Increase Rates	
G. Pacific Pipeline System LLC	
H. Chevron Products Company Complaint	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

I. RATE CASES AND COST OF SERVICE PROCEEDINGS

A. SCE General Rate Case – Phase I

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-12-014	Brown	Fukutome	None	Strain

What it Does

- Phase I sets the revenue requirement for distribution and generation capital and operating costs for test year 2006, and attrition years 2007, and 2008.
- Phase II sets rate design and cost allocation. This is done by a separate application (A.05-05-023).

Next Steps

- Phase II, A.05-05-05

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 11, 2006	Commission issues D.06-05-016	Proceeding closed
May 5, 2006	Second revised proposed decision placed on Commission Agenda	This decision addresses the general rate increase request of SCE. For test year 2006, SCE is authorized a revenue requirement of \$3,749,292,000, which reflects an increase of \$333,115,000 or 9.75% over the previously authorized level of \$3,416,177,000. On total system revenue basis, the revenue increases amount to 2.74% for 2006. The second revised proposed decision adopts 100% result sharing as requested by SCE.
Apr. 25, 2006	SCE filed motion	SCE filed comments on errors in results of operations (RO) model , Exhibit 901, of the revised proposed decision
Apr. 3, 2006	Revised proposed decision issued	Revisions were made to the proposed decision to correct errors in the results of operations, and clarification on other issues
Feb. 14, 2006	Reply comments filed on proposed decision	Reply comments filed by SCE, DRA, and intervenors.
Feb. 7, 2007	SCE filed comments on Exhibit 900	SCE filed comments on errors in results of operation (RO) model , Exhibit 900
Feb. 6, 2006	Comments filed on proposed decision	Comments on proposed decision filed by SCE, DRA, and intervenors
Jan. 17, 2006	Proposed decision issued	Comments due February 6, 2006 and reply comments due 5 days after comments are filed
Nov. 17, 2005	Ruling issued	Comments on SCE, CUE and TURN's proposed stipulation are due November 18, 2005.
Nov. 17, 2005	ORA, and Aglet file motion	Motion filed in opposition for approval of stipulation on reliability investment incentive mechanism of Edison, CUE, and TURN.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Nov. 2, 2005	SCE, Coalition of CA Utility Employees, and TURN file motion	Motion filed for approval of stipulation on reliability investment incentive mechanism.
Oct. 21, 2005	Updated briefs are filed	SCE filed updates regarding postage and Mohave issues.
Oct. 11, 2005	Updated hearings begin	
Sept. 30, 2005	SDG&E files motion	Motion files to establish a Memorandum Account for its 2006 SONGS-related revenue requirement
Sept. 2, 2005	Reply briefs due	
Aug 8, 2005	Opening briefs filed and served	Briefs present SCE and the intervenors' analyses and recommendations pursuant to findings during evidentiary hearings.
June 7 – July 19, 2005	Evidentiary hearings	
June 6, 2005	Second Prehearing conference	
May 9-19, 2005	Public Participation Hearings held	
May 6, 2005	Intervenors filed their testimonies	Testimonies presents Intervenors' analysis and recommendations.
April 15, 2005	ORA files testimony	ORA recommends a rate decrease of \$92.4 million for test year 2006 and increases of \$67.4 million in 2007 and \$75.9 million in 2008. In addition, ORA recommends adding an additional year, 2009 to the current GRC cycle.
Mar 21, 2005	ALJ issues Ruling	Ruling grants the motion of Edison to defer its Phase 2 initial showing until May 20, 2005.
Mar 15, 2005	ALJ issues Scoping Ruling	Confirms that this is a ratesetting proceeding and sets the schedule for Phase 1. Final decision for Phase 1 targeted for January 2006.
Dec 21, 2004	SCE filed A.04-12-014	SCE requests a \$1.247 billion increase in revenue requirement above its 2003 base rate revenue requirement of \$2.814 billion adopted in D.04-07-022. This represents an increase of \$569 million above SCE's 2005 present authorized base revenue of \$3.66 billion. SCE states that the actual base revenue requirement is an increase of \$370 million (10.4%) above SCE's 2005 base revenue at present rates. The \$370 million is derived by reducing the proposed base revenue requirement of \$569 by a sales growth revenue of \$59 million and a one-time refund of \$140 million overlection of Postretirement Benefits Other Than Pensions costs. SCE proposed increases of \$159 million in 2007 and \$122 million in 2008.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

B. SCE General Rate Case – Phase II

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-05-023	Bohn	DeBerry		Robles, Ghadessi

What it Does

1. Establishes marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design to determine the distribution and generation components of SCE's rates.
2. Phase II issues include:
 - a) Establishing method by which marginal generation, distribution, and customer costs for each rate group are determined.
 - b) Identifying delivery-related marginal costs at different voltage levels for allocation of design demand costs, by rate group.
 - c) Determining how Equal Percent of Marginal Cost (EPMC) factors are developed for revenue allocation.
 - d) Determining whether to use EPMC or another methodology in allocating distribution and generation costs.
 - e) Determining the total revenue allocated to any one rate group, considering a "cap" or maximum increase
 - f) Determining the appropriate rate design for California Alternative Rates for Energy (CARE) rates.
 - g) Likewise, determining rate design for non-CARE and medical baseline rate tiers.
 - h) For non-residential rate design, establishing lighting, traffic control, large power, agricultural and pumping, and Stand-by rates.
 - i) Establishing rate design for interruptible customers.
 - j) Tariff change proposals.

Next Steps

- ORA testimony due December 16, 2005
- Intervenor Testimony due January 20, 2006
- Rebuttal Testimony due March 10, 2006
- Evidentiary Hearings March 20 – March 30, 2006
- **Decision anticipated at the July 20 or August 24 meeting, for rates effective October 1.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 16, 2006	Proposed Decision issued	The PD incorporates revenue allocation and rate design resulting from increases approved in this GRC, and the ERRA and DWR rate cases. The PD also includes ordering paragraphs to coordinate the results of a decision anticipated in the cost responsibility surcharge Rulemaking 02-01-011, to effect one combined rate change effective October 1, 2006.
Apr 20, 2006	Settlement hearing held.	Reasonableness of settlement established in hearing; expedited schedule of events adopted, with no parties submitting comments or reply comments. Pending decision, rates may be effective July 15, 2006.
Apr 7, 2006	Parties reach written settlement agreement.	All parties active in this proceeding signed written agreement to resolve remaining issues regarding marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design.
Feb 23	Parties reach settlement in principle on revenue allocation	Parties will continue discussions in an effort to reach settlement on rate design.
Feb 3, 2006	SCE issues Comparison of Parties'	After extensive settlement discussions, SCE circulates update of

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	Positions	parties' positions delineating 1) specific proposals, 2) list of parties in agreement, and 3) list of alternate proposals for Marginal Cost, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design issues.
Jan 17, 2006	A coordinated "Comparison of Parties' Positions" due February 3, is allowed to replace Statements of Contested Facts, due January 27.	Due to parties' continuing efforts to reach settlement, ALJ DeBerry rules that a comparison exhibit, showing all parties' positions, is allowed to replace Statements of Contested Facts.
Nov 14, 2005	Settlement Discussions begin	Discussions begin amongst all parties including DRA.
Sep 6, 2005	Updated Exhibits filed	An update of exhibits filed with May 20 Phase II application.
Aug 15, 2005	Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner issued	Specifies Phase II issues and schedule of proceeding dates.
July 20, 2005	Prehearing Conference	ALJ DeBerry heard parties' statements in preparation for issuing scoping memo for proposed proceeding schedule.
May 20, 2005	Phase II GRC application	Exhibits include: Application, Policy Proposals, Marginal Cost and Sales Forecast Proposals, Revenue Allocation Proposals, Rate Design Proposals, Proposed Rate Schedule Changes, and Witness Qualifications.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

C. Sierra Pacific Power Company General Rate Case

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A05-06-018	Bohn	McKenzie	None	Strain, Lafrenz

What it Does

1. Sierra Pacific 2006 GRC requests an overall revenue requirement increase of \$8.1 million, which represents an overall rate increase of 12.7%.
2. Residential rates would increase by 16.6%, small commercial rates by 14%, large commercial rates by 8%, and medium commercial rates decrease by 2%.

Next Steps

- Settlement to be reviewed by the ALJ and considered by the Commission.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Feb. 6, 2006	Joint Motion to accept Settlement filed	The Parties approved and adopted a settlement agreement. Parties agreed to a revenue requirement increase by \$4.098 million which is about half of the revenue requirement requested in Sierra Pacific's application,
Jan 18, 2006	Joint Statement of Material Facts to be Adjudicated at Hearing filed	The Sierra Pacific, DRA, TURN, The A-3 Customer Coalition and Western Manufactured Housing Community Association (hereafter,

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		collectively, the Parties) indicated to the ALJ that settlement discussions were actively ongoing
Oct. 7, 2005	Scoping Ruling issued	Confirm that this is a ratesetting proceedings and establishes the procedural schedule: Parties file a joint statement by 1/18/06; Hearings on 1/23-27/06; Opening briefs due 2/24/06; Reply briefs due 3/10/06; and decision issued 6/06
Oct. 3, 2005	Sierra Pacific files supplement to application	Supplement consists of Sierra Pacific's Depreciation Study.
Sept. 7, 2005	Prehearing conference held	Parties adopted a new procedural schedule.
June 3, 2005	Sierra Pacific filed A.05-06-018	Application requests authority to increase its electric rates and charges for electric service.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

D. PG&E 2007 GRC – Phase I

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A0512002	Bohn	Kenney/Econome	None	Lafrenz/Strain

What it Does

- Phase I sets the revenue requirement (RR) for distribution and generation capital and operating costs for test year 2007, and attrition years 2008, and 2009.
- Phase II sets rate design and cost allocation. This is done by a separate application.
- On January 31, 2006, PG&E filed an updated 2007 test year General Rate Case results of operations calculations for changes in rates effective on January 2006. PG&E is seeking a rate increase of \$532 million (11.3%) over its adopted 2006 RR of \$4.714 billion.
- PG&E requests the following total base RR of \$5.246 billion, to be effective January 1, 2007:**
 - Gas Distribution \$1.099 billion (\$72 million (7.0%) increase over adopted 2006 RR of \$1.027 billion)**
 - Electric Distribution \$3.055 billion (\$407 million (15.4%) increase over adopted 2006 RR of \$2.648 billion)**
 - Electric Generation \$1.092 billion (\$53 million (5.1%) increase over adopted 2006 RR of \$1.039 billion)**
- The following are some of the requests PG&E included in its 2007 GRC:
 - Seeks approval to close the front counters at all 84 of PG&E's local offices.
 - Requests approval to increase its late-payment fee to 1% per month of unpaid energy-related charges, to increase its "restoration for non-payment" fee to \$55, and to increase its "non-sufficient funds" fee to \$11.50.
 - Seeks authorization to convert the one-way balancing account currently in place for costs associated with vegetation management into a two-way balancing account.
 - Request authorization to transfer the balances in the Electric and Gas Credit Facilities Fees Tracking Accounts and the Community Choice Aggregation Implementation Cost Balancing Account to the appropriate electric and/or gas revenue balancing accounts for recovery from customers.
 - Proposes a new performance incentive mechanism (PIM) and a request for pension funding that was not included in its NOI.

Next Steps

- Evidentiary hearings continue until 7/7/06.**
- July 14, 2006 – Comparison Exhibit to be filed.**
- August 4, 2006 – Opening Briefs.**
- August 18, 2006 – Reply Briefs.**

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

<i>Proceeding Overview</i>		
Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 15, 2006	Commission issues D.06-06-014	Decision adopts an uncontested settlement agreement that authorizes PG&E to recover contributions of its employee pension plan during 2006-2009.
May 31 – July 7, 2006	Evidentiary Hearings begin	
May 31, 2006	Ruling issued	Removes from this proceeding all issues regarding PG&E's late payment fee
May 30, 2006	Ruling issued	Grants motion of PG&E and Parties to defer local office issues to January 2007
May 16, 2006	Proposed Decision	Opinion authorizing PG&E to recover contributions to its employee pension plan pursuant to an uncontested settlement agreement by PG&E, DRA, and CCUE. Comments are due June 5, 2006; reply comments - 5 days after comments are filed.
May 16, 2006	Motion filed	Motion of PG&E, CCUE, CFBF, DIRA, DRA, and TURN to defer local office issues to January 2007
Apr. 28, 2006	Intervenor testimony served	
Apr. 14, 2006	DRA testimony served	DRA recommends that the Commission authorize \$4.695 billion in 2007 GRC base rates for PG&E, compared to PG&E's request for \$5.246 billion. DRA recommends increasing PG&E's Electric Distribution RR by \$136 million; increasing PG&E's Electric Generation by \$118 million; and decreasing PG&E's Gas Distribution by \$37 million from its authorized 2006 rates.
Mar. 9, 2006	Ruling issued	Consolidates A.05-12-021, A.05-12-002, and I.06-03-003, for the limited purpose of considering the settlement agreement concerning pension funding issues for 2006-2009
Mar. 8, 2006	Motion filed	Motion of PG&E, DRA, and CCUE to adopt Settlement of Pension Contribution issue
Mar. 7, 2006	PG&E filed Exhibit (PG&E – 16)	PG&E filed errata to its 2007 GRC application. PG&E states that to the extent that these corrections require changes to the input data or formulas in the revenue requirement (RO) model, it will incorporate the necessary changes when it submits the Comparison Exhibit on July 14, 2006
Feb. 21, 2006	Ruling issued	Sets public participation hearings
Feb. 3, 2006	Scoping Ruling issued	Confirms that this is a ratesetting proceeding and establishes the procedural schedule
Jan. 17-19, 23, 2006	Prehearing Conference Statements Filed	Statements filed by PG&E, DRA, and intervenors
Jan. 12, 2006	Reply to Protests filed by PG&E	
Jan. 5, 2006	Protests filed	DRA, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, and South San Joaquin Irrigation District filed protests to the application.
Dec. 21, 2005	Ruling issued	Sets a Prehearing conference on January 23, 2006
Dec. 2, 2005	2007 GRC Application filed	
Oct 3, 2005	Notice of Intent is filed	
Aug. 1, 2005	PG&E files Notice of Intention to file its 2007 General Rate Case application.	PG&E will file its 2007 GRC application for authority, among other things to increase rates and charges for electric and gas service effective on January 1, 2007.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

E. PG&E 2007 General Rate Case – Phase II

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.06-03-005	Chong	Fukutome		Ghadessi, Robles

What it Does

1. Establishes marginal costs, revenue allocation, and rate design to determine the distribution, public purpose program, and generation components of PG&E's rates. This proceeding will also consider proposed changes to the agricultural class definition.
2. Phase II issues include:
 - a) Establishing method by which marginal generation, distribution, and customer costs for each rate group are determined.
 - b) Identifying delivery-related marginal costs at different voltage levels for allocation of design demand costs, by rate group.
 - c) Determining how Equal Percent of Marginal Cost (EPMC) factors are developed for revenue allocation.
 - d) Determining whether to use EPMC or another methodology in allocating distribution and generation costs.
 - e) Determining the total revenue allocated to any one rate group, considering a "cap" or maximum increase
 - f) Determining the appropriate rate design for California Alternative Rates for Energy (CARE) rates.
 - g) Likewise, determining rate design for non-CARE and medical baseline rate tiers.
 - h) For non-residential rate design, establishing lighting, traffic control, large power, agricultural and pumping, and Stand-by rates.
 - i) Establishing rate design for interruptible customers.
 - j) Tariff change proposals

Next Steps

- PG&E update exhibits due June 26, 2006.
- Intervenors serve testimony on agricultural definition issue July 26, 2006.
- Rebuttal testimony on agricultural definition issue due August 9, 2006.
- Evidentiary hearings on agricultural definitions issue August 21 – 23, 2006.
- Opening briefs on agricultural definition issue due September 6, 2006.
- Reply briefs on agricultural definition issue due September 13, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 25, 2006	Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Scoping Memo issued	ALJ Fukutome issued the Scoping Memo to determine scope, schedule, category, need for hearings, and other procedural matters. The memo includes a schedule for determining the agricultural definition issue in addition to addressing marginal cost, revenue allocation, and rate design issues. The agricultural definition issue will be addressed first.
May 3, 2006	Prehearing conference held	ALJ Fukutome heard parties' statements in preparation for issuing scoping memo for proposed proceeding schedule. Proceeding issues include critical peak pricing, and separate track for

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		considering the agricultural definition.
April 14, 2006	Ruling issued setting a prehearing conference	ALJ Fukutome issued a ruling setting a prehearing conference for May 3, with pre-conference statements submitted by April 25. The prehearing conference will address proceeding schedule, category, need for evidentiary hearings, and discovery issues.
March 2, 2006	Phase II GRC application	Exhibits include Application, Executive Summary, Marginal Cost, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

F. PacifiCorp General Rate Case

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.0511022	Brown	Galvin	none	Lafrenz

What it Does

1. Request an \$11.0 million increase
2. Increase rates by an average of 15.6%.
3. Requests authority to implement an energy cost adjustment clause and to implement a Post Test-Year Adjustment Mechanism in this GRC

Note: PacifiCorp through the advice letter process proposed to move customers covered by a 1956 contract that expired on April 17, 2006, to full tariff rates. It was determined that the appropriate process is to include this issue in PacifiCorp's GRC and not through the advice letter process.

Next Steps

- July 26, 2006 – evidentiary hearings begin
- August 21, 2006 – opening briefs and deadline to file a request for final oral arguments
- September 8, 2006 – reply briefs/proposed submission date
- December 14, 2006 – final decision

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 16, 2006	DRA & Interested Party Results of Operations Direct Testimony Served	
Apr. 13, 2006	Commission issues D.06-06-034	Decision adopts a four-year transition plan to bring Klamath Irrigation Project customers that no longer qualify for fixed rates under a 1956 Contract between PacifiCorp and the U.S. Dept. of Interior up to full PA-20 Irrigation tariff rates. This decision authorizes PacifiCorp to establish a Klamath Transition Memorandum Account and to seek recovery of any shortfall in subsequent hearings in this proceeding. In addition, Klamath Water Users Association can seek a separate rate classification and challenge the proposed tariff rates in subsequent hearings in this proceeding.
Apr. 10, 2006	Reply Comments on Proposed Decision	Reply comments filed by PacifiCorp and Klamath Water Users

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	filed March 21, 2006	Assoc.
Apr. 3, 2006	Comments on Proposed Decision filed March 21, 2006	Comments filed by U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Siskiyou County, Klamath Water Users Assoc., PacifiCorp, and DRA.
Mar. 23, 2006	Ruling	Sets a hearing schedule
Mar. 21, 2006	Proposed Decision - Opinion granting interim irrigation rates within the Klamath River Irrigation Project	By this decision, a four-year transition plan is adopted to bring Klamath Irrigation Project customers that no longer qualify for fixed rates under a 1956 Contract between PacifiCorp and the U.S. Dept. of Interior up to full PA-20 Irrigation tariff rates. This decision would authorize PacifiCorp to establish a Klamath Transition Memorandum Account and to seek recovery of any shortfall in subsequent hearings in this proceeding. In addition, Klamath Water Users Association could seek a separate rate classification and challenge the proposed tariff rates in subsequent hearings in this proceeding. Comments due April 3, 2006 and reply comments due April 10, 2006.
Feb. 24, 2006	Rebuttal Testimony to propose agreement on transition rates	DRA opposes the creation of a memorandum account to track the subsidy and allocate the entire subsidy to California ratepayers during the phase-in period.
Feb. 6, 2006	Scoping Ruling	Confirms that this is a ratesetting proceeding. Set the following procedural schedule: March 6 -7, 2006 – evidentiary hearing; March 17, 2006 – prehearing conference; April 13, 2006 – decision on propose agreement on transition rates for Klamath Water Users Association customers; other issues – December 31, 2006. Decision submittal date December 31, 2006.
Jan. 30, 2006	Propose agreement on transition rates for Klamath Water Users Association customers	PacifiCorp, the Klamath Water Users Association (KWUA), and the Department of Interior (DOI) reached an agreement on a transition plan that is designed to move the customers covered by the 1956 contract between PacifiCorp's predecessor, Oregon Power Company, and the DOI from the current rates of \$0.006/kWh to full tariff rates over a four-year period. This plan also includes a creation of a memorandum account to track the subsidy during the phase-in period.
Dec. 22, 2005	Notice filed	Prehearing conference on January 18, 2006
Nov. 29, 2005	Application filed	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

III. OTHER RATEMAKING PROCEEDINGS

A. DWR Bond Charge

Proceeding No.	Commissioners	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.00-11-038	Brown	Allen	Perlstein	Roscow

What it Does

Sets annual bond charge for payment of debt service on DWR bonds.

Next Steps

- DWR is expected to issue its “draft” determination of its 2007 debt service revenue requirement and 2007 bond charge in July 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Dec 1, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-12-010	Adopts the 2006 DWR bond charge of \$.00485 per kWh
Nov 2, 2005	Draft Decision was mailed	Sets the 2006 DWR bond charge at \$.00485 per kWh
Oct 27, 2005	DWR supplemented and updated its August 3 rd Determination	DWR’s bond-related revenue requirement decreased \$43 million, to \$882 million
Oct 17, 2005	Reply briefs filed	No party disputed DWR’s requested bond-related revenue requirement
Oct 11, 2005	Briefs filed	No party disputed DWR’s requested bond-related revenue requirement
Aug 3, 2005	DWR submitted 2006 Determination	DWR sought \$919 million to cover its power-related costs
Apr 7, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-04-025.	The 2005 DWR bond charge is \$.00459 per kWh. This reflects a \$75 million downward revision to DWR’s bond-related revenue requirement.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

B. DWR Revenue Requirement

Proceeding No.	Commissioners	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.00-11-038	Brown	Allen	Perlstein	Roscow, Robles

What it Does

1. Sets annual power-related revenue requirement, allocates it between the three utilities, and establishes utility-specific power charges for DWR power.
2. Trues-up prior year allocations.

