

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue
Implementation and Administration, and
Consider Further Development, of
California Renewables Portfolio Standard
Program.

Rulemaking 15-02-020
(Filed February 26, 2015)

NOTICE OF EX PARTE WRITTEN COMMUNICATION BY CLEAN COALITION

Pursuant to Rule 8.2 of the California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Clean Coalition gives notice that the Clean Coalition sent the attached letter to President Picker, Commissioners Rechtschaffen, Randolph, Peterman, and Guzman Aceves, and Administrative Law Judge Anne Simon on August 10, 2018.

:

/s/ Doug Karpa
Douglas M. Karpa
Clean Coalition
16 Palm Ct.
Menlo Park, CA
State Bar No. 266365
doug@clean-coalition.org

August 10, 2018

President Michael Picker

Commissioner Carla Peterman

Commissioner Clifford Rechtschaffen

Commissioner Liane Randolph

Commissioner Martha Guzman Aceves

Administrative Law Judge Simon

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Avenue

San Francisco, CA 94102

August 10, 2018

RE: Proposal for a clear standard for intervenor compensation eligible customer representative organizations that performing demonstration projects in the customer interest.

Dear President Picker, Commissioners, and ALJ Simon,

The Clean Coalition seeks to establish a workable standard for evaluating the customer status of organizations that recognizes the critical nature of customer interest demonstration projects by customer representative organizations. Demonstration projects are a powerful tool in customer advocacy, but current policy discourages such demonstration projects. We propose that the Commission adopt a policy that

demonstration projects for the purpose of advancing customer interests be presumed to be consistent with customer interests.

Customer representative organizations must be able to engage in projects to demonstrate the feasibility of key innovations if they are to advocate effectively in the customer interest without jeopardizing the customer status of customer representative organizations for intervenor compensation. If engaging in demonstration projects jeopardizes intervenor compensation status, customer representative organizations will be caught in a double bind of either pursuing the real-world data to be persuasive in front of the Commission or being able to present that data as a funded intervenor, but not both.

The Commission must recognize that customer representative organizations promote demonstration projects for completely different purposes than those of for-profit businesses with clear and substantial competitive interests. While customer representative organizations seek to demonstrate the efficacy of their recommended approaches to decision-makers and to develop technical expertise as an *input* to Commission proceedings, businesses with competitive interests seek to shape Commission proceedings and then pursue economic opportunities as an *output* of Commission proceedings. The Commission's evaluation of customer representative organizations' proof-of-concept projects should reflect this fundamental distinction.

The Commission should therefore extend existing standards to create a clear policy regarding customer interest demonstration projects that these projects be presumed to be consistent with customer interest. Thus, where demonstration projects arise out of a customer interest mission of an organization and are substantially related to the mission, the Commission should recognize that such projects do not pose any conflict in interests.

The Commission should similarly use existing standards to evaluate projects as creating a competitive conflict only if they are shown to create a “clear and substantial competitive interest” with substantial evidence.

I. Customer interest demonstration projects are fundamentally important to advancing public interest

A. The Commission has long recognized the critical importance of demonstrating innovations in the public interest.

The Commission must first recognize the fundamental importance of customer interest demonstration projects. Public interest distributed energy resources (DER) demonstration projects are “promising both as a way to meet L[ocal] C[apacity] R[equirements] needs and as a laboratory for innovation regarding preferred resources,” as recognized recently by the Commission in approving the contracts for the second round of the Preferred Resources Pilot.¹ Although the Preferred Resources Pilot is run by an Investor Owned Utility (IOU), the principle that demonstration projects are a critical laboratory for innovation applies with no less force to customer interest representative organizations seeking to promote cutting edge approaches to create a better and cheaper renewable energy system.

Without the ability to identify key issues on the ground, customer representative organizations would be hampered in their advocacy for customer interests in achieving the full savings possible in a fully renewable future. These demonstration projects provide customer organizations with real world data to give real credibility to their advocacy for innovations in the customer interest, not just at the Commission, but also before the

¹ Decision 18-07-023 (July 12, 2018) at 11 (*quoting* D.14-03-004 at 65-66.)

California Energy Commission, the California Independent System Operator, Investor Owned Utilities, Community Choice Aggregators, or other any entities with authority to implement new approaches. The insights into the actual barriers to achieving savings allows customer representative organizations to raise critical new issues to decision-makers. The lessons learned from demonstration projects also can help bring new solutions to old problems to light for the Commission and other decision-makers.