Next Steps

- The Commission still must issue a decision regarding the allocation of benefits of Williams gas contract (deferred from recent decision allocating 2006 DWR revenue requirement).
- DWR is expected to issue its “draft” determination of its 2007 debt service revenue requirement and 2007 bond charge in July 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Dec 1, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-12-010	Allocates DWR’s 2006 power cost revenue requirement among IOUs, and sets IOU power charges for 2006. The allocation of benefits of the Williams gas contract was deferred to a yet-to-be-issued Commission decision.
Nov 21, 2005	Draft Decision was mailed	
Oct 27, 2005	DWR supplemented and updated its August 3 rd Determination	DWR’s power-related revenue requirement increased \$418 million, mainly due to higher forecast gas costs, to a total of \$4.546 billion
Oct 17, 2005	Reply briefs filed	
Oct 11, 2005	Briefs filed	Parties dispute allocation of benefits of Williams gas contract, and allocation of certain hedging-related costs and benefits. DWR’s cost estimates are NOT disputed.
Aug 3, 2005	DWR submitted its 2006 Determination of Revenue Requirement	DWR sought \$4.128 billion to cover its power-related costs
Jun 30, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-06-060	This decision grants, in part, a petition to modify D.04-12-014, the Commission’s previous order adopting a “permanent” methodology for the allocation of DWR’s contract costs, replacing it with the methodology in the instant order. The adopted methodology is considered effective as of Jan 1, 2004. Under the adopted method, the “variable” costs of each DWR contract will be directly assigned to the IOU that physically manages that contract. The “fixed” costs of the DWR revenue requirement are allocated to each IOU as follows: PG&E (42.2%), SCE (47.5%) and SDG&E (10.3%).
Apr 7, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-04-025.	Adopts DWR’s revised revenue requirement, a \$166 million reduction. IOUs filed implementing advice letters by April 21 st , with rate changes effective no later than June 1, 2005.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

C. SoCalGas Native Gas

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-01-034	Brown	Wong	None	Effross

What it Does

Consider SoCalGas' (SCG) request for authority to establish a cost/revenue sharing mechanism that would provide SCG with the incentive to drill additional wells at or near its existing storage fields in an effort to locate and produce new gas supplies.

Next Steps

- Potential settlement agreement forthcoming.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 30, 2006	Proposed decision of ALJ Wong	Adopts as the cost and revenue sharing mechanism for SoCalGas' native gas program the Settlement Agreement, the Revised Joint Stipulation, and the rules which were attached to the supplement to the original stipulation. The adoption of this sharing mechanism will provide an incentive for SoCalGas to explore for, and produce native gas that is located at its gas storage fields, while providing an opportunity for SoCalGas' ratepayers and shareholders to equally share in the benefits of such a program.
Jan 27, 2006	Reply Briefs submitted by SoCalGas, SCGS, Exxon Mobil	
Jan 13, 2006	Opening briefs submitted by TURN, CIPA/CNGPA/Indicated Producers/WSPA, DRA, SCGC, SoCalGas, Exxon Mobil	
Nov 2, 2005	Ruling regarding procedural schedule issued by ALJ Wong.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Southern California Generation Coalition, The Utility Reform Network, and the Office of Ratepayer Advocates shall serve their "factual presentation," as described above, on the factual issues in dispute on November 10, 2005. 2. Any party who wants to respond to the November 10, 2005 factual presentation shall serve their responsive prepared testimony on December 7, 2005. 3. Evidentiary hearings in this proceeding shall be held beginning on December 13, 2005, at 10:00 a.m. at the Commission's hearing room, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, and continue through December 15, 2005.
Sept 22, 2005	Response filed by ORA/PELEO/PUC, Southern California Generation Coalition,	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	TURN	
Sept 8, 2005	Comments filed by SoCalGas	
Sept 7, 2005	Motion filed by CIPA, ExxonMobil, Indicated Producers, SoCalGas, & WSPA for Approval of Revised Joint Stipulation.	
Aug 9, 2005	Administrative Law Judge's Ruling	Notices a prehearing conference for September 19, 2005 to discuss whether evidentiary hearings should be held on the July 21, 2004 stipulation and the July 25, 2005 settlement agreement that were filed in this proceeding. This ruling also provides notice that interested parties shall file their opening comments and reply comments on the July 25, 2005 settlement agreement by August 24, 2005, and September 8, 2005, respectively.
June 30, 2005	ALJ Wong issued a ruling granting motion.	Comments requesting evidentiary hearings should be filed by July 18, 2005. Responses to the comments should be filed by July 29, 2005.
Apr. 19, 2005	Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, and Southern California Generation Coalition Motion to Sever and Suspend Consideration of Access Issues	Issues regarding access to the Southern California Gas Company ("SoCalGas") system currently are being considered in a variety of other proceedings. Severing and suspending access issues in the instant proceeding would permit consideration and resolution of all remaining issues without prejudice to considering access issues at a later date in the unlikely event that access issues were not fully resolved in the other proceedings.
Aug 24, 2004	Procedural schedule suspended as active parties discuss possible settlement.	
Jul 21, 2004	Joint motion of SoCalGas, the Indicated Producers, Independent Petroleum Association, and the Western States Petroleum Association for approval of stipulation.	Indicated producers favor 10% share for ratepayers. Other concerns include Terms and Conditions of Access to the SoCalGas Transportation System, Monitoring and Reporting, and the Future of Depleted Native Gas Wells.
Jul 21, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TURN served testimony. • Southern California Generation Coalition served testimony. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TURN proposed straight 35% share for ratepayers. • The Coalition proposed different mechanisms for different circumstances, with ratepayers' shares to range from 25% - 50%.
Jan 26, 2004	SoCalGas filed A.04-01-034.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCG wants to drill for gas on a portfolio of lands that it owns outright, leases, owns mineral rights to, or leases mineral rights to. This is a nontraditional activity for a publicly regulated utility, therefore SCG needs a cost/revenue sharing scheme to be approved and implemented before it can proceed. • SCG proposes to set up a royalty trust-like arrangement whereby its shareholders undertake to provide all the capital and bear all the risk, and ratepayers would be issued a royalty share of revenue generated from new natural gas production.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

D. SoCalGas Native Gas Access

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-08-018	Brown	Wong	None	Effross

What it Does

- In A.04-08-018 SoCalGas requests the Commission establish and approve standardized terms and conditions under which gas produced by California gas producers will be granted access to SoCalGas' natural gas operating system. To that end, SoCalGas wants CPUC to approve a standard access Interconnect and Operational Balancing Agreement (IOBA) tariff.
- SoCalGas filed this application in order to comply with a Joint Stipulation in its A.04-01-034 native gas proceeding. The Joint Stipulation was entered into on July 13, 2004 among SoCalGas and the Joint Parties. (The Joint Parties are comprised of the Indicated Producers, California Independent Petroleum Association and the Western States Petroleum Association.) In the Joint Stipulation, SoCalGas agreed that it would file an application "to address gas quality monitoring protocols and off-shore and on-shore California producer access terms and conditions."
- The other parties are concerned about ensuring nondiscriminatory access to SoCalGas's system.

Next Steps

- Potential settlement agreement forthcoming.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
April 27, 2006	Reply brief filed	CIPA/Indicated Producers/WSPA
April 26, 2006	Reply briefs filed	Exxon Mobil, SoCalGas, SCGC
April 7, 2006	Opening briefs filed	Exxon Mobil, SoCalGas, SCGC, CIPA/Indicated Producers/WSPA, DRA/PELEO/PUC
March 6-10	Evidentiary hearings conducted	
Feb 14, 2006	Ex Parte filed by Indicated Producers.	On February 9, 2006, Evelyn Kahl, counsel to the Indicated Producers (IP), met in San Francisco with Belinda Gatti, advisor to Commissioner Brown. Kahl advised the Commission that the IP and WSPA are very interested in gaining greater certainty in the relationship between SoCalGas and interstate producers. Kahl indicated that IP/WSPA have proposed a standardized agreement. Kahl observed that SoCalGas is in a strong monopoly position in this relationship.
November 2, 2005	Ruling: ALJ Wong revises the procedural schedule.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utility to serve updated testimony: January 10, 2006 • Prepared testimony by all other parties to be served: January 31, 2006 • Prepared rebuttal testimony by all parties to be served.: February 21, 2006 • Evidentiary hearings: March 6-10, 2006. Start time on March 6, 2006 at 10:00 a.m.
October 31, 2005	Comments on ALJ Ruling dated 10/25/05 filed by CIPA, ExxonMobil, Indicated Producers, CNGPA, WSPA	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

October 31, 2005	Comments on revised procedural schedule filed by ORA/PELEO/PUC, SCGC	
October 25, 2005	ALJ Wong issued ruling.	Revises the evidentiary hearing dates. Sets evidentiary hearing for February 21-24, 2006. Comments on the procedural schedule/Responses to the ruling are due by October 31, 2005.
August 30, 2005	Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge	Evidentiary hearings to be held daily Dec. 8-14, 2005. The following issues will be addressed: What should be the terms and conditions of access to SoCalGas' transmission system for California natural gas producers? Should the Commission approve the standard access agreement that SoCalGas has proposed in its application? Should all of the existing California access agreements with SoCalGas be replaced with a standard access agreement as they expire or are terminated under their existing terms? Should the standard access agreement replace ExxonMobil's existing agreement with SoCalGas regarding supplies of gas from Pacific Offshore Pipeline Company (POPCO) entering SoCalGasGas' system?
August 17, 2005	Prehearing conference is held.	
June 27, 2005	Ruling noticing prehearing conference	ALJ Wong issues ruling noticing prehearing conference for August 17, 2005, at 10:00 a.m. ALJ Wong states that it will be more efficient to wait until the prehearing conference is held before deciding whether to grant SocCalGas's motion.
June 3, 2005	Status report issued by SoCalGas and joint parties.	The parties reported that they were still engaged in discussions and recommended that a prehearing conference be scheduled in August 2005.
May 25, 2005	ExxonMobil and SoCalGas respond, asking the Commission to reject SCGC's motion.	
May 10, 2005	Southern California Generation Coalition filed a Motion to Suspend Consideration of SoCalGas's application.	SCGC's reasoning was that the issues covered by A.04-08-018 are currently under consideration in both R.04-01-025 (Gas OIR) and SoCalGas Advice Letter 3413-A.
December 9, 2004	Status report issued by SoCalGas and joint parties.	
October 29, 2004	Status report issued by SoCalGas and joint parties.	
September 30, 2005	SoCalGas files response to protests.	SoCalGas' response also stated that SoCalGas and the joint parties had entered into discussions concerning the issues in this proceeding.
September 20, 2004	Protests filed by by ExxonMobil Gas & Power Marketing Company (ExxonMobil), Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), and the Southern California Generation Coalition (SCGC). Joint protest filed by the Indicated Producers, California Independent Petroleum Association, and Western States Petroleum Association (joint parties).	The protest of the joint parties stated that SoCalGas and the joint parties had entered into discussions concerning the issues in this proceeding.
August 16, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SoCalGas files application 	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

E. SoCalGas/SDG&E System Integration-Firm Access Rights

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-12-004	Brown	Wong	None	Alfton

What it Does

This proceeding addresses SoCalGas and SDG&E's application regarding System Integration-Firm Access Rights-Off-System Sales (SI-FAR-OFF). The Commission will decide on the two utilities' proposal to establish an integrated transmission system and firm access rights, and for off-system deliveries.

Next Steps

- ALJ to Rule on SDG&E and SoCalGas Motion of June 13, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 21, 2006	Joint Response of Coral Energy Resources, Division of Ratepayer Advocates, Kern River Gas Transmission Company, Questar Southern Trails Pipeline, SES Terminal, LLC, California Manufacturers and Technology Association, Department of General Services, BHP Billiton LNG International, Inc. Exxon Mobil Corporation, Woodside Natural Gas, Inc., Southern California Generation Coalition, The Utility Reform Network, Clearwater Port LLC, and Indicated Producers to the June 13, 2006 Motion of SDG&E and SoCalGas	Parties do not necessarily object to SoCalGas and SDG&E submitting revised testimony to reflect changes in their proposals that result from the SA. Parties allege that many aspects of the SA have not been reflected in the revised testimony, however. Parties request an extension of the procedural schedule to enable them to evaluate the impact of the SA on the issues and proposals in Phase 11. Parties propose a schedule at least 6 weeks later than the current schedule.
June 13, 2006	SDG&E and SoCalGas filed a Motion for leave to submit revised direct testimony in Phase 2 and to shorten time in which to respond.	SDG&E, SoCalGas and Southern California Edison Company entered into a Settlement Agreement (SA), provisions of which will affect issues in this and other Commission proceedings. SDG&E and SoCalGas request authorization to file revised testimony in Phase 2 based on provisions of the SA, but not to change the current Phase 2 schedule.
April 13, 2006	D. 06-04-033 issued in Phase 1 approving system integration	SDG&E and SoCalGas are permitted to combine the transmission costs of the two utilities, and to develop integrated transmission rates for the various customer classes of both utilities using the cost allocation methodology they proposed. These rates shall go into effect on the first day of the month in which regasified liquefied natural gas (LNG) is expected to flow through Otay Mesa.
Nov 4, 2005	Reply briefs filed.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Oct 21, 2005	Opening briefs filed.	
Sept 12-15, 2005	Evidentiary hearings held.	
Sept 1, 2005	PHC held	Witness Order and cross examination schedule for evidentiary hearings discussed.
Aug 26, 2005	Rebuttal Testimony of all parties issued	
July 29, 2005	Intervenor Testimony Issued	
June 27, 2005	SoCalGas and SDG&E issued Supplemental Testimony on Phase 1.	
May 24, 2005	Assigned Commissioner's and ALJ's Scoping Memo and Ruling Issued	Proceeding is bifurcated into Phase 1 – System Integration, and Phase 2 – Firm Access Rights and Off-System Issues. Phase 1 issues were delineated.
Apr 29, 2005	PHC held.	Issues, bifurcation and schedule were discussed.
Jan 20, 2005	Interested Parties filed comments, protests and responses to the application.	
Dec 2, 2004	SoCalGas and SDG&E filed A.04-12-004.	The application requests authority to integrate the transmission component of their gas transportation rates; establish a system of firm access rights (“FAR”) into their transmission system, and provide off-system gas transportation services.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

F. Agricultural Internal Combustion Equipment (ICE) – Incentives for Conversion to Electric Service

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-11-007 A.04-11-008	Brown	McKenzie		Auriemma

What it Does

This proceeding considered applications by Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) and Southern California Edison (SCE) seeking authority to offer reduced rates and additional line extension allowances to agricultural customers that convert engines used for agricultural pumping from diesel fuel to electricity. The proposed incentives for these engine conversions would potentially achieve reductions in various air pollutants in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys.

Next Steps

- This proceeding remains open to consider requests for awards of intervenor compensation.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Aug 1, 2005	PG&E's and SCE's AG-ICE tariffs	
June 27, 2005	PG&E filed Advice Letter (AL) 2679-E, and SCE filed AL 1897-E.	
June 16, 2005	CPUC issued D.05-06-016.	Approves Settlement Agreement with one modification. At the request of the parties to the Joint Settlement, the effective date of the program was deferred until August 1, 2005 to allow time for the utilities to implement the program.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

May 25, 2005	ALJ issued proposed decision.	Approves all-party settlement agreement.
April 29, 2005	Parties filed Brief	Sets forth the justification for an 851 exemption In connection with the transfer of the nitrous oxide credits that would be received as a result of replacing the diesel engines
April 7, 2005	Hearing held on the Settlement Agreement	
March 30, 2005	settlement agreement and joint motion for its approval filed	<p>Main features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AG-ICE initial average rate set at approximately 7.5 cents per kWh, to increase by 1.5 percent annually over the ten-year program term • Rates structured on a time-of-use basis to discourage peak period usage • Additional line extension “adder” for ICE customers limited by a maximum based on the engine’s kilowatt (kW) rating • Total program capital investment limited to \$27.5 million for PG&E and \$9.17 million for SCE over two-year enrollment period • Utility reimbursed by ICE customers departing utility system early • Limit of 100 program participants within the boundaries of the South San Joaquin Irrigation District in southern San Joaquin County • Acquired CO2 emission reductions held for the benefit of ratepayers
Mar 11, 2005	Intervenor testimony was filed.	The California Farm Bureau Federation, ORA, and TURN filed testimony. The Agricultural Energy Consumers Association filed its testimony earlier, on February 24.
Mar 4, 2005	Applicants served updated testimony on reliability and other issues.	
Mar 3, 2005	Scoping Memo and Ruling issued.	Consolidated the two applications, confirmed the proceeding category as ratesetting, established the issues and procedural schedule, and designated the principal hearing officer.
Feb 8, 2005	The applicants and interested parties unanimously agree and stipulate to reduce comment period on the Proposed Decision.	From 20 days to 13 days with the reply period reduced from 5 days to 4 days.
Jan 28, 2005	The Energy Division held a Workshop, and technical experts met in a follow-up session on February 1, 2005.	Explored the issues raised in protests, including: (1) the extent to which reliability may be impaired as a result of increasing load on utility systems in the summer of 2005, and possible means of mitigating those concerns; (2) whether the utilities’ proposed incentives contribute to margin, or instead negatively impact other ratepayers; and (3) whether the increased capital costs and operation and maintenance costs associated with the proposals for additional line extension incentives will, in the future, have to be borne by other ratepayers.
Nov 9, 2004	PG&E filed A.04-11-007, and SCE filed A.04-11-008.	<p>Both applications offer incentives to customers that convert engines used for agricultural pumping from diesel fuel to electricity including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 20% reduction compared with the current average rate of the otherwise applicable tariff for their engine use, a reduction that would remain in effect for ten years (subject to escalation of the total average rate at 1.5% per year); • Ratcheted demand charges would be eliminated from the rate applicable to the converted engines; and • Additional line extension allowances tied to reductions in various air pollutants that could be expected from the proposed engine conversions in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

G. Southwest Gas GCIM

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-11-009	Brown	Wong	None	Effross

What it Does

Pursuant to D.04-03-034, Southwest's last general rate proceeding, Southwest wishes to establish a Gas Cost Incentive Mechanism as a means to reduce gas costs for ratepayers, and as an incentive to shareholders to benefit from improved gas purchase procedures.

Next Steps

Ruling has been issued.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 26, 2005	ALJ DeBerry Rules	Application is granted. Since this application is uncontested, public hearings are not necessary, and comment period is waived.
December 15, 2004	ORA files response.	ORA supports Southwest's proposal as submitted. ORA further states there are no disputed issues of fact, and that it believes hearings are not necessary.
November 12, 2004	Southwest files Application (A.) 04-11-009 (Application) requesting Commission approval of a proposed GCIM, and also expedited <i>ex parte</i> action on the Application.	Proposed GCIM will set a volume-weighted performance benchmark to determine the savings or costs resulting from differences between the benchmark and Southwest's actual annual gas costs. Southwest explains that its GCIM proposal is a result of extensive collaboration with the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) during the past several months, and that its GCIM proposal is patterned after existing gas cost incentive mechanisms currently authorized for other California utilities.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

H. PG&E Incremental Core Storage

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-03-001	Grueneich	Wong		Cadenasso

What it Does

1. Determines how much incremental (amount above current levels) gas storage the core requires.
2. Establishes process by which independent gas storage providers may compete for incremental gas storage needs.
3. Sets cost recovery methods for incremental gas storage acquired by PG&E.

Next Steps

- **Comments on Proposed Decision due July 10, 2006.**
- **Reply comments on PD due July 17, 2006.**
- **Final decision expected at July 20 Commission meeting.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jun 20, 2006	Proposed Decision mailed.	PD adopts 1-in-10 day winter reliability standard for PG&E's core customers. Authorizes PG&E to issue an RFO for incremental storage to meet the reliability standard if acceptable credit standards can be reached with the independent storage providers (ISP). If incremental storage is not obtained, PG&E is to acquire firm pipeline capacity to meet the winter reliability standard.
Mar 6, 2006	Reply briefs filed.	
Feb 17, 2006	Opening briefs filed.	TURN argues that additional core storage is not needed for reliability and that if a 1-in-10 peak day standard is adopted PG&E's noncore customers would unfairly benefit by lower gas spot prices. Lodi Gas Storage and Wild Goose allege PG&E's proposed credit standards are anti-competitive. PG&E argues that its credit standards protect core customers from the potential unavailability of gas injected into storage. DRA supports a 1-in-10 standard because core load is growing and the core should pay for any additional storage due to the benefits core customers receive.
Jan 25, 2006	Partial settlement agreement filed.	Outlines RFO process for acquiring additional storage. All parties except TURN agree that 1-in-10 peak day standard should be used to determine amount of incremental core storage to obtain and that the costs be recovered from bundled core customers.
Jan 17-18, 2006	Evidentiary hearings held.	
Sept 13, 2005	Intervenor testimony filed by ORA, TURN, Lodi Gas Storage (LGS), Wild Goose Gas Storage (WGS), and SPURR.	ORA recommends that PG&E make the list of storage products that it would make bids on less restrictive, and to be allowed to enter gas storage open seasons. TURN opposes PG&E's proposal as it unfairly benefits non-core customers. LGS prefers bilateral negotiations rather than an RFO and notes several PG&E credit policy issues. WGS recommends modifications to the list of products PG&E can bid for. SPURR supports PG&E's proposals regarding the treatment of CTAs.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Aug 12, 2005	PG&E files supplemental testimony.	Provided estimates of rate impacts for incremental storage; proposes that CPIM changes would be negotiated with ORA and filed by advice letter; and submitted proposed RFO procedures and evaluation methodology.
June 7, 2005	ALJ Scoping Memo issued.	Major issues to be considered in proceeding are: 1) Should 1-in-10 peak day standard be adopted as core reliability planning standard. 2) What storage services can independent storage providers be allowed to compete for. 3) What processes should be adopted for the solicitation of storage proposals and how will they be evaluated.
June 2, 2005	Prehearing conference held.	
Apr 14, 2005	Reply by PG&E to protests.	PG&E says that: 1) any benefits the noncore gain from its proposal is not a subsidy from the core; 2) will work with gas storage providers on the RFO process; 3) reducing the amounts of firm interstate pipeline holdings in lieu of storage represents a reversal of Commission policy, and; 4) it will maintain its current credit standards.
Apr 4, 2005	Comments filed by ORA.	ORA recommends that the Commission adopt an agreement it reached with PG&E addressing approval procedures and the acquisition of gas storage above the 1 in 10 year standard.
Apr 4, 2005	Protests filed by Lodi Gas Storage, Wild Goose and TURN.	TURN argues that PG&E's proposal results in the core maintaining system reliability to the noncore's advantage and that the Commission set standards for noncore to hold firm pipeline capacity. Wild Goose raises technical issues about the RFO process. Lodi advocates a broader definition of "incremental" gas storage that would lessen the need for firm interstate pipeline capacity and questions PG&E's credit policy.
Mar 2, 2005	Application filed.	Filed in compliance with directive issued in R.04-01-025. PG&E proposes: 1) to add incremental storage to meet a 1-day-in-10-year peak day standard; 2) use gas storage for reliability and hedging; 3) use pre-approval and expedited advice letter procedures to acquire gas storage, and; 4) solicit gas storage proposals from independent gas storage providers through an RFO.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

I. PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SCG Applications for Approval of 2006-2008 Energy Efficiency Programs

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-06-004, A.05-06-011, A.05-06-015, and A.05-06-016	Kennedy	Gottstein	Lee	Tapawan-Conway

What it Does

This consolidated proceeding will determine whether the funding levels and overall portfolio plans submitted by the utilities are reasonable and consistent with the energy efficiency policy rules adopted in D.05-04-051 in R.01-08-028.

Next Steps

- The Commission will act on the utilities' compliance filings on their 2006-2008 energy efficiency final program portfolios.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 1, 2006	Energy Division issued a disposition on PG&E's advice letter compliance filing.	The disposition confirms the effective date of May 17, 2006 for PG&E's advice letter compliance filing.
April 28, 2006	Energy Division issued dispositions on SDG&E's and SCG's advice letter compliance filings.	The dispositions confirm the effective date of March 3, 2006 for SDG&E's and SCG's advice letter compliance filings.
April 18, 2006	Energy Division issued a disposition on SCE's advice letter compliance filing.	The disposition confirms effective date of February 5, 2006 for SCE's advice letter compliance filing.
Feb 17, 2006	PG&E filed an advice letter compliance filing for its 2006-2008 energy efficiency programs as required by D.05-01-055. PG&E also filed a Motion to Bifurcate its compliance filing.	In this compliance filing, PG&E only addressed the third-party program component of its portfolio, including additional details on its mass market programs. PG&E anticipates to file the local government partnership programs in April 2006.
Feb 1, 2006	SDG&E and SCG filed advice letter compliance filings for their 2006-2008 energy efficiency programs as required by D.05-01-055.	
Jan 6, 2006	SCE filed an advice letter compliance filing for its 2006-2008 energy efficiency programs as required by D.05-01-055.	
November 18, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-11-011	The decision approves EM&V funding for the 2006-2008 program cycle and addresses related issues.
October 19, 2005	ALJ issued draft decision on EM&V funding for 2006-2008 program cycle	
September 22, 2005	Commission adopted D.05-09-043	The decision approves funding levels for the utilities energy efficiency portfolio plans for 2006-2008-Phase 1 issues
September 7, 2005	Joint Staff and utilities submitted proposed EM&V plans and budgets for	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	2006-2008 program cycle	
August 30, 2005	The ALJ issued a ruling	The ruling solicits comments on Joint Staff and utilities' proposed EM&V plans and budgets for 2006-2008 program cycle to be posted on September 7, 2005
August 17, 2005	The ALJ issued draft decision (DD) on the utilities' program plans and budgets for 2006-2008 program cycle	Comments on the DD are due on September 6, 2005 and reply comments due on September 12, 2005
July 15, 2005	Utilities filed CMS, PG&E filed additional program details	
July 6-8, 12-13, 2005	CMS meetings held	Utilities, the PRG members and other intervenors discussed and attempted to resolve issues raised in the PRG assessments, the TMW report, and C&S filings; CMS will present status of these issues
July 8, 2005	Energy Division and CEC (Joint Staff) submits comments on C&S savings estimates to the parties	
July 1, 2005	Utilities submitted supplemental filing	Regarding methodology for estimating savings from Codes and Standards (C&S) program
June 30, 2005	Parties filed opening comments on the utilities' applications	
June 30, 2005	Assigned Commissioner issued ruling and scoping memo	Phase I decision will focus on the utility portfolio/program plans and funding levels, Phase II decision will address EM&V plans and funding. Compliance phase will begin after competitive solicitations and could be via Commission decision or resolution.
June 22, 2005	ALJ held Pre-Hearing Conference	The ALJ directed the utilities, the PRGs, and those parties that filed opening comments to develop a Case Management Statement (CMS), and set forth timeline for various filings.
June 8, 2005	PG&E filed supplemental filing	Submits PG&E's PRG assessment with attached consultant (TecMarket Works) report on the utilities' program plans as of mid-May.
June 1, 2005	Utilities submitted applications	Attached to SCE/SCG and SDG&E's applications are their respective Peer Review Group's (PRG) assessments.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

J. Contra Costa 8 Generation – PG&E

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-06-029	Peevey	Brown		Fulcher

What it Does

PG&E asks for approval of an agreement it has entered into with Mirant for the acquisition of 530 MW of generation.

Next Steps

PD has been issued. Comments need to be reviewed and incorporated into PD as appropriate.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 9, 2006	ALJ Brown issued a PD.	PD adopts Joint Settlement Agreement of parties.
April 20, 2006	Reply briefs filed by parties.	
Mar 30, 2006	Opening briefs filed by parties.	
Dec 8, 2005	Motion filed by PG&E.	To adopt settlement agreement.
Dec 5, 2005	Settlement meeting with ORA.	
Oct 3, 2005	Response filed by Merced Irrigation District, and Modesto Irrigation District.	Response to Joint Motion filed on September 23, 2005 (q.v.).
Sep 23, 2005	Joint Motion filed by California Unions for Reliable Energy, Coalition of California Utility Employees, ORA, PG&E, TURN.	To clarify the scoping memo and adopt a stipulation.
Aug 16, 2005	Scoping Ruling issued by assigned Commissioner President Peevey.	
June 17, 2005	Application was filed by PG&E.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

K. SoCalGas Long-Term Gas Transportation Agreement Application

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-10-010	Brown	Barnett		Effross

What it Does

SoCalGas applies for approval of a long-term gas transportation agreement entered into by Guardian Industries Corp, and SoCalGas on 8/12/05. Guardian produces glass in Kingsburg, CA. It has historically used oil as fuel, and is considering switching to gas. Guardian has also stated that it will relocate its facility, and the attendant jobs, out of state, unless it receives favorable rate treatment to lower its costs of operation. SoCalGas and Guardian propose an agreement whereby SoCalGas will deliver gas on a firm basis, subject to an escalating ceiling and floor rate, and offer a five year discount to the Public Purpose Program Surcharge. This would effectively provide a discount to Guardian.

Next Steps

- Hearings

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
April 6, 2006	Ex parte filed by SDG&E/SoCalGas	On April 5, Marzia Zafar, CPUC Relations Manager for Southern California Gas Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company, had a telephone conversation with Belinda Gatti, advisor to Cmmr. Brown, and also sent an email (attached to the notice) to Theresa Cho, advisor to Cmmr. Grueneich. Copies of the email were also sent to Belinda Gatti, advisor to Cmmr. Brown, Robert Lane, advisor to Cmmr. Bohn, and Richard Myers of the Energy Division. During her conversation with Belinda Gatti, Zafar stated that the Division of Ratepayer Advocates' assertion that the Commission has never discounted the Public Purpose Program surcharge is incorrect. Zafar urged the Commission to adopt ALJ Barnett's proposed decision as drafted.
Mar. 30, 2006	Ex parte filed by DRA/RASHID/PUC	On March 27, 2006, Dana Appling, Director of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), met with Theresa Cho, advisor to Cmmr. Grueneich, in San Francisco. Also present were Harvey Y. Morris, Assistant General Counsel, and Rashid A. Rashid, Attorney for DRA. Copies of documents filed in this proceeding were used. DRA requested that the Commission propose an alternate decision to ALJ Barnett's draft decision (DD). DRA explained that the Commission does not have legal authority to discount the public purpose program (PPP) surcharge as the DD proposes. DRA warned that if the Commission discounts Guardian's PPP surcharge based on its threat to leave the state, it would set precedent for the Commission to provide discounts to other industrial gas consumers that threaten to leave the state, which would lead to substantial decreases in PPP funding.
Mar. 20, 2006	Reply comments filed	SoCalGas
Mar. 14, 2006	Comments filed	SoCalGas, TURN, DRA/RASHID/PUC

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Feb. 22, 2006	ALJ Barnett releases Draft Decision	<p>IT IS ORDERED that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The long-term gas transportation agreement between Southern California Gas Company and Guardian Industries Corp. as proposed is reasonable and is approved. 2. No hearings were necessary for this proceeding. 3. Application A.05-10-010 is closed.
Jan 2, 2006	Reply briefs filed by SoCalGas, TURN, DRA	
Dec 13, 2005	Opening briefs filed by SoCalGas, TURN, ORA	
Nov 15, 2005	SoCalGas files <i>ex parte</i>	On October 10, 2005, Marzia Zafar, CPUC Regulatory Relations Manager for Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), met with Belinda Gatti, advisor to Cmmr. Brown, in San Francisco. Also present were Peter Hanson, advisor to Cmmr. Brown, Lad Lorenz, Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for SoCalGas, and Marty Bergman and Ray Siada of Guardian Glass. Parties urged the Commission to expedite this proceeding in order for Guardian Glass to make its decision whether to stay in California or to relocate to another state. Guardian Glass representatives explained that although the SoCalGas transportation rate is competitive with other States, the surcharge levied on that rate is not competitive. Zafar explained that the legislature enacted the Public Purpose Program surcharge and left the allocation of it to the Commission, and that a discount is appropriate in order to keep this customer and its three hundred jobs in California.
Oct 31, 2005	Prehearing Conference at CPUC	
Oct 28, 2005	TURN files protest.	Questions the engineering of a discount through reducing Public Purpose Program Surcharge.
Oct 27, 2005	ORA files protest.	Questions the engineering of a discount through reducing Public Purpose Program Surcharge.
Oct 7, 2005	SoCalGas files motion for Authority to Submit and Maintain Confidential Information under Seal and for Protective Order	Confidential Materials Attached and Filed Under Seal, namely, the Unredacted Attachment 1 and the Unredacted Testimonies of witnesses Joe Velasquez and Allison F. Smith to the Application filed concurrently herewith.
Oct 7, 2005	SoCalGas files motion for Order Shortening Time to Respond to Application.	
Oct 7, 2005	SoCalGas files application.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

L. SCE and SDG&E Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding - NDCTP

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-11-008	Brown	Long		Premo
What it Does				
<p>The Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding sets contribution levels for the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Funds and addresses reasonableness for decommissioning activities and expenses between 2002 and 2005. SCE requests an annual revenue requirement of \$58.5 million and SDG&E requests an annual revenue requirement of \$12.22 million, commencing January 1, 2007.</p>				
Next Steps				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening Briefs scheduled for June 23, 2006. Concurrent Reply Briefs and projected submission date is July 14, 2006. 				
Date	Actions Taken	Comments		
July 14, 2006	Concurrent Reply Briefs Due			
June 23, 2006	Opening Briefs Due			
May 25, 2006	Settlement Submitted	Settlement agreement submitted by SCE, SDG&E, DRA, FEA, and TURN.		
May 24-25, 2006	Hearings Held			
Apr 28, 2006	Rebuttal Filed			
Apr 7, 2006	Intervenor Testimony Filed			
Mar 28, 2006	Petition to Intervene filed.	Petition filed by Utility Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO.		
Feb 14, 2006	PG&E files Motion to Reconsider Ruling on Motion to Compel			
Feb 10, 2006	SCE files Motion to Vacate and Reconsider Ruling on Motion to Compel			
Feb 10, 2006	SCE files Response to DRA Motion to Compel			
Feb 9, 2006	Ruling on Motion to Compel issued	SCE is ordered to provide DRA with the requested tax forms. SCE did not respond to the motion within 10 days		
Jan 27, 2006	DRA files Motion to Compel	DRA requests the ability to copy certain tax forms.		
Jan 18, 2006	Scoping Memo issued.	SCE/SDG&E's application is combined with PG&E's application A.05-11-009. .		
Jan 5, 2006	Pre Hearing Conference held.			
Dec 16, 2005	DRA files protest to application.	Identified concerns include the need for increased decommissioning funding for SONGs and Palo Verde, trust fund balance estimates and assumptions, escalation rates and contingency factors, and tax treatment.		
Nov 10, 2005	SCE and SDG&E submit a Joint Application and Testimony for their 2005 NDCTP			

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

M. PG&E Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding - NDCTP

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-11-009	Brown	Long		Premo
What it Does				
<p>The Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding sets contribution levels for the Nuclear Decommissioning Trust Funds and addresses reasonableness for decommissioning activities and expenses between 2002 and 2005. PG&E requests annual revenue requirements of \$9.491 million and \$0 for Diablo Units 1 and 2 Trusts, respectively, and \$14.621 million for Humboldt Unit 3 Trust, for 2007-2009.</p>				
Next Steps				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Briefs scheduled for June 23, 2006. • Concurrent Reply Briefs and projected submission date is July 14, 2006. 				
Date	Actions Taken	Comments		
July 14, 2006	Concurrent Reply Briefs Due			
June 23, 2006	Opening Briefs Due			
May 25, 2006	Settlement Submitted	Settlement submitted by PG&E, DRA, TURN, and, in part, Scott Fielder.		
May 24-25, 2006	Hearings Held			
Apr 28, 2006	Rebuttal testimony filed.			
Apr 7, 2006	Intervenor testimony filed			
Jan 31, 2006	PG&E files required Supplemental Testimony.			
Jan 18, 2006	Scoping Memo issued.	PG&E's application is combined with the SCE/SDG&E application A.05-11-008. PG&E is directed to file supplemental testimony concerning an Independent Board of Consultants to oversee Humboldt 3 decommissioning as ordered in D.00-02-046.		
Jan 5, 2006	Pre Hearing Conference held.			
Dec 16, 2005	DRA files protest to application.	Identified issues include protection of the funds, the need for increasing funds for Diablo, trust fund estimates, escalation rates and contingency factors, waste burial assumptions, decommissioning timing of Humboldt and tax treatments.		
Nov 10, 2005	PG&E submits Application and Testimony for its 2005 NDCTP.			

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

N. SCE for Authority to Add City of Anaheim's Share of SONGS Units 2 & 3 to SCE's Rates and Associated Relief

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.06-03-020	Brown	O'Donnell		Premo
What it Does				
SCE requests approval of an early ownership transfer of Anaheim's share of SONGS 2 & 3 to SCE for the years 2007 to 2010. SCE requests an annual revenue requirement increase of \$95.7 million to provide rate recovery of operating costs with a generation increase of 68 MW. SCE procurement costs will decrease.				
Next Steps				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prehearing Conference to be set. 				
Date	Actions Taken	Comments		
June 12, 2006	SCE submits agreement to reduce NDCTP request			
June 9, 2006	DRA withdraws protest.			
May 8, 2006	Ruling	Requires DRA to submit response to necessity for hearings.		
April 20, 2006	City of Anaheim Response Filed			
April 13, 2006	DRA files protest to application.	Identified issues include appropriate valuation of the proposed acquisition, procurement cost savings and the need to coordinate this with other proceedings.		
March 14, 2006	SCE submits Application, Testimony, and Motion for Protective Order.			

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

O. SDG&E for Authorization to Participate in the SONGS 2 & 3 Steam Generator Replacement Project (SGRP) and to retain its 20% share of SONGS 2 & 3.

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.06-03-020	Brown	O'Donnell		Premo
What it Does				
SDG&E requests authorization to participate in the SONGS 2 & 3 SGRP and to establish ratemaking for cost recovery. SDG&E requests an estimated \$142 million in 2004\$ for the SGRP and removal and disposal of the original steam generators. The SGRP installation is expected in 2010-2011.				

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Next Steps

- Parties' Testimony due July 25, 2006.
- Hearings set for August 21-24, 2006
- Opening Briefs to be filed September 27, 2006.
- Reply Briefs to be filed October 11, 2006.
- Proposed decision to be filed January 9, 2007.

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 13, 2006	Scoping Ruling and Memo Issued	
June 8, 2006	Pre-Hearing Conference Held	
April 14, 2006	SCE submits Application, Testimony, and Motion for Protective Order.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

P. Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-05-001 A.05-05-003 A.05-05-004 A.05-05-005	Peevey	Gottstein		Tapawan-Conway (EE) Sarvate (LIEE) Kaneshiro (DR)

What it Does

In D.05-10-041, the Commission adopted a settlement agreement to close out all previous AEAP's. This is the first post-settlement Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding to be opened. In this proceeding, PG&E, SDG&E, SCG, and SCE submit annual reports on their 2004 EE and LIEE programs, as well as required Measurement and Verification studies, and incremental cost for Demand Response Programs.

Next Steps

- The ALJ typically holds a PHC to consolidate the applications and scope out the proceeding.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 26, 2005	Resolution ALJ 176-3153	Sets the above referenced applications as ratesetting and determines there is no need for hearing.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

III. MAJOR RULEMAKING PROCEEDINGS

A. Long-Term Procurement Plan (LTPP) Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.06-02-003	Peevey	Brown	Levine	Sterkel, Oh, Auriemma

What it Does

1. Reviews the need for additional policies to support new generation and long-term contracts in California, including consideration of transitional and/or permanent mechanisms (e.g., cost allocation and benefit sharing, or some other alternative) which can ensure construction of and investment in new generation in a timely fashion.
2. Serves as the forum for the Commission's biennial procurement review process, established pursuant to AB57, D.04-01-050 and D.04-12-048, which requires that IOUs submit long-term procurement plans that serve as the basis for utility procurement and comprehensively integrate all Commission decisions from all procurement related proceedings.
3. Functions as the umbrella rulemaking to all other procurement related proceedings.

Next Steps

- **Draft Decision on Commission agenda for July 2006.**
- Scoping memo on Phase 2 expected **Summer 2006.**
- LTPP plans expected to be filed **late Summer 2006**, with significant pre-filing work finished before filings.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 20, 2006	Draft Decision Issued	Draft Decision issued on Phase 1 issues related to cost allocation for new generation contracts. On agenda for 7/20/06 meeting.
April 21, 2006	Reply Comments filed.	
April 10, 2006	Comments filed on policies to support new generation.	
Mar 14, 2006	Workshop held.	
Mar 7, 2006	Proposals due.	Parties to submit proposals on need for additional policies to support new generation.
Feb 23, 2006	ACR Issued	Ruling issued setting PHC, providing additional details on OIR's request for proposals on 3/2/06.
Feb 16, 2006	OIR Opened.	R.06-02-013 adopted by Commission.
Dec 14, 2005	Workshop	Energy Division hosted a workshop to discuss the upcoming, new long-term procurement proceeding.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

B. Resource Adequacy (RA) Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.05-12-013	Peevey	Wetzell	Bone, Dorman	Sterkel, Brooks

What it Does

Phase 1 Issues

1. Consideration of a Local Capacity Requirement (LCR), including the CAISO's LCR study.
2. Establishment of a Local Resource Adequacy Requirement (Local RAR) program, in addition to the System RAR requirement established pursuant to D.05-10-042.
3. Review of system RAR program implementation issues, compliance issues, tradeable capacity products, and other issues deferred by D. 05-10-042.

Phase 2 Issues

1. Consideration of Multi-year RAR requirements, Capacity Markets, RAR program requirements for small and multi-jurisdictional utilities.

Next Steps

- Draft decisions issued on May 30, 2006 and June 20, 2006.
- Final decision by June, 2006 on Phase 1A, and final decision by July 2006 on Phase 1B.
- Scoping memo for Phase 2 expected July, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 20, 2006	Draft Decision Issued on Phase 1B	Draft decision issued on tradable capacity product issues and other outstanding implementation issues related to resource adequacy. On agenda for 7/20/06 meeting.
May 30, 2006	Draft Decision Issued on Phase 1A	Draft decision issued on Phase related to adopting a local resource adequacy program for 2007. On agenda for 6/29/06 meeting.
May 3, 2006	Reply comments on LCR filed	
Apr 28, 2006	Comments on LCR Report and Reply comments on RA issues filed	
Apr 28, 2006	CAISO issued Errata to LCR Report	
Apr 26, 2006	CAISO meeting on LCR	
Apr 21, 2006	CAISO issued LCR report	
Apr 21, 2006	Comments on RA issues and Staff Report filed	
Apr 10, 2006	Energy Division Report issued	Energy division Report on RA issues
Mar 27, 2006	Workshop on Tradable Capacity Product	Energy division held a workshop to discuss regulatory barriers to a tradable capacity product.
Mar 15, 2006	Workshop on Local RAR and LCR	Workshop on procedural issues and new RA information
Mar 13, 2006	Post-Workshop Comments filed.	
Mar 1, 2006	Scoping Memo Issued.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Feb 16, 2006	First RAR Filings.	All load-serving entities filed their first system RAR compliance filings via advice letter.
Feb 7-8, 2006	Workshop held to discuss Local RAR and LCR.	Energy Division held 2 day workshop to discuss CAISO's LCR Study and Local RAR proposals filed
Feb 2, 2006	PHC Held	
Jan 24, 2006	Local RAR Proposals filed	Parties were ordered by D.05-10-042 to file proposals on Local RAR.
Jan 13, 2006	PHC Statements filed	
Dec 15, 2006	OIR Opened.	R.05-12-013 opened by the Commission

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

C. Procurement Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-04-003	Peevey	Wetzell, Brown, Gottstein		Sterkel

What it Does

1. Reviews and approves utility energy procurement plans.
2. Establishes policies and cost recovery mechanisms for energy procurement.
3. Ensures that the utilities maintain an adequate reserve margin.
4. Implements a long-term resource adequacy and planning process.