Customer representative organizations play a unique role in promoting *customer* interest demonstration projects that private enterprises and the Commission cannot. The Commission is necessarily conservative and limited in its scope of authorizations of trials and experimentation at ratepayer expense, whereas for-profit entities will typically pursue trials that aid their profits. In contrast, customer representative organizations have a unique agenda to emphasize customer interests. Customer representative organizations will deploy public funding, such as government grants or foundation or donor support, to develop a wider range of demonstrations to pursue innovations in the customer interest. Customer representative organizations must have the freedom to explore and expand the range of “feasible” alternative approaches in ways the Commission and the IOUs it oversees cannot.

Finally, the experience gained from demonstration projects helps reduce the massive asymmetry when customer representative organizations debate staff from IOUs, Community Choice Aggregators, or the Commission itself. As noted in by the Commission when it launched its review of the intervenor compensation program in 1997, “[t]he complex, highly technical and often obscure nature of the issues makes it difficult for people new to the utility arena to make a contribution to the process without expending

large amounts of time and effort to understand the process.² When customer representative organizations develop technical expertise and real world data through demonstration projects, they can close this gap.

B. The Clean Coalition's activities fall squarely within customer interest demonstration projects.

The Clean Coalition's activities provide vivid examples of how customer interest demonstration projects empower advocacy for the customer interest. The Clean Coalition's main mission is to advocate for faster and cost-effective transition to a 100% renewable energy economy by ensuring that the full value of local energy can be realized for the benefit of customers. Since this is a concept that has met with resistance from entrenched interests in the energy sector, this advocacy would remain largely theoretical unless and until real world projects can show that this approach can and does work.

For example, when we learned that Hawai'i was looking to replace its aging diesel generators with clean local energy, the Clean Coalition assisted a public energy cooperative, the Kauai Island Utility Cooperative (KIUC), and a DER developer, AES Distributed Energy (AES), to assess the viability of a solar+storage solution as a viable approach. We did not build the project or generate profits from the project, but we did help demonstrate how optimization of renewable resources could maximize the reduction of diesel generation at the lowest cost. The result was 28MW solar and 100MWh five-hour duration battery energy storage system that cost 10.85 cents per kWh. This project has been fundamentally important in demonstrating the viability of DER in meeting 24 x 7 energy needs cost-

² I.97-01-010 (January 13, 1997), at 2.

effectively and KIUC was able to use the model we developed with AES to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of future renewable energy opportunities and projects. While KIUC and AES have engaged in their economic transaction, the Clean Coalition has gone on to cite this early example in numerous comments at the Commission, including advocating for cheaper, healthier alternatives to the Ellwood refurbishment; in our testimony to the Energy Commission to suspend the Puente Power Project; and in many other contexts.

Similarly, we challenged utilities and the Commission on early notions that cost-effective DER couldn't be deployed on existing distribution networks. We did early, uncompensated work demonstrating the ability of the existing distribution grid to host high penetrations of solar at the Hunters Point substation using data supplied by PG&E. Without those modeling efforts, the Clean Coalition likely could never have been effective in convincing the California legislature and the Commission to ultimately approve and implement first in the nation distribution grid planning through AB 327 and the Distribution Resources Plan proceeding. Similarly, our work with the City of Palo Alto to determine the value of local generation was fundamental in uncovering the massive market distortion that results from the disparate treatment of wholesale distributed generation caused by the structure of Transmission Access Charges in California. This distortion will cost *customers* tens of billions of dollars in the next two decades and remains a critical issue for the Commission to address.

Today, having achieved some success in those areas, we have moved on to demonstrating that storage can free distribution hosting capacity through our Valencia Gardens Energy Storage Project, that integrated Community Microgrids in Santa Barbara County can be a physical testbed for Distribution System Operator functions, and that

distributed systems can provide resilience in the face of natural disasters. All represent demonstrations of cost-saving or performance improving principles or approaches mostly not yet fully adopted by the Commission. Without the real-world examples, the Clean Coalition's advocacy in the customer interest would be greatly reduced and the Commission might well be delayed by years in moving toward a more cost-effective energy grid.

Although some of these efforts were unfunded, some were funded by public grants or private foundations, and one was funded by a company, all share the common characteristic: they were pursued to advance our customer interest mission. The notion that somehow these projects are being pursued as some kind of economic business opportunity is simply misguided in light of the clear record of the Clean Coalition relying on our experience from demonstration projects to advance customer interests.