Next Steps

- Proceeding may be closed in near future.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
6/21/06	Draft Decision issued.	Draft Decision issued on issues related to PG&E and IEP settlement related to qualifying facilities.
2/16/2006	D.06-02-032 established a load-based cap on GHG emissions.	
12/15/2005	D.05-12-021 considered reallocation of DWR contracts.	
12/15/2005	D.05-12-022 considered PTM requests on D.04-12-048.	Grants in part, and denies in part, petitions to modify D04-12-048.
12/1/2005	D.05-12-019 adopted regarding Qfs.	Continues the interim relief as provided in D04-01-050 for Qualifying Facilities with expired or expiring contracts from January 1, 2006 until the Commission issues a final decision in the

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		combined two dockets, R04-04-003 and R04-04-025.
Oct 27, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-10-042	The decision adopts a system resource adequacy program requirement for 2006, with annual and monthly showings.
Sept 22, 2005	SCE withdrew A. 05-06-003; On Sept 9 th , Commissioner Grueneich issued a scoping memo in application.	SCE withdrew application for approval of new generation contracts; SCE had asked permission to acquire up to 1500 MW of capacity through new power purchase agreements (PPAs).
Sept 8, 2005	ALJ ruling issued revising schedule for Phase 2 rebuttal testimony.	
Aug 25, 2005	ALJ ruling issued regarding Capacity Markets staff white paper.	Comments will be filed and served by September 9; reply comments will be filed and served by October 10.
July 29, 2005	ALJ ruling issued which modifies interagency Confidentiality Agreement.	
June 10, 2005	ALJ ruling issued which provides Notice of Availability of Phase 2 Resource Adequacy Workshop Report and providing for comments.	Comments are due July 8 and replies are due July 18.
Apr 25, 2005	Incentive mechanism post-workshop comments were filed.	
Apr 2005	Resource adequacy workshops were held on April 21, 22 and 29.	
Apr x, 2005	Procurement incentive workshop report released for public comment.	
Apr 7, 2005	ALJ Ruling was issued.	Additional resource adequacy workshops were scheduled, and the previously adopted Phase 2 schedule was rescinded and will be reset by future ruling.
Mar 25, 2005	PG&E, SCE and SDG&E submitted compliance filings, as ordered by D.04-12-048.	The utilities provided updated information to their short-term and long-term procurement plans.
Mar 7 - 9, 2005	Procurement incentive workshops were held.	
Jan – Feb 2005	Resource adequacy Phase II workshops were held.	
Dec 16, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-12-048.	Decision adopts the utilities' long-term procurement plans that were filed in July 2004, allows for greater head-to-head competition and provides guidelines on all-source solicitations, resolves cost recovery issues, and begins integrating renewables procurement with general procurement.
Oct 28, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-10-035.	Resource adequacy Phase I decision.
Jul 8, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-07-028, indicating that reliability is not only the CAISO's job.	The decision clarifies and modifies prior orders to indicate that it is also a utility responsibility to procure all the resources necessary to meet its load, not only service area wide but also locally. In doing so, a utility must take into account not only cost but also transmission congestion and reliability.
Jun 15, 2004	Resource adequacy workshop report released for public comment.	Resource adequacy workshops were held on March 16; on April 6, 7, 12, 13, 14 and 26; and on May 5, 17, 18 and 26. The workshops addressed issues such as protocols for counting supply and demand resources, deliverability of resources to load, and load forecasting. The purpose of the report is to identify consensus agreements reached by workshop participants, identify issues where agreement does not exist, and set forth options to resolve those issues.
Jun 9, 2004	The Commission issued D.04-06-011, on SDG&E's Grid Reliability RFP. This decision also closes R.01-10-024.	This decision approves the five proposals that SDG&E presented to meet its short-term and long-term grid reliability needs. Among those five proposals includes approval for SDG&E to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • purchase the 550 MW Palomar plant (in 2006 when construction

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		is complete) from its affiliate, Sempra Energy Resources; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sign a 10-year Power Purchase Agreement for 570 MW from Calpine's Otay Mesa plant.
Jan 22, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-01-050.	The decision addressed long-term procurement policy issues for PG&E, SCE and SDG&E. Major issues include resource adequacy and reserve requirements, market structure, financial capabilities, long-term planning assumptions and guidance, and confidentiality.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

D. Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-04-026	Peevey	Simon		Douglas, Churchill

What it Does

Implements a Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) program in accordance with SB 1078.

Next Steps

- Proposed decision regarding RPS participation rules for ESPs, CCAs and small/multi-jurisdictional utilities expected late Summer 2006.
- Final approval of IOUs' 2006 RPS procurement plans & RFOs expected in June and July, allowing 2006 solicitations to move forward.
- Proposed decision on RPS reporting and compliance rules expected in late summer 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
July/August 2006	Proposed decision on reporting & compliance rules	
June 22, 2006	Prehearing conference on scope of new RPS OIR	
May 25, 2006	New OIR adopted, R.06-05-027	
May 25, 2006	Resolution approved new wind contract signed by SDG&E	
May 25, 2006	Decision adopted conditionally approving TOD benchmarks, 2006 short-term RPS procurement plans & RFOs	
May 17, 2006	Ruling adopting 2006 Transmission Ranking Cost Reports	
Apr 20, 2006	2005 MPR calculation adopted	
Mar 17, 2006	Reply comments filed on reporting & compliance workshop	
Mar 14, 2006	Draft resolution on final 2005 MPR	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	mails	
Mar 10, 2006	Comments filed on reporting & compliance workshop	
Mar 7, 2006	Responses filed to 2/17 proposals	
Mar 1, 2006	Reply comments filed on TOD benchmarking	
Feb 17, 2006	ESP, CCA, SMJU participation proposals filed	
Feb 16, 2006	New OIR on ESPs, etc. issued (R. 06-02-012)	
Feb 16, 2006	All-Party Workshop: RPS Compliance & Reporting Rules	
Dec 22, 2005	Major IOUs file 2006 RPS short term plans.	
Dec 15, 2005	2005 MPR proposed decision on Commission agenda.	
Dec 14, 2005	PHC on ESPs, CCAs, small multi-jurisdictionals, and RECs.	
Dec 10, 2005	IOUs will file supplemental compliance filings for 2005 LT RPS procurement plans.	
Nov 18, 2005	ESP-CPUC Jurisdiction decision adopted.	
Apr 4 – 5, 2005	Time of Delivery (TOD) MPR workshop was held.	
Mar 7, 2005	Utilities filed their draft 2005 RPS procurement plans.	
Feb 11, 2005	The final Market Price Referent (MPR) was released via an Assigned Commissioner's Ruling. http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/RULINGS/43824.htm	MPR is the benchmark price comparison for renewable energy generation vs. traditional gas-fired generation plants. Contracted bids that exceed the benchmark price can be reimbursed through the Supplemental Energy Payment (SEP) fund administered by the California Energy Commission.
Feb 10, 2005	Reply comments on TOD MPR and REC Trading were filed.	
Feb 3, 2005	Comments on TOD MPR and REC Trading were filed.	
Dec 13, 2004	SDG&E notified the Energy Division that it compiled its RFO short list.	The initial short list identifies the bidders the utility has selected for potential contract negotiations.
Dec 12, 2004	Scoping Memo for Phase 2 was issued.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission will gather party comments and briefs on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Participation of small and multi-jurisdictional utilities, ESPs, and Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs) in the RPS program; ➤ Treatment of existing Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) from QFs; ➤ Development of a Time of Delivery (TOD) Market Price Referent (MPR); ➤ Investigate development of REC trading program. • Utilities will file Draft 2005 RPS Procurement Plans and a draft 2005 RPS Solicitations, which is expected to happen in the 4th quarter of 2005.
Sep 29, 2004	PG&E notified the Energy Division that it compiled its RFO short list.	The initial short list identifies the bidders the utility has selected for potential contract negotiations.
Jul 8, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-07-029, on Least-Cost/Best-Fit.	In this decision, the Commission adopted criteria for determining the least-cost, best-fit for renewable energy bids.
July 2004	Energy Division approved the utilities'	Energy Division approved PG&E's and SDG&E's renewable energy

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	request for bid protocols, and the initial RFOs were initiated.	request for bid protocols and the initial RFOs were initiated for these IOUs. SCE's request to be excused from the initial RFO was approved because SCE met the 1% renewable procurement target during the interim procurement period.
Jun 9, 2004	The Commission issued decisions D.04-06-014 and D.04-06-015.	The decisions focused on Standard Terms & Conditions, and the Market Price Referent, respectively.
Apr 22, 2004	The Commission opened this RPS rulemaking, R.04-04-026.	
Mar 22, 2004	Market Price Referent (MPR) white paper was sent to service list for comment.	
Mar 2003	The Commission adopted D.03-06-071.	In this decision, the Commission sets forth the implementation methods for the Renewable Portfolio Standards Program (RPS) as required under SB 1078. The decision establishes four fundamental processes necessary to implement RPS, and mandated by law: (1) the market price referent, or benchmark (MPR); (2) the rules for flexible compliance; (3) the criteria for least cost, best fit ranking of renewable energy bids; and (4) a process for determining standard contract terms and conditions.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

E. Direct Access (DA) and Departing Load (DL) Cost Responsibility Surcharge (CRS)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.02-01-011	Brown	Pulsifer		Auremma, Velasquez

What it Does

1. This proceeding sets and implements a Cost Responsibility Surcharge (CRS) that is the obligation of applicable Direct Access (DA) and Departing Load (DL) customers. The CRS is necessary in order to make the utilities' bundled customers financially indifferent to load migration from bundled to DA and municipal DL service (including customer self-generation) that occurred after DWR long term contracts were signed.
2. A capped 2.7 cent/kWh CRS needs to be paid by applicable DA and DL customers. The CGDL CRS is capped at 2.7 cents/kWh. The CRS includes the DWR bond charge, the utilities' tail CTC, Edison's Historical Procurement Charge (HPC) and PG&E's Regulatory Asset Charge (RAC) applicable only in Edison's and PG&E's respective service territories, and the DWR power charge. The accrued undercollection associated with the capped CRS is to be tracked in balancing accounts and paid off by DA and DL customers, with interest, over time.
3. This proceeding also sets policy governing the suspension of DA service, DA load growth under existing contracts, and rules for customer movement to and from bundled and DA service. Additionally, this proceeding addresses the Municipal customers' DL CRS exemption applicability.
4. The Energy Division, along with DWR, the IOUs, and interested DA/DL parties, are calculating the CRS paydown estimates as part of a cooperative Working Group.

Next Steps

- The Commission will reexamine the current 2.7 cent cap on the CRS in 2005 to consider whether this level is sufficient to enable the entire DA CRS undercollection to be "paid back" by the time most of the DWR contracts expire in 2012.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

- A Draft Decision and an Alternate Draft Decision, are scheduled to be voted on at the July 21, 2005 Commission meeting. The decisions address the California Municipal Utilities Association's (CMUA) Petition for Modification of D. 04-12-059, which seeks clarification of the CRS applicability on Municipal (Publicly Owned Utility) DL customers
- A Draft Decision addressing Petitions To Modify filed by CMUA, Merced, and Modesto concerning the Regulatory Asset Charge and Energy Recovery Bond Charge applicability on Publicly Owned Utility "transferred load" and "new load," is also scheduled to be voted on at the July 21, 2005 Commission meeting.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 30, 2005	The Commission issued D.05-06-041.	Adopts a CRS applicable to county and municipal water districts' electric self-generation in the service territories of SCE, PG&E, and SDG&E by applying the mechanism and exceptions adopted in D.03-04-030 to this CG.
June 21, 2005	Working Group Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Working Group was notified of confidentiality concerns held by SDG&E that were preventing it from providing DWR's consultants (Navigant Inc.) with confidential load information that is required in order to calculate the 2003-2005 CRS. SDG&E has since provided the information to DWR and its consultants. • An alternate proposal for calculating the CRS was made by the Direct Access parties; this proposal would require the use of a benchmark to calculate the CRS, which DA parties argue could provide for more transparency in the CRS calculation process. Several alternate proposals have been circulated since the meeting, and the group is expected to discuss them further in the next few weeks.
May 17, 2005	Two Draft Decisions were mailed out.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Decisions concerning CMUA's Petition to Modify D. 04-12-059, which seeks clarification of the MDL CRS applicability, and Merced/Modesto Irrigation Districts' Rehearing D. 05-01-31 (A. 03-08-004) were mailed to the respective services lists.
April 18, 2005	Working Group Status Report was served on the proceeding's service list.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Status Report summarizes the discussions that took place at the April 12th and 14th Working Group meetings, and also includes the next steps that parties agreed need to be taken in order to move along the processes dealing with the 2003-2005 CRS calculations and the Municipal DL CRS billing and collection negotiations.
April 14, 2005	Working Group Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per a March 28, 2005 ALJ Ruling, a second Working Group meeting was held in with the intent of moving a long the negotiations process between the Publicly Owned Utilities and the Investor Owned Utilities for Municipal DL billing and collection of the CRS.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

April 12, 2005	Working Group Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Per a March 28, 2005 ALJ Ruling, the first Working Group meeting was held in order to begin a process in which all the interested parties will take part in calculating the CRS obligations for 2003 on a true-up basis and for 2004 and 2005 on a forecasted basis.
Mar 30, 2005	ALJ Ruling	Outlines the process to determine total CRS obligations of direct access and departing load customers: 1) on a true-up basis for the year 2003 and 2) on a forecast basis for 2004 and 2005.
Mar 17, 2005	The Commission issued D.05-03-025.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopts an Affidavit for DA customers to verify, under penalty of perjury, that they are not exceeding their contractual limits for DA usage. In the Affidavit, the customer is required to warrant that its total level of DA load on all DA accounts does not exceed the contracted level of load defined by the Agreement that was in effect as of September 20, 2001, and also disclose those specific contractual volumes of load or indicate that the contract is on a "full requirements" basis. To address legitimate concerns as to commercial sensitivity of this data, the decision adopts Restrictions on utility employee access. The Affidavit applies to customers w/ demand over 500 kW.
Feb 24, 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Commission adopted Resolution E-3909. The Commission adopted D.05-02-051, which resolves the Petition for Modification of D.03-04-030 (the Customer Generation Departing Load decision) filed by the California Large Energy Consumers Association and California Manufacturers and Technology Association. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopts methods to equitably allocate responsibility for the unrecovered Bond Charges assigned to Customer Generation (CG) effective as of April 3, 2003. Individual CG customers may elect to pay the amounts they individually incurred either in a lump sum payment or a charge amortized over 2 years. A customer migrating from direct access to Customer Generation (CG) will not be required to pay the DWR Power Charge component of the CRS, but remains liable for past DA CRS undercollections incurred as a DA customer.
Jan 31, 2005	Energy Division workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The workshop discussion addressed the process that is needed in order to implement the billing and collection of the Cost Responsibility Surcharges (CRS) for Municipal Departing Load (MDL), pursuant to D.03-07-028 as modified by D.03-08-076, D.04-11-014, and D.04-12-059.
Jan 27, 2005	The Commission issued D.05-01-040.	Adopts cost responsibility obligations for 2001 through 2003, applicable to Direct Access and Departing Load customers pursuant to the methodology adopted in D.02-11-022.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

F. Demand Response Rulemaking and Associated Proceedings

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.02-06-001 A.05-01-016 (PG&E) A.05-01-017 (SDG&E) A.05-01-018 (SCE) A.05-03-016 (PG&E) A.05-03-015 (SDG&E) A.05-03-026 (SCE) A.05-06-028 (PG&E) A.05-06-006 (PG&E) A.05-06-008 (SCE) A.05-06-017 (SDG&E)	Peevey, Grueneich	Long, Gamson, Malcolm		Kaneshiro, Chavez, Rosauer, Lam, Morgenstern

What it Does

1. Develop demand response programs and dynamic pricing tariffs for large customers.
2. Review the IOUs' Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) applications, for statewide implementation of AMI for all small commercial and residential IOU customers, and associated cost recovery and dynamic pricing tariffs proposals.

Next Steps

- Draft decision that adopts PG&E's AMI project proposal is scheduled for the July 20, 2006 Commission meeting.
- Staff recommends a new OIR to develop cost-effectiveness methodology and load impact protocols.
- Default CPP is being considered in PG&E's current GRC, but no official decision has been made yet.

AMI Proceedings Overview

PG&E's AMI pre-deployment Application (A.) 05-03-016

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 26, 2006	TURN's Motion for rehearing was rejected by the Commission	
Oct 24, 2005	Turn filed a motion for rehearing of (D.)05-09-044	
Sept 22, 2005	The Commission approved PG&E's AMI pre-deployment funding request (D.05-09-044)	The Commission approved \$49 million for AMI pre-deployment activities such as metering data communication net-work set-up, billing/care system integration and system testing
Mar 15, 2005	PG&E filed A.05-03-016	PG&E seeks cost recovery of up to \$49 million of pre-deployment expenditures for the initial stage of the AMI Project.

SDG&E's AMI Application (A.)05-03-015

June 16, 2006	SDG&E submits supplemental testimony	Supplemental testimony includes a comparison of SDG&E's (PTR) and PG&E's residential and small commercial CPP rate proposal including the incremental costs and benefits of the scenarios outlined in the ALJ Ruling.
May 19, 2006	ALJ Ruling	Modifies procedural schedule adopted in November 18, 2005 Ruling. Orders additional supplemental testimony on residential and small commercial CPP proposal comparisons. Evidentiary hearings scheduled for September 25-October 6,

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		2006.
Mar 28, 2006	SDG&E submits prepared supplemental, consolidating, superseding and replacement testimony	Supplemental testimony updates and revises estimates of AMI costs and benefits based on the results of the request for proposal (RFP) process and the final demand response impacts estimated in the State-Wide Pricing Pilot (SPP).
Nov 18, 2005	ALJ Ruling	The ALJ Ruling modifies the schedule adopted in the July 26, 2005 Ruling in response to an October 20, 2005 motion by SDG&E to modify the procedural schedule. Evidentiary hearings are scheduled for July 10-24, 2006 and a final decision in December of 2006.
August 25, 2005	Commission approves multi-party settlement agreement	The Commission approved \$3.4 million in funding for SDG&E's AMI pre-deployment activities for the period of September 2005 through March 2006 and an additional \$5.9 million for the period March 2006 through the end of 2006.
March 30, 2005	SDG&E amended its application	
March 15, 2005	SDG&E filed Application (A.) 05-03-015	SDG&E requests approval of their preferred full scale AMI deployment strategy and approximately \$50 million for pre-deployment costs.
SCE's AMI Application (A.) 05-03-026		
Dec 1, 2005	Commission approved multi-party settlement.	SCE's phase 1 AMI pre-deployment application is approved and closed. SCE will need to file a new application should it seek additional ratepayer funding to implement its AMI project.
October 3, 2005	A multi-party settlement agreement was filed	The Settling Parties agreed to SCE's scope and timing of Phase 1 Advanced Integrated Meter (AIM) project development and the approval of \$12 million in ratepayer funding for the Phase 1 AIM project activities
March 30, 2005	SCE filed Application (A.)05-03-026	SCE requests approval of its AMI deployment strategy and cost recovery of \$31 million to develop an Advance Integrated Meter (AIM). SCE's proposed AMI strategy is to design and develop a new AIM platform that integrates new technologies to increase functionality and operational efficiencies.
PG&E's AMI Application (A.)05-06-028		
Dec 1, 2005	Commission approved multi-party settlement.	SCE's phase 1 AMI pre-deployment application is approved and closed. SCE will need to file a new application should it seek additional ratepayer funding to implement its AMI project.
October 13, 2005	PG&E files amendment to A.05-06-028	PG&E amended its estimated AMI project implementation costs from \$1.46 billion to \$1.75 billion. This amount includes the \$49 million in AMI pre-deployment costs authorized in D.05-09-044
June 16, 2005	PG&E filed its AMI Project Application (A.)05-06-028.	PG&E requests approval of its AMI Project to automate 100% of the all electric and gas meters within 5 years at a cost of \$1.46 billion (\$2.227 billion 20-yr present value revenue requirement), ratemaking proposals and cost recovery mechanism.
Date	Actions Taken	Comments
March 30, 2005	SCE filed its AMI Application (A.)05-03-026	SCE requests approval of its AMI deployment strategy and cost recovery of \$31 million to develop an Advance Integrated Meter (AIM). SCE's proposed AMI strategy is to design and develop a new AIM platform that integrates new technologies to increase functionality and operational efficiencies.
Mar 15, 2005	PG&E and SDG&E filed their updated AMI business case analysis and applications for cost recovery for AMI pre-deployment activities.	PG&E in A.05-03-016 seeks cost recovery of up to \$49 million of pre-deployment expenditures for the initial stage of the AMI Project. SDG&E requests approval of its: (1) preferred full scale AMI pre-deployment plan and associated 2005-2006

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		activities, (2) cost recovery mechanism and revenue requirement for pre- and initial deployment costs in 2005-2007, and (3) preferred full deployment strategy for 2007 implementation and associated costs. SDG&E anticipates that AMI design and start-up expenses to be in excess of \$40 million.
Nov 24, 2004	An Assigned Commissioner and ALJ Ruling was issued which moved the due date for the AMI applications to March 15, 2005 and calls for an AMI reference design technical conference.	By January 12, 2005, the utilities were order to complete and serve their AMI business case analysis required by the July 21, 2004 Ruling. Formal AMI applications are due March 15, 2005. The AMI reference design technical conference is tentatively scheduled for February 1, 2005.
Oct 15, 2004	PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E filed their preliminary AMI business case analysis.	PG&E's evaluated 19 deployment scenarios and found that AMI deployment was cost effective for 5 of those scenarios; SCE evaluated 23 deployment scenarios and found that AMI deployment was cost effective for two partial deployment cases; SDG&E's analysis recommends a phase AMI deployment strategy, starting with customers in the inland and desert zones with loads greater than 100kW.
Nov 24, 2003	Scoping memo outlined issues for Phase 2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the business case analysis framework for the deployment of an Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) from a utility, customer, and societal perspective. • Development of a real-time pricing tariff for large customers. • A/C cycling evaluation as a control technology that interfaces with AMI elements. • Agricultural customer participation. • Implementation of the CPA Demand Reserves Partnership. • Initiate the planning process for meeting the 5% demand response target by 2007.