II. Customer interest demonstration projects should be evaluated based on their purpose of advancing ratepayer interests.

A. The existing Commission standard for customer interest representative organizations should be applied to evaluation of customer interest demonstration projects.

The Commission should adopt a clear standard that demonstration projects by a customer representative organization, which serve to prove feasibility of the positions that the organization advocates, should be presumed to be consistent with the organization's customer mission and fully consistent with the organization's status as a customer representation organization.

This standard flows naturally from the standard the Commission has already established for evaluating the customer status of organizations. Fundamentally, customer

representative organizations are “groups whose raison d’etre, as demonstrated in their bylaws or articles of incorporation, is the representation of residential customers.”³

Customer representative groups represent “self-interests in the proceeding [that] arise primarily from their role as customers of the utility, in addition to the ... the broader interests of at least some other consumers, customers, or subscribers.”⁴ Thus, where the purpose of the organization is to represent customers, then the organization is a customer representative organization. Similarly, where the purpose of a demonstration project is to prove principles in the customer interest, the projects should be presumed to be consistent with customer interest.

The Commission should adopt this kind of broad approach to evaluating customer demonstration projects that would broaden participation by customer groups, rather than restricting the ranks of customer representative organizations by culling those with the sophistication to engage in demonstration projects. The Public Utilities Code requires the Commission to “encourage[] the effective and efficient participation of all groups that have a stake in the public utility regulation process”⁵ In that spirit, the Commission adopted standards for evaluating customer status “intended to ultimately broaden participation by customers in our proceedings.”⁶ The Commission should adopt a similar approach here.

In this light, demonstration projects of customer representative organizations should be presumed to reflect the customer representative organization’s mission of representing customer interests, since such projects arise out of customer representative

³ D.86-05-007, 21 CPUC 2d 99, at *6-7.

⁴ D.88-12-034 (Dec. 9, 1988), at 7.

⁵ Pub. Util. Code §1801.3.

⁶ D.98-04-059 (April 23, 1998), at 2.

organizations' missions to demonstrate technical or policy advances that would promote ratepayer interests. Projects conducted for the purpose of advancing these ratepayer interests should be considered fully within the scope of the organization's ratepayer interests.

This approach to evaluation of non-profit activities for alignment with the public mission is a well-established approach to categorizing business activities. For example, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) specifically determines the taxable status of business activities of 501(c)(3) nonprofits based on whether they are "related business activities," and so exempt, or are unrelated business activities, and so taxable. In this instance, the key test for regularly engaged-in business activities is whether they are "substantially related to the performance by the organization of its exempt purpose or function."⁷ The Commission should recognize that business activities that are substantially related to the performance by the organization of its exempt purpose present no conflict with the customer representation mission of customer representative organizations.

1. The Clean Coalition's activities derive from its mission to develop and advocate for savings and efficiencies from DER.

Using the Clean Coalition as an example, our demonstration activities derive from our mission advocacy in the customer interest by proving up that the innovations we advocate for actually work. Typically, we seek to demonstrate each new principle with a single trial, but sometimes it takes multiple examples to convince Commission, CAISO, or

⁷ Internal Revenue Service, Publication 598, Tax on Unrelated Business Income of Exempt Organizations, <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p598.pdf>.

utility staff. Regardless, in each case the purpose is to show to the Commission and other decision-makers that new approaches can and do work. All of our work with either solar+storage, or multi-site aggregations of DER in Community Microgrids demonstrates the viability of DER suites to meet grid needs or to raise new unrecognized issues with creating a cost-effective distribution-focused grid. Much of the rest of our demonstration activity focuses on showing decision-makers that local areas can host large amounts of DER (e.g., our solar siting surveys) and typically go hand in hand with facilitating the launch of market-adjusting feed-in tariffs. This last category should prove critically important in finally demonstrating to the Commission and others that the old Request for Proposals approach raises costs for DER projects for customers by imposing unnecessary risk premiums, bid costs, and costs of project failures.

B. In contrast, commercial entities have a “clear and substantial competitive interest.”

In contrast to the purposes of customer representative organizations, under existing Commission standards, participation by business entities in Commission proceedings is designed to expand *competitive* opportunities, and not to demonstrate concepts or technologies in order to move a customer advocacy mission. Applying this distinction to demonstration projects, the key distinction is whether the purpose of the organization’s participation is to promote economic opportunities *for their own organization or those they represent* without a customer interest purpose, or whether demonstration projects have a purpose of demonstrating customer interest principles.