<i>Large Customer (>200 kW) Proceedings Overview</i>		
Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 25, 2006	Commission directs IOUs to incorporate default CPP tariffs for all large customers in their next GRC	The Commission rejected a settlement that would have kept default CPP as a voluntary tariff.
April 3, 2006	Energy Division distributes a proposed DR load impact protocol for comment.	Comments were provided by several parties; ED believes the completion of the protocol requires a formal Commission proceeding
March 21, 2006	Energy Division conducts a scoping workshop on DR cost-effectiveness	Comments from the workshop indicate highly technical issues, and a complex undertaking.
March 15, 2006	Commission approves IOUs' 3-year ('06-'08) Budgets for DR Programs	\$225 m. in funding for DR programs for next three years.
January 30, 2006	Multi-party settlement is filed with the Commission regarding the IOUs' 3-year demand response program budgets ('06-'08)	Parties defer issues of cost-effectiveness and DR programs goals. Seek approval of \$225 m. in funding for DR programs for next three years.
Nov. 21, 2005	Decision closes the original OIR (R.02-06-001)	The decision directs agency staff to complete several remaining tasks which could lead to new OIRs: develop a measurement protocol for DR programs, develop a cost-effectiveness evaluation protocol for DR, explore possible improvements to customer billing formats to better convey their energy usage.
Nov. 14, 2005	Two settlements (one for PG&E/SCE, the other for SDG&E) were proposed in the default CPP proceeding.	The PG&E/SCE settlement proposes a CPP tariff that is voluntary (both IOUs argue that a default tariff is counterproductive.) The SDG&E settlement proposes a default CPP tariff on the condition

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		that SDG&E conduct intensive customer outreach and education about the new rates.
Oct. 19, 2005	Draft decision issued for public comment. Closes the original OIR (R.02-06-001)	The decision directs agency staff to complete several remaining tasks which could lead to new OIRs: develop a measurement protocol for DR programs, develop a cost-effectiveness evaluation protocol for DR, explore possible improvements to customer billing formats to better convey their energy usage.
August 1, 2005	IOUs filed revised default CPP tariffs in compliance with April, 2005 decision	Default CPP tariffs (with opt-out option) for large customers are proposed by the IOUs.
June 1, 2005	IOUs filed applications seeking approval of large customer DR programs for 2006-2008	The IOUs seek budgets approving DR programs for the next three years. Programs include interruptible programs, day-ahead programs, customer education, monitoring and evaluation protocols.
Apr 21, 2005	Commission decision on default CPP tariffs	The decision declined to adopt default CPP tariffs for 2005. Directed the IOUs to file default CPP applications for summer of 2006 by August 1, 2005.
Jan 27, 2005	Commission adopts decision for 2005 Large Customer Programs	The decision adopts 2005 budgets to continue or expand existing programs and also adopts 20/20 programs for all three utilities.

Small Customer (<200 kW) Issues

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
April 18, 2005	ACR on the Joint Utilities' 2005 budget request for the SPP, ADRS, and IDP	The ACR granted the Joint Utilities the authority to use \$2.952 million in 2003/2004 unspent funds to continue the SPP, ADRS, IDP, and associated research.
Feb 11, 2005	The Joint Utilities filed their 2005 budget request to continue offering the CPP experimental tariffs, Automated Demand Response System (ADRS) and Information Display Pilot (IDP) and conduct the required research evaluation activities.	The utilities estimate that \$4.4 million will be required to continue offering the CPP tariffs, ADRS, IDP, and complete the research and evaluation activities recommended by the evaluation sub-committee. The utilities request authority to use \$2.9 million of remaining unspent 2003/2004 funds and an additional \$1.5 million to cover these all of the 2005 activities.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

G. Distributed Generation Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-03-017	Peevey	Malcolm	Lee	Beck, Paulo

What it Does

1. This rulemaking will develop a Distributed Generation (DG) cost/benefit methodology, evaluate DG as a planning and procurement option, and revisit rate design issues.
2. R. 98-07-037 is now closed. Existing DG programs (SGIP, net metering, AB 1685 implementation, and interconnection) will be folded into this new rulemaking.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Next Steps

- **R.06-03-004 (ALJ Duda) subsumes issues in this rulemaking.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Aug 26, 2005	CPUC adopts CEC interconnection recommendations.	Adopts dispute mediation process between DG developers and IOUs, addresses interconnection costs, fees, and technical issues.
July 1-17, 2005	Comments and replies received on Staff Solar Report.	
June 27-July 12	Briefs and replies filed on DG cost-benefit issues.	Briefs address cost benefit values, sources, and methodologies.
June 14, 2005	Joint CPUC/CEC Staff Solar Report filed for comment.	Proposes actions to implement the Governor's Solar Initiative. Issues addressed include performance-based incentives, budget and administration, and eligibility criteria.
May 11-13	Evidentiary hearings on cost-benefit issues.	
April 28, 2005	DG cost-benefit reply testimony was filed.	Reply testimony addresses issues raised in April 13, 2005 direct testimony.
April 15, 2005	2004 SGIP Impacts Evaluation report was issued.	The report presents results of the fourth year of the SGIP program. The evaluation covers all SGIP projects coming online before January 1, 2005 representing a total of 116 MW.
Apr 13, 2005	DG cost-benefit testimony was filed.	Testimony focuses on methodologies and data inputs to use in cost-benefit analyses.
March 29, 2005	Energy Division issued its AB 58 net metering report to the Governor and Legislature.	The report can be downloaded from: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/static/industry/electric/distributed+generation/index.htm
Mar 23, 2005	Energy Div/ALJ released SGIP cost-effectiveness evaluation framework.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Framework will be used to evaluate cost-effectiveness of the SGIP. Evaluation report expected Summer 2005. • Parties may refer to interim SGIP framework in over DG cost-benefit testimony due April 7.
Mar 7, 2005	ACR regarding SGIP solar funds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advises IOUs they have the authority to "borrow forward" from 2006-2007 SGIP budgets to fund 2005 solar projects. • Directs CPUC and CEC staff to develop a Solar Initiative Program proposal. Staff report expected late April/early May.
Feb 24, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-02-042.	This decision was issued to correct various nonsubstantive errors contained in D.04-12-045, issued on December 16, 2004.
Jan 27, 2005	ALJ Ruling postponed hearings to give parties more time to prepare cost/benefit testimony.	New hearing dates will be scheduled.
Dec 16, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-12-045, which extends SGIP through 2007.	The decision implements AB 1685 emissions and efficiency standards, reduces per watt incentives for most technologies, and removes annual caps limiting the number of projects per entity.
Nov 29, 2004	ACR seeks comments on implementing Governor's Solar Initiative.	
Sep 22, 2004	The Governor signed Assembly Bill 1684.	Exempts DG fueled by nonrenewable waste heat from meeting SGIP emissions eligibility requirements adopted in AB 1685.
Jul 9, 2004	Energy Division (ED) Report issued for comment.	ED proposes improvements to the Self Gen Incentive Program, implementation process for AB 1685 emissions and efficiency standards effective January 1, 2005.
Mar 16, 2004	R.04-03-017 was opened.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

H. Energy Efficiency Rulemaking I

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.01-08-028	Grueneich	Gottstein	Lee	Tapawan-Conway

What it Does

The current phase of the proceeding focuses on program planning for the 2006-2008 funding cycle, and development of program measurement, savings verification, and market assessment plans.

Next Steps

- Further workshops on EM&V protocols, and EM&V reporting requirements.
- Commission to consider inventive mechanisms for energy efficiency programs.
- **For recent energy efficiency activity, see. R.06-04-010 (below).**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Apr 27, 2006	D.06-04-064 issued.	This decision corrects and clarifies the text and attachments to D.05-09-043 that were identified subsequent to the issuance of that decision. Changes include clarifying the cumulative annual totals for CO2 emission savings in Table 2 and correcting Attachment 5 numbers so that they reflect a consistent use of factors to convert gas and electric savings to CO2 emission factors.
Apr 25, 2006	Ruling issued by ALJ.	Adopts evaluators' protocols for the evaluation of energy efficiency programs.
Feb 21, 2006	Ruling issued by ALJ.	Adopts the Portfolio Monitoring reporting requirements for program implementation plans, monthly and quarterly reports.
Jan 11, 2006	Ruling issued by ALJ.	Adopts protocols for process and review of post-2005 EM&V activities.
Oct 5-6, 2005	Energy Division and CEC Joint Staff held workshop on EM&V protocols and program reporting requirements.	
Oct 4, 2005	The ALJ issued a ruling.	The ruling solicits comments on the Joint Staff's Draft Protocols for EM&V of Energy Efficiency.
Sept 2, 2005	The ALJ issued a ruling	The ruling adopts Joint Staff's proposed performance basis for non-resource programs; proposed process for estimating and verifying parameters needed to calculate net resource benefits (with some clarifications) and directs Joint Staff to proceed with the development of EM&V protocols, evaluation plans and other EM&V-related activities as directed by the ruling
Aug 10-11, 2005	Energy Division and CEC Joint Staff held workshop on EM&V Protocols Concepts	The workshop discussed initial draft concepts for EM&V protocols being prepared under contract with TecMarket Works

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Aug 3, 2005	The ALJ issued a ruling	The ruling solicits comments on Joint Staff's draft proposal on EM&V protocols issues discussed in the June 29-30 workshop
June 29-30, 2005	Energy Division and CEC Joint Staff held workshop on EM&V	The workshop focused on EM&V model and performance basis for non resource programs
May 2005	Various peer review group and program advisory group meetings	The meetings are in conjunction with the IOU program administrators' planning process for their 2006-2008 EE programs per D.05-01-055
Apr 21, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-04-051	This decision updates the existing EE Policy Manual and addresses threshold evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) issues raised in workshops and establishes a process for developing EM&V protocols.
Apr 19, 2005	The ALJ issued a ruling	The ruling adopts an implementation roadmap for evaluation, measurement and verification that Joint CPUC-CEC staff prepared as directed in D.05-01-055
Apr 4-6, 19-22, 26-29	Various peer review group and program advisory group meetings	The meetings are in conjunction with the IOU program administrators' planning process for their 2006-2008 EE programs per D.05-01-055
Mar 28-30, 2005	The utilities held the 2 nd Public Workshops for their 2006-2008 program planning process.	The workshops focused on the topics that were also presented at the third PAG meetings.
Mar 25, 2005	PG&E convened optional PAG meeting.	The meeting focused on Local government partnerships.
Mar 21-23, 2005	The utilities convened the third Program Advisory Group (PAG) meetings.	The SDG&E PAG met on March 21, the SCE/SCG PAG on March 22, and the PG&E PAG on March 23. The meetings focused on program concepts for 2006-2008.
Mar 18, 2005	PG&E convened optional PAG meeting.	The meeting focused on the following topics: energy efficiency as a resource, integration of third party programs in utility portfolio.
Mar 10, 2005	Energy Division convened the 1 st statewide Peer Review Group (PRG) meeting.	The meeting focused on housekeeping matters – PRG mission statement, roles/responsibilities, deliverables, meeting schedules.
Mar 2-4, 2005	The utilities held the 1 st Public Workshops for their 2006-2008 program planning process.	The workshops focused on the topics that were also presented at the second PAG meetings.
Feb 23-25, 2005	The utilities convened the second Program Advisory Group (PAG) meetings.	The PG&E PAG met on February 23, the SDG&E PAG on February 24, and the SCE/SCG PAG on February 25. The meetings focused on the utilities' program accomplishments and preliminary ideas for their program portfolios for 2006-2008.
Feb 15-16, 2005	Workshop on policy rules update was held.	ALJ Gottstein facilitated the workshop, which focused on discussion of the draft policy rules contained in her December 30, 2004 ALJ ruling on the first day, and on terms and definitions during the second day.
Feb 9-11, 2005	The utilities convened the initial PAG meetings, in compliance with D.05-01-055.	The SCE/SCG PAG met on Feb. 9, the SDG&E PAG on Feb. 10, and the PG&E PAG on Feb. 11. The meetings focused on housekeeping and preliminary matters
Jan 27, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-01-055, addressing the Energy Efficiency administrative structure.	The decision returns the utilities to the lead role in program choice and portfolio management, but imposes safeguards in the form of an advisory group structure and competitive bidding minimum requirement. The Energy Division, in collaboration with the CEC, will have the lead role in program evaluation, research and analysis, and quality assurance functions in support of the Commission's policy oversight responsibilities.
Jan 21, 2005	Workshop report on Evaluation, Measurement, and Verification (EM&V) protocols development was issued.	
Dec 29, 2004	The Assigned Commissioner issued a ruling.	The ACR solicits comments from the utilities, implementers of energy efficiency programs involved in the commercial buildings

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		sector, building owners and operators of the commercial building sector and interested parties and interested parties on how to implement and further the goals articulated in the Governor's Green Building Executive Order issued on December 15, 2004.
Dec 17, 2004	The Assigned Commissioner issued a ruling.	The ACR notifies parties of upcoming workshop to update policy rules and related terms and definitions for post 2005 energy efficiency programs.
Dec 2, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-12-019.	The decision grants, subject to modifications, the joint petition of PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas to increase spending on natural gas EE programs.
Sep 23, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-09-060.	The decision translates the Energy Action Plan mandate to reduce per capita energy use into explicit, numerical goals for electricity and natural gas savings for the utilities. Electric and natural gas savings from energy efficiency programs funded through the public goods charge and procurement rates will contribute to these goals, including those achieved through the Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program.
Aug 10, 2004	Public Goods Charge Audit report released to the public.	The report focuses on the financial and management audit of PGC energy efficiency programs from 1998-2002.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

I. Energy Efficiency Rulemaking II

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.06-04-010	Grueneich	Gottstein		Tapawan-Conway

What it Does

This proceeding focuses on further refinement of Commission's policies, programs and evaluation, measurement and verification activities related to post-2005 energy efficiency activities administered by Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company.

Next Steps

- **Workshops on Phase I issues (Risk/Return Incentive Mechanism) set for June 26-28, 2006 to discuss preliminary proposals.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 24, 2006	The Assigned Commissioner issued Ruling and Scoping Memo.	This ruling and scoping memo describes the issues to be considered in this proceeding and the timetable for their resolution.
May 4, 2006	Comments on PHC filed.	
April 17, 2006	ALJ Ruling issued on notice of PHC scheduled on May 9, 2006.	
April 13, 2006	R.06-04-010 opened.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

J. Low Income Programs

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-01-006	Grueneich	Weissman, Malcolm	Harris	Randhawa
A.04-06-038, et.al. (Applications 04-07-002, 04-07-014, 04-07-015, 04-07-020, 04-07-027, 04-07-010, 04-07-011, 04-07-012, and 04-07-013 consolidated by September 27, 2004 ALJ Ruling)		Weissman, Malcolm		Sarvate, Randhawa, Fortune, Elzey

What it Does

1. Comprehensive forum addressing Commission's policies governing post-2003 CARE and LIEE low-income programs.
2. **The California Alternate Rate for Energy (CARE) program provides households with income below 200% of the Federal Poverty Level with a 20% discount on their energy bills. The Low-Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE) program provides installation of weatherization measures and energy efficient appliances at no cost to LIEE participants.**

Next Steps

- Next LIOB meeting will be held in Sacramento on September 14, 2006.
- In accordance with D.05-12-026, each of the large IOUs will file 2007-2008 funding applications for LIEE and CARE programs no later than July 1, 2006.
- ED Staff Report on the SMJU applications filed on June 1 2006 due in July 2006.
- A proposed decision on the budget augmentation requests filed on April 14th is expected in July 2006, with a final decision out by August 25, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 8, 2006	LIEE Symposium held at LADWP building in Los Angeles	The Symposium was sponsored by CPUC, US Environmental Protection Agency, US Department of Energy and California Municipal Association
June 7, 2006	LIOB Meeting held in Los Angeles at the CPUC building.	SMJU budget applications, a comparison exhibit of upcoming large IOU budget applications, and the schedule of activities for 2006 were discussed. Please refer to the LIOB website www.ligb.org/DOCS/ for additional information
June 1, 2006	SMJUs filed Budget Applications for Low Income Programs for the Budget Years 2007 and 2008	Golden State Water Company did not file its application regarding its Bear Valley jurisdictions for the Budget Years 2007 and 2008.
May 2, 2006	LIOB Meeting held at Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission in Fresno	Please refer to the LIOB website www.ligb.org/DOCS/ for additional information
April 21, 2006	Bill Savings Study Workshop	The study is submitted annually on May 1 demonstrating the average savings that a LIEE participant achieves in his or her utility bills.
Mar. 29, 2006	Assigned Commissioner Ruling issued	In D.05-12-026, the Commission delegated to the Assigned Commissioner the authority to approve or disapprove through a ruling

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		the adoption of any Standardization Team reports currently pending or otherwise pending during the 2006-2007 funding cycle.
Mar. 14, 2006	LIEE Impact Evaluation draft study presentation and workshop	The utilities are required to conduct LIEE impact evaluation study to support their shareholder earnings claims for LIEE program costs in the Annual Earnings Assessment Proceeding (AEAP).
Feb. 28, 2006	LIOB Meeting held at Commission offices in San Francisco	Please refer to the LIOB website www.ligb.org/DOCS/ for additional information
Feb. 17, 2006	Combined workshop to Review November 1, 2005 Standardization Team Report and progress on the CARE and Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program Winter Initiative	Decision D.05-10-044 was issued approving various emergency changes to CARE and LIEE programs in light of anticipated high natural gas prices in the winter of 2005-2006. ALJ Weissman held this workshop to discuss the status of the CARE and Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program Winter initiative. Workshop also included the review of the Standardization Team Proposed Revisions to the LIEE Statewide P&P and the WIS Manual filed on November 1, 2005.
Nov. 15, 2005	Draft Decision Issued	Draft Decision issued on Rulemaking 0-4-01-006 and Applications 05-06-005, 05-06-009, 05-06-012 and 05-06-013 approving 2006-2007 Low Income Programs and Funding For the Larger Utilities and Approving new Low Income Energy Efficiency Program Measures for 2006
Oct. 27, 2005	ALJ Ruling Issued	Decision D.05-10-044 issued on Applications 05-06-005, 05-06-009, 05-06-012 and 05-06-013 approving various emergency changes to CARE and LIEE programs in light of anticipated high natural gas prices in the winter of 2005-2006
Oct. 20, 2005	Workshop on Utility Proposals	Based on the proposals received from the utilities and the comments and replies received from many other parties, ALJ Weissman held a full day workshop in San Francisco to discuss the proposals in detail in order to protect the most vulnerable consumers at this time of high natural gas prices.
Oct. 6, 2005	Full-panel hearing	In anticipation of exceptionally high gas prices this winter (as much as 70% higher than last year) and its impact on low-income residential customers, ALJ Weissman held a full-panel en-banc hearing on October 6, 2005, in Los Angeles to study these impacts and solicit proposals from IOU's for providing low-income customers with greater bill protection.
Sept. 1, 2005	ALJ Ruling Issued	Ruling Issued on Applications 05-06-005, 05-06-009, 05-06-012 and 05-06-013 setting a schedule for comments on the Assessment of Proposed New Program Year 2006 Measures
July 21, 2005	Final Decision Issued	Final Decision Issued Approving LIEE and CARE Programs For Seven SMJUs for PY 2005-2006.
July 14, 2005	ALJ Ruling Issued	Ruling Issued on Applications 05-06-009, 05-06-012 and 05-06-013 consolidating various matters and setting a schedule for comments. Comments to be provided no later than September 23, 2005
Jun 28, 2005	Meeting of the Joint Utilities LIEE Standardization Project Team	The Joint Utilities LIEE Standardization Project Team will hold a meeting on June 28, 2005. Discussion topics include: Duct Testing and Sealing as a Measure, Policies for Duct Testing and Sealing as a Free-Standing Measure, Non-Feasibility Conditions for Duct Testing, Duct Sealing and New Measures, and other issues related to costs of duct testing and sealing.
Jun 22, 2005	The Joint Utilities LIEE Standardization Project Team held a meeting on June 22, 2005.	Discussion topics included: California Title 24 duct testing and sealing requirements and associated policy and implementation issues, and revisions to the Weatherization Installation Standards (WIS) manual on furnace repair and replacement and high efficiency air conditioners for the LIEE program.
Jun 21, 2005	Draft Decision Issued	Draft Decision Issued Approving LIEE and CARE Programs For Seven SMJUs for PY 2005-2006. Applications are due from SMJUs by

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		December 1, 2005
Jun 20, 2005	SDG&E and SCE Proposals Filed	SDG&E, and SCE Filed proposals to Evaluate the Effectiveness of their Cool Center Programs.
Jun 16, 2005	Notice of The Joint Utilities LIEE Standardization Project Team meetings	The Joint Utilities LIEE Standardization Project Team will hold a meeting on June 22, 2005 to discuss the California Title 24 duct testing and sealing requirements; associated policy and implementation issues; revisions to the Weatherization Installation Standards (WIS) manual on furnace repair and replacement; and high efficiency air conditioners for the LIEE program.
Jun 14 – 17, 2005	Notice of SCE LIEE Public Workshops	SCE LIEE Public Workshop presentations were held on June 14, June 16 and June 17. The workshops were held in Rosemead, Fontana and Tulare respectively.
Jun 10, 2005	Energy Division's Supplemental Report filed in Docket Office.	Energy Division's Supplemental Report on Small and Multi-Jurisdictional Utilities for PY 2005 Low Income Program filed in Docket Office.
Jun 8, 2005	LIOB Planning Sub-Committee meeting to be held	Planning Sub-Committee of the Low Income Oversight Board meeting to be held on June 8, 2005, at the CPUC in San Francisco. This will serve as the first meeting of the sub-committee and is open to the public.
Jun 7, 2005	Assigned Commissioner Grueneich's Ruling issued	Assigned Commissioner Grueneich issued a Ruling Approving Proposed Amendments to the Workplan, Budget and Schedule for Phase 5 of the Low Income Energy Efficiency Standardization Project
Jun 3, 2005	Notice of public workshops to be held by Southern California Edison Company	SCE will hold three public workshops to discuss the CARE and LIEE programs' design and reporting requirements for 2006 and 2007 as directed by the CP UC in D.05-04-052. Public Workshops to be held on June 14 th in Rosemead, CA, Fontana on June 16 th and Tulare on June 17 th . Exact locations of SCE offices and times can be obtained from notice posted on the LIOB website.
May 13, 2005	Order Correcting Errors in D.05-04-052 (large IOU PY2005 CARE & LIEE Program budgets)	D.05-05-019 corrects errors appearing in Tables 1,2,3,4,7,9,11,12,15,16, and 17 of D.05-04-052.
May 10, 2005	ACR Inviting Applications For Appointment To The LIOB	
Apr 29, 2005	ALJ Ruling Issued	Releasing Energy Division's Report on Small & Multi-Jurisdictional Utility funding for PY 2005 Low Income Programs.
Apr 26, 2005	Standardization Team meeting on cost effectiveness results of the new measures proposed for inclusion in the utilities' 2006 LIEE program	
Apr 22, 2005	Energy Division Acting Director's letter authorizing release of the PY2002 LIEE Impact Evaluation draft report and approving the retention and final payments to the project contractors.	Approval of the Final Draft Report and Authorization of Retention and Final Payments to Contractors for the Program Year (PY) 2002, Low Income Energy Efficiency, (LIEE), Impact Evaluation, Pursuant to D.03-10-041.
Apr 21, 2005	D.05-04-052 on large IOU PY2005 CARE and LIEE budgets issued.	Approves PY 2005 Low-Income Energy Efficiency & California Alternate Rates for Energy programs for Pacific Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company.
Apr 11, 2005	LIOB Meeting held at Commission offices in San Francisco	Please refer to the LIOB website www.ligb.org/DOCS/ for additional information
Mar 25, 2005	Joint Assigned Commissioner and ALJ Ruling was issued.	Directs the Standardization Team to withdraw and refile its proposal related to Phase 5 of the LIEE Standardization project.
Mar 25, 2005	The March 30 th LIOB meeting and the March 28 th sub-committee meeting have been postponed.	Please refer to the Daily Calendar for updates.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Mar 22, 2005	Draft Decision on large IOU PY2005 CARE and LIEE budgets issued.	
Mar 17, 2005	Notice of March 28 th LIOB sub-committee teleconference.	A sub-committee, consisting of three current LIOB members, will meet to discuss and develop a report to the LIOB on the replacement of leaky water heaters as affected by proposed changes to the Policy & Procedures and Installations Standards Manuals. The public sub-committee meeting will be held via teleconference on March 28, 2005. The call- in information for both of these meetings can be found on the Commission Daily Calendar.
Mar 17, 2005	Executive Director grants the utilities' February 7 th request.	The next evaluation of the LIEE program's impact will be conducted for the 2005 program year, instead of 2004, and will be filed in the 2006 AEAP.
Mar 16 -17, 2005	Standardization Team Meeting was held.	To discuss cost effectiveness results for new measure proposals.
Mar 11, 2005	ALJ Thomas, via email, grants a three week extension for the LIOB only.	LIOB comments are due April 4, 2005.
Mar 10, 2005	LIOB requests an extension of time to file comments on the proposed revisions to the LIEE manuals.	Proposed revisions were filed on January 18 th and the comment period was set by ALJ Ruling dated February 11, 2005.
Feb 25, 2005	Low-Income Oversight Board teleconference meeting.	Board members discussed the new LIEE measure proposals, updates to the Policy and Procedures Manual, status of projects currently underway, Board member term limits, and upcoming opportunities for the Board to file comments with the Commission. In addition, the Board raised several issues including the upcoming Proposed Decision in R. 04-01-006, the February 11 ALJ Ruling requesting comments, the February 15 Draft Decision denying San Gabriel Valley Water Company's low-income water proposals in A.03-04-025, and Senate Bill 580, which would extend the LIOB's role to cover water and telecommunications low-income issues.
Feb 23, 2005	Notice of Co-Assignment in R.04-01-006 and Applications (A.) 04-06-038, et al.	Per the notice of the Chief Administrative Law Judge, Steve A. Weissman is the co-assigned Administrative Law Judge to this proceeding.
Feb 11, 2005	ALJ Ruling asking for comments on the Standardization Team's Manual Revisions filed January 18, 2005.	
Feb 7, 2005	SCE letter to Executive Director Larson, on behalf of the large utilities, requesting the next LIEE Impact Evaluation be conducted for PY2005 instead of PY2004.	
Jan 31, 2005	Parties filed proposal for new measures to be considered in Phase V of the Standardization Project.	There were four proposals that recommended the following new measures: High Efficiency Central Air Conditioners (AC), Central AC and Heat Pump maintenance, Duct Testing and Sealing, and bulk purchases CFLs.
Sep 17, 2004	ACR revising the due date for Energy Division's audit of PG&E's LIEE program.	Energy Division's final report is now due March 30, 2005.
Jun 22, 2004	ACR modifying due date for CARE audit.	Audit is to be completed by July 30, 2005; Energy Division's report due September 30, 2005. Comments due October 29, 2005 with replies due November 15, 2005.
Jan 8, 2004	The Commission opened R.04-01-006, a new rulemaking for post-2003 low-income programs.	R.01-08-027 and A.02-07-001, et. al., are closed.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

K. Reliable Long-Term Natural Gas Supplies (Gas Market OIR)

Proceeding No.	Commissioners	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-01-025	Peevey, Kennedy	Weissman	Morris	Loewen, Effross

What it Does

Rulemaking to establish policies to ensure reliable, low cost supplies of natural gas for California.

Next Steps

- Phase II PD to be issued soon, to address all aspects of the case, including gas quality.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 12, 2006	Rehearing request of Ratepayers for Affordable Clean Energy	D06-05-017
May 30, 2006	ALJ Malcolm ruling	Grants PG&E, SoCal, and SDG&E's motions to file under seal. Denies PG&E, SoCal, and SDG&E's motions for protective order. Denies PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCal's requests to shorten time to respond to their petitions for modification. Sets an evidentiary hearing for June 9, 2006.
May 26, 2006	TURN response to PG&E's Petition for Further Modification of Decision 04-01-047 and for Modification of Decision 05-10-015.	
May 26, 2006	DRA/PELEO/PUC response, PUBLIC VERSION; to the petition of PG&E for further modification of D04-01-047, and for modification of D05-10-015, and request for expedited treatment	
May 26, 2006	DRA/PELEO/PUC Motion to File Under Seal [unredacted version of RESPONSE attached and filed under seal].	
May 22, 2006	Ex parte filed by Shell Trading Gas & Power	On May 18, 2006, John W. Leslie, attorney for Shell Trading Gas & Power, sent a letter (attached to the notice) to Pres. Peevey. Copies of the letter were also sent to Cmmrs. Brown, Grueneich, Chong and Brown, and ALJ Weissman. The letter responded to a letter dated May 3, 2006, from Barry Wallerstein of SCAQMD to Pres. Peevey, and addressed matters related to gas quality in Phase II of this proceeding.
May 17 and 18, 2006	SDG&E and SoCal file petitions for modification of D.02-06-023, D.03-07-	SDG&E seeks expedited consideration of request for greater latitude to enter into long-term gas hedging.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	037, and D.05-10-043.	
May 11, 2006	D.06-05-017 denies RACE motion of April 1, 2005.	Determines that CEQA does not apply to the Phase 1 issues.
May 5, 2006	PG&E files petition for modification of D.04-01-047 and D.05-10-015.	PG&E seeks greater latitude to enter into long-term hedging arrangements for its gas portfolio, and expedited treatment.
March 13, 2006	ALJ rejects motion for expedited decision on transmission.	ALJ cites lack of factual basis for request.
March 8, 2006	SoCal and SDG&E file motion for expedited decision on local transmission expansion policy.	They cite need to relieve congestion on "Rainbow Corridor" via open season, and need guidance on how to do this.
December 12-18, 2005	Hearings held on gas quality issues.	The most contentious issue is what range to allow for "Wobbe Index (WI)", which indicates how much fuel energy can be delivered to an appliance or motor. SoCalGas and LNG argue for allowing high WI gas, while environmental advocates argue for lower WI.
November 22, 2005	SoCal revises its OBA proposal to reflect new engineering findings calling for less flexible delivery requirements at Otay Mesa.	Parties will file responses to SoCal's new OBA on December 2. It is possible that some parties may ask for evidentiary hearings related to the new tighter proposed requirements at Otay Mesa.
November 4, 2005	Parties files responses to the ED report on EG gas supplies.	Parties generally support ED recommendation for long-term firm capacity contracts for based-loaded generating plants.
October 6, 2005	Energy Division files report on gas supply arrangements made by electric utilities for generating plants.	ED report recommends that utilities consider entering into long-term capacity contracts for gas supplies for base-loaded generating plants.
September and October, 2005	Opening and reply briefs filed.	General consensus on current adequacy of in-state infrastructure. Divergence of opinions on generic tests for resource adequacy; on methodology for determining when receipt point-related upgrades are necessary and how to pay for them; on the terms of capacity contracts related to local transmission upgrades.
August 2005	Hearings on infrastructure adequacy	
August 16, 2005	SoCal files proposed OBA (Operational Balancing Agreement) and IA (Interconnection Agreement) standardized contracts, based on negotiations. Comments by other parties.	Issues are substantially narrowed.
August 12, 2005	PG&E, SDG&E, and SoCalGas file testimony.	The three utilities declare that they have worked collaboratively towards the adoption of more unified tariff specifications, although several key differences remain. These are said to be due to the historic differences in natural gas supply quality between northern and southern California.
June 8, 2005	Energy Division issues IOBA workshop report.	Energy Division makes some recommendations to the Commission for disposition of IOBA-related issues, and recommends further negotiations.
May 11, 2005	Workshop held on Interconnection and Operational Balancing Account (IOBA) issues.	Discussed a variety of "threshold" issues as well as contract specifics. Consensus reached on some issues.
May 2, 2005	Pre-workshop comments filed.	
April 25, 2005	Comments on Gas Quality Workshop Report.	
April 21, 2005	Assigned Commissioners and ALJ issue Revised Schedule for Phase 2	Emergency reserves and backstop are shelved for the moment. Evidentiary hearings will be held on guidelines for slack capacity. The existing State-agency Natural Gas Working Group will make a recommendation re its expansion/modifications. Parties encouraged to negotiate on PG&E's competitive storage issue. At-

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		risk ratemaking will be addressed in other proceedings.
April 5, 2005	SoCal hosted gas quality stakeholders' meeting.	Decided that the Air Emissions Advisory Committee should be expanded to include technical representatives from all groups.
April 4, 2005	Energy Division issued Gas Quality Workshop Report.	Comprehensive overview of issues. Tentative recommendation to incorporate Wobbe number in specifications. Calls for further negotiations.
Mar 23, 2005	Prehearing Conference for Phase 2 was held.	
Mar 14, 2005	Parties filed pre-PHC comments	Near-unanimous call to reject emergency reserve and backstop, while general acceptance of infrastructure review working group. Mixed views on throughput risk.
Feb 17 - 18, 2005	Joint CPUC/CEC workshop was held, on issues related to natural gas quality.	Many participants over two day forum.
Sep 2, 2004	The Commission issued D.04-09-022 on Phase I issues.	D.04-02-025 authorizes utilities to give notice to El Paso and TransWestern to relinquish interstate capacity, establishes procedures for obtaining new interstate capacity contracts, allows for designation of receipt points, rejects blanket rolled-in ratemaking treatment for LNG-associated system upgrades, and orders new applications to be filed for SoCal's firm transportation rights proposal, for proposed SoCal-SDG&E system integration, and for review of PG&E's storage operations and interstate firm capacity levels. Establishes Otay Mesa as a "dual receipt point" for SoCalGas and SDG&E.
Jan 22, 2004	The Commission opened this OIR to consider and rule upon proposals the Commission is requiring California natural gas utilities to submit, which must be aimed at ensuring reliable, long-term supplies of natural gas to California.	The Commission orders PG&E, SDG&E, SoCalGas and Southwest Gas to submit proposals addressing how California's long-term natural gas needs should be met through contracts with interstate pipelines, new Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Facilities, storage facilities and in-state production of natural gas. The Commission invites all parties to respond to these proposals, and the Commission will thereafter issue orders guiding or directing the California utilities on these matters.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

L. Community Choice Aggregation (CCA)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.03-10-003	Peevey	Malcolm		Velasquez

What it Does

- This proceeding implements Public Utilities Code sections 218.3, 331.1, 366.2, 381.1 and 394.25 which were added to the PU Code pursuant to the passing of Assembly Bill 117 – AB 117 permits cities and counties to purchase and sell electricity on behalf of utility customers in their jurisdictions after these cities and counties have registered with the Commission as “Community Choice Aggregators (CCAs).”
- This proceeding has been bifurcated as follows:

Phase I – addressed implementation, transaction costs, and customer information issues; it also set an interim cost responsibility surcharge (CRS) at 2.0 cents per kWh, which will be trued up in 18 months, or sooner, and thereafter, will be trued up annually.

Phase II – will address transition and implementation issues between the utilities and the CCAs – such as customer notice, customer protection, operational protocols, billing, metering and distribution services, reentry/switching fees, and CARE discounts – in addition to determining cost responsibility for individual CCAs, known as CRS “vintaging.”

Next Steps

- Energy Division is drafting a Resolution addressing the CCA parties’ concerns with the utilities’ CCA Implementation Advice Letters.
- The Energy Division is working on a procedural timeline that will address the necessary steps that will be taken by the CCAs, the utilities, and the CPUC in order for CCA’s to begin serving customers.
- The Executive Director will submit a CCA Registration Packet to the R. 03-10-003 service list soon.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 17, 2006	Reply Commented were filed concerning the CCA Implementation ALs	
May 5, 2006	Comments were filed concerning the CCA Implementation ALs	
March 28, 2006	The Energy Division facilitated a workshop to discuss the utilities’ CCA Advice Letter filings	The meeting enabled the parties to better understand the ALs and narrow the number of issues that remained in dispute.
February 14, 2005	The three large investor owned utilities filed their CCA implementation tariffs	The protest period, at the request of the CCA parties has been extended to 60 days.
December 15, 2005	Decision 05-12-041, “the Phase II Decision,” was approved.	This decision rules on the CCA implementation issues.
July 8, 2005	Opening Briefs filed in CCA Phase II	Parties filed opening legal briefs on July 8, 2005, addressing relevant policy implications of CCA Phase II.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

May 25, 2005	CCA Phase II hearings commenced.	Parties participated in CCA hearings, which began on May 25, 2005 and concluded on June 2, 2005.
May 2005	Reply and Rebuttal Testimony on CCA Phase II issues were filed.	Parties filed reply testimony on May 9, 2005 and rebuttal testimony on May 16, 2005.
Apr 28, 2005	Opening testimony on CCA Phase II issues was filed.	Parties filed opening testimony on April 28, 2005.
Mar 30, 2005	Pre-hearing Conference was held.	This PHC outlined which Phase II issues have come to mutual agreement amongst the parties during the workshop process, and which issues still need to be resolved in formal hearings.
Mar 2005	Workshops were held on March 3, 9, 16, 22 and 30.	Workshop topics included: Open Season procedures and policies; CRS Vintaging; Tariffs; CCA Implementation Plans; and Credits and Liability for In-kind Power. The purpose of these workshops was to determine areas of agreement and which issues still need to be resolved going forward for Phase II during May hearings.
Feb 14, 2005	Utilities filed tariffs, as ordered by D.04-12-046.	
Feb 3, 2005	An Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Scoping Memo for Phase 2 Issues was issued.	The Ruling sets the following dates for workshops. A third PHC will be held on March 30, 2005.
Jan 25, 2005	Pre-hearing conference for Phase II of the proceeding was held.	The ALJ and parties discussed scheduling. An ALJ Ruling will follow.
Dec 16, 2004	The Commission adopted D.04-12-046, resolving Phase I issues.	The order adopts a methodology for and sets the initial Cost Responsibility Surcharge (CRS) at 2.0 cents per kWh. The order also establishes ratemaking for utility CCA program costs and addresses outstanding information needs.
Jun 2 – 10, and 24, 2004	Evidentiary hearings held.	
Oct 2, 2003	Rulemaking R.03-10-003 opened.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Commission opened this OIR to implement portions of AB 117 concerning Community Choice Aggregation. • R.03-10-003 discusses the definition of a Community Choice Aggregator, utility and CCA obligations, and cost issues.
Sep 24, 2002	Assembly Bill 117 filed with Secretary of State, Chapter 838.	AB 117 requires the Commission to implement the procedure to facilitate the purchase of electricity by Community Choice Aggregators.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

M. Avoided Cost / QF Pricing Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-04-025 (Expansion of Phase 1)	Peevey	Gottstein		Lai
R.04-04-025/R.04-04-003 Phase 2 on QF issues)	Peevey	Halligan/Brown		McCartney

What it Does

1. This rulemaking serves as the Commission's forum for developing a common methodology, consistent input assumptions, and updating procedures for avoided costs across the Commission's various proceedings, and for adopting avoided cost calculations and forecasts that conform to those determinations.
2. It is the forum for considering similarities as well as differences in methods and inputs for specific applications of avoided costs, including QF avoided cost pricing.

Next Steps

- **R.04-04-025/R.04-04-003: Draft decision expected in Phase 2 in late May 2006.**
- **Address PG&E/IEP Settlement described below as filed on April 18, 2006.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 18, 2006	Comments due on settlement	Reply comments due June 2
Apr 18, 2006	PG&E/IEP filed a Settlement on addressing issues in R.04-04-025, R.04-04-003, and R.99-11-022.	If unapproved by Sept 1, parties are no longer bound by the settlement. Settlement addresses SRAC and other cost factors and expiring contracts
Mar 2006	D.06-03-017 denied rehearing in D.05-04-024.	
Dec 1, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-12-009, and rehearing was denied in D.06-03-017.	This continues the interim relief as provided in D.04-01-050 for Qualifying Facilities with expired or expiring contracts from January 1, 2006, until the Commission issues a final decision in the combined two dockets, R.04-04-003 and R.04-04-025.
Apr 7, 2005	The Commission adopted D.05-04-024.	It addressed the use of the E3 Avoided Cost Methodology in the Energy Efficiency 2006-2008 Program Cycle.
Mar 18, 2005	Draft Interim Opinion on E3's Avoided Cost Methodology.	This Phase 1 draft decision proposes to adopt the E3 Avoided Cost Methodology for use in energy efficiency program planning.
Feb 18, 2005	Assigned Commissioner's Ruling and Scoping Memo issued.	Consolidates R.04-04-003 and R.04-04-025 for the limited purpose of joint evidentiary hearings on policy and pricing of QFs.
Jan 27, 2005	Law & Motion Hearing was held.	Consider resolution of outstanding QF data requests to the utilities. QFs have requested confidential IOU data with which to calculate Incremental Energy Rates (IER) using production cost models with QFs-in and QFs-out, as was previously done in annual ECAC (Energy Cost Adjustment Clause) proceedings in the first half of the

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		1990's under the Index SRAC Formula, which was in use prior to the Transition SRAC Formula which has been in use since January 1997.
Jan 24, 2005	Joint Pre-hearing conference was held for R.04-04-025 and R.04-04-003.	Primary purpose was to (1) coordinate consideration of QF pricing issues in R.04-04-025 with long-term policy issues for expiring QF contracts in R.04-04-003, and (2) discuss outstanding QF data requests to the utilities.
Jan 21, 2005	Joint Ruling in R.04-04-025 and R.99-11-022.	Joint ruling on Short Run Avoided Cost Pricing for QFs. All comments, briefs, etc. submitted on the remanded issue and PG&E's petition for modification of D01-03-067, filed 12/15/04, will remain in R.99-11-022. Moves SRAC pricing issues into R.04-04-025.
Jan 13, 2005	Ruling in R.04-04-025.	Addresses motions to compel filed by the IEPA (dated January 4, 2005) and CAC/EPUC (dated December 9, 2004). Directs parties to convene and come to terms on the QF data requests to the utilities.
Oct 25, 2004	E3 Report Finalized.	The E3 report on avoided cost has been finalized (with a new title), " <i>Methodology And Forecast Of Long Term Avoided Costs For The Evaluation Of California Energy Efficiency Programs.</i> " The final report, and updated spreadsheet models, can be downloaded directly from the E3 website at www.ethree.com/cpuc_avoidedcosts.html . The pre- and post-workshop comments on the E3 report are posted on the E3 website.
Apr 22, 2004	Order Instituting Rulemaking issued.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

N. Gain on Sale Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-09-003	Brown	Thomas		Fulcher

What it Does

This Rulemaking develops policies and guidelines for use by the Commission when it allocates the gain from the sale of a utility asset. These policies and guidelines will apply to the sale of energy, telecommunications, and water utility assets.