Under existing standards, competitive business entities are those “*clear and substantial* competitive interests”⁸ to seek to expand their economic opportunities to sell the products or services they offer to the marketplace. The distinguishing characteristic of a competitor is that the competitor “advocates for changes expanding *its* opportunities to compete.”⁹ This standard should require a clear showing an organization has a clear and substantial interest in expanding economic opportunities. Suggestions of ambiguous or speculative interests should not be enough. Such an approach is consistent with the legislative mandate to “encourage[] the effective and efficient participation of all groups that have a stake in the public utility regulation process”¹⁰ Thus, the touchstone to determine whether a party is a customer representative organization or a business competitor is the *purpose* in their advocacy: customer organizations have a purpose to advocate for customer interests, while business competitors have a purpose of expand their own competitive opportunities for new contracts and projects.

Absent benefits flowing to the organization itself or its sector, the customer representative organization would not have any clear and substantial competitive interest. Thus, a customer representative organization that is not advocating for expanded economic opportunities for itself would be “free from conflicts that may arise in representing two interests, the competitor's as a competitor and the ratepayers' as customers”¹¹ because the organization wouldn't have a competitive interest. Hypothetical or tangential involvement by competitive entities in customer interest demonstration projects does not create “clear

⁸ D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000), 12.

⁹ D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000), 12 (emphasis added).

¹⁰ Pub. Util. Code § 1801.3.

¹¹ D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000), at 12.

and substantial” interest, nor does it imply that advocacy based on the lessons learned from demonstrations is somehow transformed into pushing for expanded economic opportunities.

The Commission has been consistent that the touchstone of a competitor is that its purpose in proceedings is to increase its own economic opportunities. The history of intervenor compensation claims by companies with competitive interests have all involved efforts to change the outcome of a proceeding to expand the market for products or services of the entity with the “clear and substantial competitive interest.” For example, the design group Utility Design, Inc. was denied compensation eligibility because it was participating to advocate for an outcome that would increase the market opportunities for itself and other competitors in the line extension and construction business.¹² Similarly, Liberty Fuels Inc. was denied customer status because its participation was aimed to achieve an outcome that would increase sales of its fuel products.¹³ Even the Greenlining Institute, which advocates for low income homeowners, was deemed to be have a “competitive interest” in a single proceeding to set intervenor compensation rates, even though it is a customer representative organization in all other contexts, because in that particular proceeding it was advocating for rates that would ultimately determine how much the Greenlining Institute was paid.¹⁴ Throughout the key factor is that the purpose competitive organization’s advocacy is to increase its own economic opportunity.

¹² D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000).

¹³ Decision 04-06-002 (June 9, 2004).

¹⁴ Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling on Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (R0410010) (August 29, 2005) 2005 WL 2148623 (Cal.P.U.C.).

C. Speculation about the potential motivations of participants has been rejected by the Commission as a basis for determining what interests are being represented.

Conclusions that an organization has a competitive interest need to be grounded in concrete and substantial evidence that the purpose is related to an actual economic stake, and not derive from speculation or conjecture. Speculation that an intervenor might be motivated by some prospective hope of hypothetical benefits is beyond the scope of the analysis of customer representation. Speculation about the potential or intentions to secure future earnings was expressly rejected by the Commission as an appropriate inquiry in determining customer eligibility: “an intervenor’s motivation for participating in a Commission proceeding ... [is not] relevant to the eligibility determination.”¹⁵ The Commission expressly took up the question of whether professionals should be excluded from customer representation because they might be thought to hope for future contracts when representing customers, and the Commission squarely rejected the use of speculation about prospects for future revenue generating contracts: “[T]he Commission cannot know whether the prospect of future earnings is motivating the participation of the intervenor.”¹⁶ Thus, allegations of clear and substantial competitive interests should either be supported by substantial evidence of such concrete interests or removed from consideration. Speculation as to the motives of an intervenor is beyond the scope of the customer status evaluation, especially when the black and white mission stated in the organization’s bylaws contradict such speculation.

¹⁵ D.98-4-059 (April 23, 1998), at 28.

¹⁶ D.98-4-059 (April 23, 1998), at 28.

III. The application of the standard must incorporate evaluation of various factors indicating customer interest purposes.

As a practical matter, when evaluating customer status, the Commission should presume the demonstration projects conducted by customer representative organizations are in line with the organization's legal mission. This would streamline the process and prevent unnecessary documentation barriers from being erected. However, in those instances where the Commission seeks a more specific analysis, there are several key factors the Commission could examine.

A. Customer interest projects exhibit particular characteristics distinct from clear and substantial competitive interests.

Engagement with demonstration projects does not constitute a "clear and substantial competitive interest" for four reasons. First, these demonstration projects grow out of the customer interests, so alignment between an organization's customer mission and the customer interest purpose of any demonstration project should be dispositive. Second, customer representative organizations have a completely different relationship between projects and advocacy. Customer representative organizations conduct demonstration projects first in order to advocate for policy changes second, whereas competitive businesses advocate for policy changes first in order to pursue new opportunities second. Third, customer representative organizations will respond to policy successes by moving on to demonstration projects on new policy issues, not by pursuing the economic opportunities created by a change in policy. Fourth, grant or donor support for demonstration projects supports only the cost of demonstration projects, and so do not

create any economic interests, because there are no excess funds derived from grant-funded demonstration projects.

Ultimately, the Commission should not confuse the incidental economic opportunities that inevitably arise from nearly any change in policy direction with intentional efforts to expand economic opportunity for a targeted company or trade group. Instead, the Commission should focus on identifying what “clear and substantial competitive interest” the customer representative organization would actually advance with its positions before concluding there is such an interest.

1. The customer interest demonstration projects have a rationale that is substantially related to the mission of the organization.

First, customer representative organizations’ demonstration projects “arise primarily from their role as customers of the utility,”¹⁷ just as their advocacy at the Commission does. The critical question is what customer interests the projects advance. In the case of the Clean Coalition’s demonstration activities, for instance, advance the customer interest in creating an energy sector that functions effectively to deliver cost-effective and environmentally-friendly energy services. Where a customer representative organization facilitates a demonstration within the scope of its mission, this project should be presumed to be in the customer interest.

On the other hand, a blanket assertion that involvement in demonstration projects amounts to participating in the private energy development industry ignores the reality

¹⁷ D.88-12-034 (Dec. 9, 1988), at 7.

that demonstration projects can and do represent a vital tool for customer representative organizations to strengthen their advocacy on behalf of customers. In fact, the Commission has already recognized that even non-profit contractors can be customer representatives in the context of Cal/Neva, which was deemed to be a customer representative organization, “as non-profit contractors, ... an association comprised of community action agencies and community based organizations representing low income interests.”¹⁸ Clearly, the Commission has rejected the notion that even non-profit contractors who directly build projects must be excluded from customer representative organization status. This stands in sharp contrast to the customer representative organization, like the Clean Coalition, which aren’t contractors, don’t build projects, only facilitates the development of projects by others, and have no economic stake in the projects.

2. Customer interest demonstration projects precede the Commission proceeding, but business competitive opportunities result from the Commission proceeding.

Second, the relationship between demonstration projects and Commission proceedings is fundamentally different for customer representative organizations than it is for competitive organizations. Customer representative organization demonstration projects are but a tool to further advocacy to advance customer interests, whereas for competitive businesses, the projects have no customer rationale and are merely an end in themselves. As a result, customer demonstration projects precede the proceedings in which they are relevant to support advocacy for positions. Once the proceeding is successfully

¹⁸ D.98-04-059 (April 23, 1998), at 30, n.14.

concluded, no further demonstration projects on that topic are needed. In contrast, the commercial entity participates in proceedings to “expand[] *its* opportunities to compete.”¹⁹ Once the opportunities are successfully expanded, competitive entities ramp up to meet the new opportunities. Thus, the logical relationship between activities and proceedings is fundamentally inverted for competitive business entities from the order in which customer representative organizations proceed.

3. Customer representative organizations do not typically repeat many of the same kind of demonstration projects, whereas business competitive entities will *increase* the number of substantially similar projects it conducts.