Next Steps

- **D.06-05-041** voted out May 25, 2006. Dissent by Commissioners Peevey and Grueneich mailed June 13, 2006. Joint Petition for rehearing filed by DRA and TURN on June 29, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 29, 2006	Joint Petition for Rehearing filed by DRA and TURN.	Alleges that 50%-50% allocation inconsistent with the reasoning in the text of the Decision.
May 25, 2006	Modified PD voted out as D.06-05-041.	Allocates gains 50%-50%. Commissioners Peevey and Grueneich dissent, saying that 50% to shareholders is excessive.
Mar 2006	Alternate Decision issued by Commissioner Chong.	Primary issue is whether gains are to be shared 50%-50% (alternate) or 66% to ratepayers (ALJ DD).
Nov 2005	ALJ Proposed Decision issued.	
Oct 19, 2004	Reply comments were filed.	Comments and replies are being reviewed by ALJ and staff.
Oct 4, 2004	Comments were filed.	
Sep 2, 2004	Commission issued R.04-09-003.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission establishes the burden of financial risk as the primary determinant of the allocation of the gain from the sale of a utility asset. It proposes eight guidelines to be followed when these allocations are made. It anticipates that the "typical" case will allocate 20% of the gain to shareholders, and 80% of the gain to ratepayers. • The Rulemaking also proposes a review and clarification of P.U. Code § 789, et seq. It also promulgates rules for the enforcement of P.U. Code § 455.5.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

O. Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) Rulemaking

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.04-08-020	Peevey	DeBerry	Nataloni	Lewis

What it Does

This Rulemaking discusses existing scientific research on electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and the findings of a Department of Health Services Report released in 2002. Rulemaking 04-08-020 states that given the continued scientific uncertainty associated with EMFs, the Commission will continue its existing EMF mitigation policy of Prudent Avoidance. R.04-08-020 will also consider three issues:

1. The results of the Commission's current "low-cost/no cost" mitigation policy and the need for modifications.
2. Explore improvement in the implementation of the existing "low cost/no cost" mitigation policy.
3. As new EMF related scientific data becomes available, new or revised Commission EMF mitigation policies.

Next Steps

- D.06-01-042 issued January 26, 2006. This proceeding is closed.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 26, 2006	D.06-01-042 issued.	Decision orders workshops for the three major electric utilities to review and modify their design guidelines for the reduction of EMF.
Jan 28, 2005	Reply comments were submitted.	
Dec 31, 2004	Comments were submitted.	
Aug 24, 2004	Rulemaking was adopted.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

P. Holding Companies and Affiliate Relationships

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.05-10-030	Brown	Vieth	Morris	Fulcher

What it Does

This Rulemaking re-examines the relationships of the major energy utilities with their parent holding companies and affiliates. The rules governing these relationships, such as the various holding company conditions and the Affiliate Transactions Rules, and other applicable rules, will be reviewed.

Next Steps

- Amended OIR voted out by Commission at June 29, 2006 meeting.
- Schedule:
 1. Review comments on OIR, due by July 27.
 2. Issue draft rules by August 25.
 3. Hold workshop September 21.
 4. Issue DD October 10.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 29, 2006	Amended OIR voted out by Commission.	
June 26, 2006	Amended OIR issued by ALJ	Discusses problems and potential affiliate transaction rule revisions, and calls for comment and alternative solutions. Slated for June 29, 2006 Commission meeting.
Nov 30, 2005	Comments on Rulemaking filed by parties.	
Oct 27, 2005	Rulemaking issued by Commission.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

IV. TRANSMISSION PROCEEDINGS

A. *Transmission OII*

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
I.00-11-001	Peevey	TerKeurst		Schumacher

What it Does

1. Examined transmission system needs throughout California, including consideration of transmission needs stemming from proposals associated with renewable sources and with other electric procurement.
2. Phases 1 through 8 are complete or subsumed in other proceedings.

Next Steps

- Proceeding to close in near future following decision modifying frequency of transmission project status reports now required monthly.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

B. *Mission-Miguel*

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.02-07-022		Malcolm		Uchida

What it Does

The Commission granted a CPCN for the Mission-Miguel 230kV Transmission Line.

Next Steps

- Construction Mitigation Monitoring continues toward a scheduled end of summer 2006 completion.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 30, 2006	CEQA contract was extended beyond June 30, 2006 due to delays in the project.	Contractor Aspen reports estimated project completion in 2 to 3 months.
June 30, 2005	Commission approved Otay Mesa 230kV line from Miguel to Sycamore and Miguel to Old Town that included a	The second 230kV circuit on a vacant position of the proposed 230kV tower was reviewed and analyzed under the Mission-Miguel #2 Project EIR, but the CPCN approval occurred under the Otay

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	second circuit 230kV line on vacant position of 230kV tower approved under Mission-Miguel #2.	Mesa Project.
Mar 24, 2005	SDG&E sent letter to Energy Division director.	SDG&E stated that it plans to bring the temporary 230kV line into service two months ahead of schedule, i.e., in July instead of September 2005.
Mar 2005	Construction in progress and Mitigation Monitoring started.	Two mitigation variances on work hours due to bad weather were approved in March 2005.
Dec 16, 2004	Commission approved SDG&E's Petition to Modify D-04-07-026 for a temporary upgrade of a 69 kV line to 230 kV.	The temporary upgrade of 69kV line to 230kV starts from summer 2005 until new 230kV line is energized in 2006.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

C. Otay-Mesa

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-03-008	Peevey	Brown	Nataloni	Elliott, Blanchard

What it Does

The Commission granted a CPCN for the Otay Mesa Power Purchase Agreement Transmission Line Project.

Next Steps

- Construction and mitigation monitoring is now underway.
- Project under construction for an estimated June 2007 completion.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 30, 2005	Commission approved Otay Mesa Project Decision 05-06-061	Project CPCN approved as proposed with design alternatives but not overhead single pole option.
May 27, 2005	ALJ issued proposed decision.	
May 20, 2005	Final EIR and Response to Comments were issued.	
Apr 16, 2005	Draft Environmental Impact Report comments were submitted.	
Mar 15, 2005	Public workshops held on DEIR.	
Mar 3, 2005	DEIR released for 45-day public review.	
Jan 21, 2005	Scoping memo issued by ALJ.	
Sep 29, 2004	Scoping Report released.	
Aug 3 – 4, 2004	Scoping meetings for EIR preparation were held in San Diego.	30-day scoping period from July 23 to August 23, 2004.
Jul 20, 2004	Application deemed complete by Energy Division staff.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

May 13, 2004	Energy Division selected contractor for environmental document preparation.	
Mar 8, 2004	SDG&E file a new CPCN for a 230 kV line from Miguel-Sycamore and Miguel-Old Town.	This project was identified in November 2003 as Miguel-Mission 3, but applicant will terminate the 230 kV UG portion at "Old Town substation instead of Mission. There will be a new 230 kV circuit in the Miguel-Mission Right of Way reviewed under Miguel-Mission #2 EIR.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

D. Antelope-Pardee (Tehachapi Phase 1: SCE Segment 1 of 3)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-12-007	Grueneich	Halligan	Chaset	Boccio

What it Does

The Commission will decide whether to grant a CPCN for the Antelope-Pardee 500 kV Transmission Line Project.

Next Steps

- Draft EIR/EIS anticipated release for public and agencies comment is July 2006.
- Anticipated release of final Draft EIR/EIS for Commission certification is October 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 23, 2006	Meeting with US Forest Service and BLM	BLM indicates it will comment but probably not be an official party to the EIR/EIS, and USFS indicates that it need not identify a preferred route in the Draft EIR/EIS.
Mar 6, 2006	Development of the Administrative Draft EIR/EIS	Initial draft EIR/EIS was filed on March 24, 2006.
Dec 9, 2005	Alternative Screening meeting	The number of Alternatives to be studied in the document will be reduced to those that are feasible. As discussed in the comment below the possible Alternatives range form routes crossing the Forest, including partial undergrounding, to non-forest routes that connect Antelope substation to Vincent substation.
Aug 22, 2005	Meeting held on analysis of alternatives.	Intensive alternative route analysis is underway, of routes crossing and circumventing the National Forest. Connecting Antelope to Vincent instead of Pardee is one alternative being considered.
July 14, 2005	Scoping meeting	
June 29, 2005	Scoping meeting	
	Begin analysis of alternative routes	
	Begin field studies	
Mar 21, 2005	Contract sent to consultant for signature.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Feb 28, 2005	CEQA consultant selected.	
Feb 1, 2005	CEQA consultants interviewed.	
Dec 15, 2004	RFQ issued for CEQA consultants.	
Dec 9, 2004	SCE filed a CPCN for the Antelope-Pardee 500 kV line project for the PPM Wind Farm development	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

E. Antelope-Vincent and Tehachapi-Antelope 500 kV Line (Tehachapi Phase 1: SCE Segments 2 and 3)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A 04-12-008	Grueneich	Halligan	Chaset	Barnsdale

What it Does

The Commission will decide whether to grant a CPCN for **segment 2 and 3 of the** Antelope Transmission Line Project for Tehachapi Wind Farm development.

Next Steps

- **An Administrative Draft version of the EIR is in preparation. The estimated completion date is July 26, 2006.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 27, 2006	Contractor Aspen has completed draft versions of Section A (Introduction) and Section B (Description of Proposed Project).	
May 9 and 10, 2006	Public scoping meetings held in Rosamond and Palmdale.	
Apr 27, 2006	Notice of Participation (NOP) issued for the 30 day scoping comment period.	Apr 27 – May 27, 2006
Mar 2006	Contractor selected.	
Mar 7-8, 2006	Contractor interviews completed.	
Jan 2006	RFQ issued.	
Sep 2005	PEA completed.	
Mar 2005	The staff is preparing the RFQ for a CEQA consultant.	
Dec 9, 2004	Application filed.	PEA deferred.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

F. Devers-Palo Verde #2 Transmission Project

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A 05-04-015	Grueneich	TerKeurst	Nataloni/Lee	Blanchard

What it Does

The commission will decide whether to grant a CPCN for the Devers-Palo Verde #2 transmission project.

Next Steps

- Additional workshop and PPH to be held on July 24, 2006 in Beaumont, CA.
- Response to comments and finalize EIR/EIS during July and August, 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 7 & 8 2006	PPHs held with workshop	
June 6,7,&8 2006	CEQA & NEPA workshops held	
May 4 to Aug 11, 2006	DEIR/EIS released to the public for a comment period.	
Jan. 20, 2006	NEPA NOI 30 day scoping period ended	Addendum scoping report released to the public
Jan 18 & 19 2006	Held 3 NEPA NOI scoping meetings in Arizona	
Nov 28, 2005	CEQA NOP scoping period ended	Scoping report released to the public
Nov. 1,2,3, 2005	CPUC held Scoping meetings in Blythe, Beaumont, and Palm Desert for the 30 day NOP Scoping period.	
Sept. 30, 2005	Application deemed complete	
Sept. 27, 2005	ALJ sends out Ruling addressing schedule and other procedural matters	
August 26, 2005	Scoping Memo sent to service list for A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	
Aug. 25, 2005	CPUC sends 3 rd completeness letter to SCE	
July 25, 2005	CPUC sends second deficiency letter to SCE	
July 20, 2005	Joint Pre-Hearing Conference held on A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	
July 12, 2005	SCE submitted Responses to CPUC deficiency comments	
May 11, 2005	CPUC submitted deficiency comments to SCE on PEA	
Apr 11, 2005	Application was filed at Commission.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

G. Sunrise PowerLink Project

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-12-014	Grueneich	Malcolm	Sher	Blanchard, Elliott

What it Does

The commission will decide whether to grant a CPCN for the Sunrise Powerlink project.

Next Steps

- SDG&E will submit PEA in late July 2006 and potential application modifications.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 21, 2006	Robert Elliott of ED assigned as overall Project Manager, with Billie Blanchard continuing as PM for all CEQA aspects.	PM is responsible to alert participants if critical schedule delays appear and to pursue solutions. CPCN expected July 2006.
June 20, 2006	SDG&E submitted status on Sunrise per ACR	
May 5, 2006	During the STEP Meeting, SDG&E and HD announced a signed MOU on collaboration of the Sunrise Power Link and Green Path 500kV Line Projects in San Diego.	The MOU promotes a collaborative effort among competing projects to link Salton Sea geothermal and other Imperial Valley renewable energy sources to the San Diego area.
Apr 7, 2006	Ruling of Assigned Commissioner and ALJ denying motion of SDG&E and setting further procedural steps.	
Mar 7, 2006	Contractor selected for CEQA process.	
Feb. 11, 2006	Commissioner issued Ruling on questions to SDG&E and Parties due Feb.24	
Jan 31, 2006	PHC held in Ramona	
Dec. 14, 2005	Application filed with CPUC	No PEA was filed with Application SDG&E requested deferral to submit in July 2006

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

H. Economic Assessment Methodology (T.E.A.M.) OII

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
I. 05-06-041	Grueneich	TerKeurst		White

What it Does

The Commission will decide what methods are appropriate to determine the economic benefits of a proposed transmission project.

Next Steps

Draft Decision anticipated June 2006.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Oct 28, 2005	Ruling in A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	No issues resolved by Sep Workshop; Ph 1 hearings to address all issues raised to date.
Sep 26, 2005	Ruling in A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	Modified schedule: Phase I Comments due Oct 6; Ph I CAISO testimony due Oct 21; SCE to submit detailed costs of DPV2 as part of supplemental direct testimony in Ph2.
Sep 14-15, 2005	Joint Workshop held in A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	
August 26, 2005	Scoping Memo sent to service list for A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	General inquiry is enhanced by applying principles to the DPV2 project. Workshop report 9-29-05 followed by ALJ Ruling 10-27-05 on scope of hearings. Phase 1 Hearings set for January 2006 (Phase 2 hearings to be exclusively on DPV2 issues). Decision set for June 2006.
July 20, 2005	Joint Pre-Hearing Conference held on A05-04-015 & OII 05-06-041	
June 30, 2005	Proceeding opened	Coordinated with A05-04-015 Devers-PV2, to take evidence addressing methodologies for assessment of the economic benefits of transmission projects.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

I. Renewable Transmission OII

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
I. 05-09-005	Grueneich	Halligan		White; Blanchard

What it Does

This OII takes proactive steps to ensure the development of adequate transmission infrastructure to access renewable resources for California. It will examine and modify the Commission's transmission processes as they relate to renewable energy development, building on the progress made in OII 00-11-001 and OIR 04-04-026.

Next Steps

- Finalize and announce outcome of investigation and steps re: streamlining the CEQA/permitting process.
- Request updated reports from IOUs on "low hanging fruit" transmission to accommodate renewables.
- Pursue ways to support policies on temporary/early interconnection and congestion management that enhance transmission access by renewables, using the record from this proceeding.
- Investigate and help expedite specific projects' temporary/early interconnection.
- Request updated status report on full timelines for alternative Tehachapi transmission plans.
- Integrate into this proceeding information being developed on the status/viability of RPS projects.
- Encourage LTP Phase 2 to include transmission scenario reflecting latest transmission plan for renewables.
- Seek parties' comments on if/how TRCRs should be changed, and what else should be pursued in this proceeding.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 15, 2006	Decision 06-06-034. Interim Opinion on Procedures to Implement the Cost recovery Provisions of P.U.C. § 399.25	Modifies finding in D.03-07-033 by finding that provisions of PUC §399.25 apply to both network and "high-voltage gen-tie" facilities deemed necessary to facilitate the achievement of RPS goals, and also states that a finding of network benefits is not a prerequisite to provision of backstop cost recovery under PUC §399.25. Furthermore, transmission projects should be considered eligible for such backstop cost recovery if they (1) consist of new high-voltage, bulk-transfer facilities, network or gen-tie, designed to serve multiple RPS-eligible generators where it has been established that the amount of added transmission capacity will likely be utilized by RPS-eligible generation to meet the state-mandated RPS goal, or (2) transmission network upgrades required to connect an RPS-eligible resource that has an approved RPS-eligible power purchase contract. Utilities are encouraged to upfront-fund transmission for renewables, but generators retain ultimate cost responsibility for gen-ties. Utility transmission projects below CPCN/PTC level may be eligible via application and justification. Where appropriate, renewables-transmission costs recovered via retail rates under §399.25 are recovered from all CPUC-jurisdictional ratepayers.
May 22, 2006	Reply comments	Reply comments submitted only by CEERT, SDG&E.
May 15, 2006	Opening comments on Draft Decision	Most extensive comments came from joint parties (CAISO, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E).

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

April 25, 2006	Draft Decision of ALJ Halligan (see above Final Decision)	The draft decision modifies a prior finding in D.03-07-033 (see above Final Decision).
April 21, 2006	Workshop Report released to the service list	The workshop report summarizes Parties' November-December comments, ED staff's responses to those comments (concurring and disagreeing), workshop participants' comments (by subject and by commenter), and "next steps" identified at the conclusion of workshop, including upcoming reports to Commr. Grueneich and to Assembly Speaker Nunez's staff, preparation of an implementation plan, and a potential follow-up workshop in the fall.
March 23, 2006	Workshop held on transmission streamlining the permitting process	The workshop agenda included introduction/purpose, overview of existing permitting process, ED staff responses to Parties' November (filed) and December workshop comments, ED-identified permitting issues, comments and presentations from parties, and an outline of next steps. Several parties filed additional written comments prior to the workshop.
Mar 1, 2006	All-party meeting	Update and parties' short statements regarding cost recovery; summary of the status of the Commission's internal review and planned workshop regarding transmission permitting streamlining; summary of IOU reports on transmission problems of contacted RPS projects and prospects for future "low-hanging fruit" RPS projects requiring little transmission development; update on status of TCSG and its upcoming report to the Commission.
Feb 17, 2006	Reply briefs filed	
Jan 27, 2006	Opening briefs on cost recovery	Parties filed opening briefs on transmission cost recovery pursuant to P.U. Code Sec. 399.25
Jan 25, 2006	Transmission status reports	PG&E, SCE and SDG&E filed reports on the status of transmission for contracted RPS projects and prospects for future "low-hanging fruit" RPS projects requiring limited or no transmission development.
Dec 21, 2005	Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling	Identified top priority issues are (1) cost recovery issues raised by P.U. Code Sec. 399.25; (2) streamlining the Commission's transmission permitting process where possible; (3) coordinating RPS procurement with transmission planning generally; and (4) identifying "low-hanging fruit," or transmission infrastructure investments by the IOUs that do not require Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) or Permit to Construct (PTC) review by the Commission, and which would facilitate renewable resource development without large-scale, long-term transmission upgrades. Established schedules (see Next Steps, above).
Dec 6-7, 2005	Workshop held	Workshop to discuss what should be the top priority issues. Summaries of TCSG and Imperial Valley SG status.
Nov 21, 2005	Ruling	Workshops set: Dec 6, 2005 for top priority issues; Dec 7 for Study Group reports.
Nov 21, 2005	Ruling	Comments due Nov 28 on changing category from ratesetting to quasi-legislative.
Nov 7, 2005	PHC held	All-Party Mtg also held the hour beforehand to accommodate Commr's schedule.
Oct 18, 2005	Ruling setting PHC	PreHearing Conference to be held Nov 7, 2005.
Sep 8, 2005	Proceeding opened	SDG&E to file the Imperial Valley Study Group IVSG Report Oct 1, 2005. SCE to file the Tehachapi Collaborative SG Report #2 on March 1, 2006.
Tehachapi Wind Power Project (issue transferred from Phase 6 of the Transmission OIL.00-11-001)		
Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 15, 2006	Tom Flynn appointed Tehachapi overall Project Manager.	Responsible to alert participants if critical schedule delays appear and to pursue solution.
May 15, 2006	ED circulates re-published TCSG Report #2 to service list	Reflects substantial refinement for appearance, consistency, and readability. Contents virtually identical to April 19, 2006 SCE filing including minor errata because it remains an unchanged product of the Collaborative.
Apr 19, 2006	SCE Files TCSG Report #2 on behalf of the Tehachapi Collaborative	Recommendations include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Further study by the CAISO of Phases 3 and 4

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A CPUC decision regarding P.U. Code §399.25 by May 2006 ensuring utility recovery of all Tehachapi transmission investment ○ CPUC to streamline transmission permitting process ○ Establish a Tehachapi Power Project manager ○ CPUC to take aggressive action now to complete Phases 1 and 2
Apr 6-7, 2006	All-TCSG Meeting	Review revisions, resolve comments and finalize Draft Chapters of TCSG Report #2.
Apr 6, 2006	Ruling	Grants TCSG extension to April 19, 2006 to file Second Report.
Mar 13, 2006	Meeting of TCSG	Continued to develop theme structure and contents of TCSG Second Report; decision made to request extension of due date to mid-April, 2006.
Mar 13, 2006	Energy Division recommendation	The Energy Division released to the service list its recommendations on streamlining the transmission permitting process. Steps not requiring changes to requirements and procedures involved efficient identification of exempt projects, and the timelines and responsibilities of different parties in the permitting process (CPUC/ED staff, Utility/applicant, ALJ). Steps possibly requiring changes to requirements and procedures involved contracting for the CEQA work, and internal staffing.
Mar 1, 2006	All-TCSG meeting	Status of Tehachapi Collaborative and 2 nd Report reflected the TCSG letter to Commissioner Grueneich.
Feb 16, 2006	TCSG letter to Commissioner Grueneich	Requests 5 week extension of due date of TCSG Second Report; letter recommends deferring the TCSG second report filing date to April 7, 2006; report recommendations will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 and 2 facilities be authorized and constructed as quickly as possible; • All studies be completed for Phases 2 and 3 (approx. 3000MW); • Phase 3 construction not be authorized yet because Phase 4 alternatives including a new line between Tehachapi and Midway may be preferable; • The collaborative transmission planning process should be transferred to the CAISO because resolution of grid operations and cost recovery issues require CAISO input.
Feb 13, 2006	Meeting of TCSG	
Jan 26, 2006	Meeting of TCSG	
Dec 19, 2005	Meeting of TCSG	
Nov 30, 2005	Meeting of TCSG	
Nov 2, 2005	Meeting of TCSG	Extensive notes on continuing studies to identify Alternative to Recommend – see Schumacher or Elliott for details.
Sep 30, 2005	Imperial Valley Study Group Report issued.	
Sep 19, 2005	Meeting of Tehachapi Collaborative Study Group.	Edison results still needed for maximum power through Fresno Tie. PG&E to provide UPFC costs for Tie and do N-1;-2 studies of Alternatives with lowest ISO production cost runs. ISO to make two additional runs; provide historical flows on P15 and P26.
Aug 15, 2005	Meeting of Tehachapi Collaborative Study Group.	Continue Fresno tie studies to 1200 MW flow. ISO to advise on Fresno tie assumptions and add a case for a Tehachapi-Midway line.
July 1, 2005	FERC ruled on Edison's Petition	Segments 1 and 2: Granted rolled-in rate treatment; Deferred an advance prudence determination; Allowed recovery of all prudent

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		costs in case of abandonment; and for Segment 3: Denied all SCE's requests including rate roll-in.
June 28, 2005	Meeting of Tehachapi Collaborative Study Group	Agreement to add CAISO study simulations of significant wind generation with little transmission upgrade to Study Plan #2.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

V. OTHER ISSUES

A. Qualifying Facilities (QFs)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judges (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
R.99-11-022	Peevey	DeBerry		McCartney
R.04-04-003 consolidated with R.04-04-025 on QF issues. See Avoided Cost/QF Pricing in Roadmap.	Peevey	Wetzell, Brown, Gottstein		McCartney

What it Does

- R.99-11-022:** Address the issue remanded by the September 2002 LA Court of Appeals order: The Commission must determine whether "SRAC prices [were or were not] correct for the period of December 2000 through March of 2001." QFs contend that prices were correct during the remand period and no retroactive adjustments are necessary. However, the utilities and two consumer groups contend that QFs were overpaid during the remand period, based on FERC's revised market prices.
- R.04-04-003:** Formulate long-term QF policy in the procurement rulemaking.
- R.04-04-025:** Formulate QF pricing policies and "...promote consistency in methodology and input assumptions in Commission applications of short-run and long-run avoided costs...." **R.04-04-003 and R.04-04-025 are now consolidated.**

Next Steps

- R.99-11-022:** Review PG&E/IEP Settlement described in Avoided Cost / QF Pricing in Roadmap.
- Some Switcher and Remand issues will still remain, even if the settlement is approved.
- QF Switcher Issues: opening briefs are due 15 calendar days after the Commission approves or denies approval of the PG&E/IEP Settlement Agreement and Amendments, and reply briefs are due 10 days after opening briefs.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Apr 18, 2006	PG&E/IEP filed a Settlement on addressing issues in R.04-04-025, R.04-04-003, and R.99-11-022. SEE DESCRIPTION IN AVOIDED COST / QF PRICING IN ROADMAP.	As filed, the settlement was with 41 QFs in PG&E's territory, but other QFs have since joined. Other IOUs are unlikely to join in because some issues have been previously settled (SCE), or some items are not at issue (SDG&E). There are two five-year pricing options, a variable option for cogen QFs, and a fixed-price option for renewable QFs.
Apr 4, 2005	LA Court of Appeals Decision, B177138.	Upholds CPUC decisions.
Jan 21, 2005	Joint Ruling in R.04-04-025 and R.99-11-022.	Joint ruling on Short Run Avoided Cost Pricing for QFs. All comments, briefs, etc. submitted on the remanded issue and PG&E's petition for modification of D01-03-067, filed 12/15/04, will remain in R.99-11-022. Moves SRAC pricing issues into R.04-04-025.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

Jan 21, 2005	Joint Ruling in R.04-04-025 and R.99-11-022.	Joint ruling on Short Run Avoided Cost Pricing for QFs. All comments, briefs, etc. submitted on the remanded issue and PG&E's petition for modification of D01-03-067, filed 12/15/04, will remain in R.99-11-022. Moves SRAC pricing issues into R.04-04-025.
Dec 8, 2004	Comments on Proposals re: Long-Term Policy for Expiring QF Contracts in R.04-04-003.	Twelve sets of Comments were filed on the Nov 10, 2004 proposals: CAC/EPUC, CBEA/CalWEA, CCC, County of Los Angeles, GPI, IEP, ORA, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and TURN.
Nov 10, 2004	Proposals filed re policy on Long-Term Policy for Expiring QF Contracts, in R.04-04-003.	Proposals filed on long-term policy options for expiring QF contracts. Ten sets of proposals were filed by CAC/EPUC, CAISO, CBEA/CLGC, CCC, County of Los Angeles, Modesto Irrigation District, ORA, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E.
Aug 11, 2004	SCE appeals QF issues in these R.01-10-024 decisions: D.03-12-062, D.04-01-050, D.04-07-037.	SCE is seeking review of Commission decisions D.03-12-062, D.04-01-050, and D.04-07-037 on the grounds that the Commission unlawfully ordered SCE to extend certain QF contracts by entering into SO1 contracts at current SRAC prices. SCE contends that the Commission cannot and should not order such extensions without first determining that prices do not exceed avoided cost. Case No. B177138. CPUC Legal Division is active in this court case. This is the second appeals case filed by SCE in the LA Court of Appeals on QF issues in the last two years. The previous case, in filed in 2002, concerned QF pricing during the 2000-2001 energy crisis.
Jul 29, 2004	CCC filed response to PG&E, SCE and SDG&E's filings, in R.99-11-022.	CCC contends that the IOUs did not present an accurate picture of energy prices during the subject period. Filings are under review. ALJ will determine next steps.
Jul 15, 2004	CCC request to comment, in R.99-11-022.	CCC requested an opportunity to comment on the July 6 th and 13 th utility filings and ALJ granted.
Jun 23, 2004	ALJ Ruling issued, in R.99-11-022.	The "ruling directs energy utilities to provide the actual purchased energy costs for the period December 2000 though April 2001, a period that includes the Remand Period."
Apr 22, 2004	R.04-04-025 issued by the Commission.	"Order Instituting Rulemaking to Promote Consistency in Methodology and Input Assumptions in Commission Applications of Short-run and Long-run Avoided Costs, Including Pricing for Qualifying Facilities." For detailed next steps in R.04-04-025, see the "Avoided Cost / QF Pricing Rulemaking" section of this Energy Roadmap document.
Mar 17, 2004	In R.99-11-022, reply comments were submitted regarding SRAC prices paid.	PG&E, SCE, and San Diego were directed to provide average monthly purchased energy prices paid for December 2000, January 2001, February 2001, March 2001, and April 2001.
Feb 17, 2004	In R.99-11-022, comments were submitted.	PG&E/ORA/TURN (Jointly), CAC, CalWEA, CCC, IEP, and SCE filed comments regarding SRAC prices paid during the remand period of December 2000 through March 2001.
Jan 22, 2004	D.04-01-050 issued in the procurement rulemaking, R.01-10-024.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing QFs have three contracting options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ voluntary QF participation in utility competitive bidding processes; ➤ renegotiation by the QF and the utility on a case-by-case basis of contract terms; and ➤ five-year SO1 contracts with the understanding that appropriate revisions by the Commission to the QF pricing methodology will flow through to the renewed contracts. • New QFs may seek to negotiate contracts with utilities under the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ voluntary QF participation in utility competitive bidding processes; ➤ renegotiation by the QF and the utility on a case-by-case basis of contract terms that explicitly take into account the utility's actual power needs, and that do not require the utility to take or pay for

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		power that it does not need.
Nov 7, 2003	Prehearing conference held on LA Court of Appeals order, in R.99-11-022.	At the PHC, ALJ DeBerry called for Comments to be filed on February 2, 2004, and Reply Comments on March 2, 2004 to address the issue of whether "SRAC prices were correct for the period of December 2000 through March of 2001." QFs contend they were underpaid during this remand period because IER and O&M Adder values in the SRAC formula were too low relative to these corresponding market values as determined by FERC.
Sep 4, 2002	The Second LA Court of Appeals issued a decision ¹ in B155748, et.al.	The decision held that, PUC "Decision Nos. 01-03-067, 01-12-028 and 02-02-028 are affirmed except to the extent that the Commission declined [failed] to consider whether the SRAC should be applied retroactively [to the December 2000 through March 2001 period]. That portion of those Decisions is annulled. The matter is remanded back to the Commission for proceedings consistent with this opinion." Petitions for review were denied November 26, 2002. ALJ DeBerry is drafting a ruling on the remand.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

B. Border Price Spike Investigation (Border Price OII)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
I.02-11-040		TerKeurst, Thomas		Loewen

What it Does

1. Determine whether utilities' actions were responsible for natural gas price spikes at the California border during 2000-2001.
2. This investigation is divided into two phases—the first phase will address actions by the Sempra utilities (SDG&E and SoCalGas) and their unregulated affiliates. The first phase is further divided – Phase IA deals with the regulated Sempra utilities and Phase IB deals with unregulated Sempra utilities. If the second phase ever occurs, it will investigate actions by non-Sempra Utilities.

Next Steps

- Awaiting final disposition of Phase IA (Sempra regulated utilities), which is not yet completed despite the December 16, 2004 vote rejecting the proposed decision.
- **Awaiting filing of settlement promised by major parties, scheduled for July 14, 2006.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 12, 2006	ALJ issues ruling staying proceeding.	Deadlines for filing testimony (June 13) and for hearings (Aug 1-11) are deferred pending further action by the Commission.
June 2, 2006	SoCalGas, SDG&E, and SCE file	Filers explain they will soon be filing a settlement with the

¹ Remand Order: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/opinions/archive/B155748.DOC>
<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/opinions/archive/B155748.PDF>.

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	motion to stay, joined by Sempra Energy on June 5.	Commission completely resolving all issues in this case, as well as in several other proceedings.
November 3, 2005	SCE files testimony in Phase IB.	Claims SDG&E inappropriately signed transportation deal with Baja affiliate which resulted in lost service to SDG&E customers in 2000-01.
September 1, 2005	Sempra Energy files testimony in Phase IB.	Claims its Energy Risk Management department did not create incentives for SoCal and SDG&E to affect border prices. Claims there was no inappropriate information exchange between regulated and unregulated affiliates.
Dec 16, 2004	The Commission voted down the proposed decision.	Some commissioners found no evidence of utility wrong-doing. No alternate was voted on.
Nov 16, 2004	ALJ filed a proposed decision (PD) finding SoCalGas guilty of wrong-doing.	The PD stated that the company knowingly and deliberately made excessive Hub loans in summer 2000 for repayment in December 2000 to spike the gas market in the latter month. Combined with hedges the company entered into, this allowed the utility to make illicit profits.
Sep 30, 2004	Sempra Energy Trading filed Complaint in Northern California District, US Court against the PUC.	The Complaint basically seeks to prevent discovery in I.02-11-040 directed to Sempra Energy Trading.
Aug 13, 2004	Opening briefs were filed.	SCE argues that SoCal possessed market power and abused it, to benefit its shareholders. SoCal argues that its behavior during the subject period was legal, sanctioned, and exemplary. ORA sides with SoCal, finding all of its actions reasonable and benefiting core customers. PG&E argues that its commodity PBR mechanism is superior to SoCal's commodity PBR mechanism, but does not claim that faults with the mechanism led SoCal to perverse outcomes.
Jun 28 – Jul 16, 2004	Phase IA hearings for Sempra utilities were held.	
Mar 10, 2004	ALJ Ruling bifurcates Phase I between regulated utilities and utilities' unregulated affiliates.	
Dec 10, 2003	SCE submitted testimony.	Testimony asserts that SCG had a role in causing 2000-2001 price spikes.
Oct 1, 2003	SoCalGas and SDG&E filed additional testimony analyzing the impact of SoCalGas' Cost Incentive Mechanism and SDG&E's Gas PBR, and comparing these to PG&E's Core Procurement Incentive Mechanism.	The testimony concluded that the mechanisms were substantially similar, and also concluded that differences in actions and results between northern and southern California were mostly due to differences in "core assets", i.e., pipeline and storage capacity.
Jun 11, 2003	Initial testimony submitted.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

C. Sempra Affiliate Investigation

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
I.03-02-033	Brown	TerKeurst	Edson	Fulcher

What it Does

1. This proceeding investigates whether Sempra's utilities have violated the Affiliate Transaction Rules. Such actions would use the utilities' market power to benefit other Sempra units to the detriment of utility customers.
2. The Energy Division staff will have two audits performed for this investigation. The first audit will investigate allegations that Sempra has violated these rules since their inception in 1997. The second audit will review overall compliance with the rules during 2003.

Next Steps

- Draft report has been submitted to Commission staff and has been distributed to the parties for comment.
- **Awaiting filing of settlement of I.02-11-040 (above), which will include recommendations of this and other audit reports. Settlement is scheduled for July 14, 2006.**

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Apr 28, 2006	Audit report filed in proceeding per ALJ ruling of Apr 24, 2006.	Draft decision will be written accepting appropriate findings and recommendations of the audit report.
Feb 2006	Audit report distributed to parties for comment.	
Jan 2006	Final audit report submitted to Energy Division staff.	
Apr 25, 2005	ED sent letter to Sempra requiring faster response to data requests.	Auditor had complained about slow response to its data requests.
Dec 2004	Sempra provided responses to the initial data requests.	The first project update was submitted to the CPUC.
Nov 2004	DGS approved the contract and work has begun by GDS. Initial data requests have been issued to Sempra.	An initial meeting with GDS, Sempra, and the Energy Division project manager was held. The initial data requests were submitted to Sempra.
Jul 2004	Contract office has negotiated contract with GDS. Signed contract expected to be submitted end of July.	Energy Division staff will work with GDS to ensure that the audits will be performed and that they will satisfy the requirements of the OIL. The staff continues to assert that the contractor underestimated the requirements of the project, but the contractor understands that he will

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

		be required to provide the necessary labor and product even if it exceeds his bid.
Sep 18, 2003	The Commission issued D.03-09-070, in response to a Sempra Petition to Modify (and to others' responses).	D.03-09-070 "deconsolidated" this proceeding from the Border Gas Price OII (I.02-11-040). The decision ordered an audit of Sempra "to assess the potential for conflicts between the interests of Sempra and the interests of the regulated utilities and their ratepayers, and to examine whether business activities undertaken by the utilities and/or their holding company and affiliates pose potential problems or unjust or unreasonable impacts on utility customers." The audit is to be performed through contract issued and monitored by Energy Division staff. This revised Opinion adds additional conflict of interest language, to ensure that applicants for this audit have had no recent dealings with either of the Sempra utilities.

D. 206 Complaint Case / DWR Contract Renegotiation

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
EL02-60 (FERC)			Bromson	Chatterjee

What it Does

1. Argue that some of the long-term DWR contracts are unlawful, and try to gain concessions from counterparties.
2. The California State Auditor issued a report on the effects of the renegotiated contracts on California energy markets, which can be found at: <http://www.bsa.ca.gov/bsa/pdfs/2002-009.pdf>
3. The Complaint has been dropped for sellers that have renegotiated their contracts. The El Paso contract was one of the remaining contracts until it was renegotiated under global settlement in March 2003. CDWR renegotiated long-term contracts can be found at: <http://www.cers.water.ca.gov/newContracts.html>

Next Steps

- Awaiting a decision from the Federal Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Dec 8, 2004	Appeal of FERC's denial of the CPUC Section 206 Complaint under the Federal Power Act took place in the Federal Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit.	
Sep 22, 2004	In the US Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) the consolidated case number for the CPUC v. FERC is 03-74207 and CEOB v. FERC is 03-74-246. CPUC/CEOB filed a joint reply brief.	Reply brief included that FERC's refusal to consider the justness and reasonableness of the rates in its review was pure legal error; the FERC granting market-based rate authority does not mean that these contract rates were determined to be just and reasonable; FERC staff report established more that a "correlation" between the dysfunctional spot market and the long-term contract market; and Petitioners should not be treated as Parties to the contracts.
Mar 22, 2004	CPUC/EOB filed to the US Court of Appeals (Ninth Circuit) seeking a review	The appeal contests that FERC may have erred in concluding that the Federal Power Act permits the public to bear unjust and

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

	of FERC's November decision and the legal standards used in refusing to set aside or modify long-term contracts (Coral, Dynegy, Mirant, Sempra and Pacificorp).	unreasonable contract rates.
Nov 10, 2003	FERC Order denied California parties' complaint.	FERC did not rule on whether California spot market adversely affected the DWR long-term contracts instead said that the petitioners did not have sufficient basis for modifying the contracts.
Mar 26, 2003	FERC released <i>Final Report on Price Manipulation in Western Markets</i> .	The report concludes that market dysfunction in the short-term market affected the long-term contracts. The spot power prices correlate with long-term contract prices, especially in one to two year contracts. The analysis will be used to inform the ongoing proceeding. No order was issued and FERC action is pending.
Feb 25, 2002	CPUC and EOB filed Section 206 Complaint at FERC.	The Complaint alleged that certain long-term contracts between sellers and CDWR were unlawful due to price and non-price terms and conditions.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

VI. PETROLEUM PIPELINE PROCEEDINGS

The following proceedings will address the various requests by petroleum pipeline companies for Commission authority to revise rates, sell petroleum pipeline assets to other companies, or take other actions.

A. SFPP (Kinder Morgan Petroleum Pipeline Subsidiary) Cost of Service Review

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.03-02-027	Peevey	Long	none	Monson

What it Does

1. Determines appropriate rate increase to offset additional cost of electric power.
2. Sets return on equity.
3. Determines appropriate rate base and expense levels.

Next Steps

- Issue a draft decision.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Feb 27, 2004	Reply briefs were filed.	Case is submitted.
Jan 30, 2004	Opening briefs were submitted.	
Dec 9 - 12, 2003	Evidentiary hearings were held.	
Sep 19, 2003	ALJ issued a Scoping Memo setting hearing dates, and allowing SFPP to update its showing on market-based rates.	Major issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • return on equity far above that for any other utility under California jurisdiction; and • cost of dismantlement, removal, and restoration of facilities (under certain conditions) to be included in rates.
Feb 21, 2003	Kinder Morgan petroleum pipeline subsidiary filed A.03-02-027, requesting a cost of service review.	This proceeding could set the means of regulating petroleum pipelines.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

B. SFPP's North Bay Expansion

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.04-11-017		Long	None	Monson

What it Does

SFPP (Kinder Morgan) increased its rates for its North Bay Expansion on December 15, 2004. The Commission will decide on whether to allow SFPP to continue with those increased rates.

Next Steps

- Issue a draft decision

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Dec 15, 2004	SFPP increased its rates.	
Feb 27, 2004	Reply briefs were filed.	Case was submitted.
Nov 9, 2004	Application was filed.	Issues brought up in A.03-02-027, SFPP's cost of service, will be addressed in this proceeding.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

C. ARCO Products Company vs. SFPP (Kinder Morgan)

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
C.00-04-013	Peevey	Brown		Monson

What it Does

The Commission will decide whether ARCO Products Company's (a division of Atlantic Richfield and Mobil Oil) claim against SFPP for unjust and reasonable rates has merit, and if so, how to deal with the ratemaking implications.

Next Steps

- Draft decision.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 30, 2004	Briefs filed by parties.	
Apr 2000	Complaint was filed.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

D. SFPP Intrastate Transportation Rates

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.00-03-044	Peevey	Long		Monson

What it Does

The Commission will decide whether SFPP can justify its rates based on market factors.

Next Steps

- Draft decision.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 30, 2004	Briefs filed by parties.	
Mar 2000	Application was filed.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

E. ARCO, Mobil Oil and Texaco vs. SFPP

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
C.97-04-025	Peevey	Long		Monson

What it Does

The Commission will make a decision regarding ARCO Products Company, Mobil Oil Corporation, and Texaco Refining and Marketing's allegation against SFPP regarding a violation of Public Utilities Code Section 451, by charging rates that are not just and reasonable for the intrastate transportation of refined petroleum products.

Next Steps

- Draft decision.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 30, 2004	Briefs filed by parties.	
Apr 1997	Complaint was filed.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

F. SFPP Application to Increase Rates

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.06-01-015	Brown	Long	None	Monson

What it Does

SFPP (Kinder Morgan) asks to increase its rates for transportation.

Next Steps

- Rule on filing for consolidation.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
May 3, 2006	BP West Coast Products and Exxonmobil filed a motion to consolidate this proceeding with A.04-11-017 and SFPP's Advice Letter 20.	
Mar 2, 2006	SFPP increased its rates.	
Feb-Mar, 2006	Protests filed by Southwest Airlines, Chevron Texaco, Ultramar, Valero, Tesoro, BP West Coast Products, and Exxonmobile.	
Jan 26, 2006	Application filed.	

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

G. Pacific Pipeline System LLC

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
A.05-05-002	Brown	Prestidge	None	Monson

What it Does

The Commission has allowed Pacific Pipeline to increase its rates by \$0.10/bbl to pay for extraordinary winter damage.

Next Steps

- PPS will file an advice letter to discontinue surcharge about September 2011.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
Jan 30, 2006	PPS filed AL 28	Authority to recover costs through CEMA. PPS will keep its surcharge in effect until 2011.
July 21, 2005	D.05-07-036 issued.	This decision grants the surcharge.
May 4, 2005	Application filed	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

Energy Roadmap: June 2006 Update

H. Chevron Products Company Complaint

Proceeding No.	Commissioner	Admin. Law Judge (ALJ)	Counsel	Energy Division Staff
C.05-12-004	Brown	Walker	Harris	Monson

What it Does

Chevron filed a complaint against Equilon doing business as Shell Oil Products and Shell Trading based on Equilon charging rates that reflect its monopoly power.

Next Steps

- Evidentiary hearings were cancelled.

Proceeding Overview

Date	Actions Taken	Comments
June 13, 2006	Draft Decision circulated.	The Draft Decision dismisses Chevron's complaint.
Apr 3, 2006	ALJ Ruling grants Equilon's motion to stay discovery pending dispositive motion and request for expedited treatment.	
Mar 30, 2006	Equilon filed Motion to Dismiss.	
Feb 16, 2006	Motion regarding arbitration filed.	
Feb 16, 2006	Equilon's response filed.	
Dec 5, 2006	Application filed.	

[Back to Table of Contents](#)