Third, customer organizations respond to policy successes in a fundamentally different way than competitive organizations do. Customer organizations tend to move on to entirely new kinds of demonstration activities to evaluate new concepts and approaches, while competitive organizations will tend to offer substantially similar services in project after project to pursue the easiest profits. When a customer organization achieves a policy success, new issues arise to be resolved, but there is no further need for demonstration projects on that topic. Thus, customer representative organizations will typically not pursue the same kind of project over and over (unless there is need for replication to convince decision-makers), but rather will move on to demonstrating new principles and improvements. In contrast, a competitive business would ramp up to position itself to *increase* the number of substantially similar projects it can deploy to avail itself of any

¹⁹ D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000), at12 (emphasis added).

newly expanded opportunity. Thus, the Commission should distinguish clearly between customer representative organizations pursuing subsequent demonstration projects, each on new topics, from competitive interests, which will seek to capitalize on expanded opportunities to compete in one particular area.

For example, since the Clean Coalition demonstrated at Hunter's Point that existing distribution grids could handle high levels of DER, the Clean Coalition has not conducted another similar project. Similarly, since facilitating a single demonstration that in-front-of-the-meter batteries can increase distribution grid hosting capacity, the Clean Coalition has not engaged in any other similar projects, except to address more complex issues that arise from initial experiments. An economic competitor would seek to scale up these projects and deploy the same repeatedly with different clients without limit in pursuit of profits, not abandon an approach once proven successful. In this manner, the customer representative organization's approach to subsequent projects is entirely different.

4. Customer representative organizations do not pursue demonstrations out of a profit motive and do not derive excess funding from demonstration activities

Fourth, the Commission should also clearly recognize that demonstration projects do not represent some kind of profit center for organizations or an end in themselves. Demonstration projects do take money to design and implement, but customer organizations are typically not able to derive excess funding from demonstration activities. Grant or donor support for demonstration projects usually covers only the costs of conducting the demonstration projects and do not typically create excess funds that could

create an economic interest for customer representative organizations. Securing grants to cover the costs of conducting customer interest demonstration projects is fundamentally different from payments to a for-profit business for delivering a product or service, which create profits and economic incentives. Without excess funds, demonstrations cannot give rise to an economic interest. Furthermore, even if excess funds were derived from such activities, those funds would merely support further customer advocacy and cannot be converted to private profits. Therefore, grant funded demonstration projects simply cannot create competitive economic interests.

5. Advocating for policy changes that incidentally create opportunities for companies implementing improvements is not the same as advocating for expanded business opportunities.

Ultimately, the Commission should not confuse customer interest advocacy that may incidentally result in business opportunities with competitive interest advocacy for expanded opportunities for the competitive businesses themselves. Eliding this critical distinction would almost eviscerate customer interest policy advocacy. Many ratepayer interests involve changes in business as usual, and companies that provide more efficient or environmentally beneficial services will naturally benefit, but that is not why customers advocate for those changes. For example, customers with an interest in avoiding serious climate change will inevitably advocate for policies that benefit renewable energy companies. Customers advocating for more equitable access to renewable energy benefits will inevitably benefit those companies that install, for example, community solar projects. Similarly, customers interested in using DER to create a resilient and cost-effective

renewable energy system will advocate for policies that create opportunities for anyone who provides DER-based solutions. However, this is a far cry from advocating for a particular industry sector as a business per se. Although there are incidental business benefits, the Commission should not mistake such incidental effects for the *purpose* and *interests* that motivate the customer advocacy in the first place.

IV. The distinct characteristics of customer interest demonstration activities inform several factors in the analysis of customer interest demonstration projects.

At a practical level, the Commission can look to several indicia of customer interest in its investigation of interests arising out of the status as customer, which remains the fundamental touchstone of customer status.

A. The analysis of customer interest is determined on a proceeding by proceeding basis.

First, the Commission should squarely recognize that the assessment of whether an entity is advocating out of the customer interest or to advance its own opportunity to compete is a proceeding-by-proceeding analysis. The Commission has long recognized that the same organization can be a customer in some contexts but have clear and substantial financial interests in another. Thus, the same business that might be a competitor in some proceedings might nonetheless appear before the Commission as a customer in another, for example by “advocating for changes to a tariff under which the business takes service.”²⁰ Similarly, a customer representative organization might be squarely a customer

²⁰ D.00-04-026 (April 6, 2000), at 12.

representative organization in every proceeding, except where direct financial consequence for the organization would flow (e.g., in intervenor compensation rates proceedings.)²¹

Second, this squarely implies that the analysis of customer status must turn on the position and interests at stake *in that particular proceeding*. A customer representative organization that has some particular “unrelated business activity,” as the IRS defines it, to raise funds would be a competitor in any proceeding touching on that particular business activity but remain a customer representative organization in all other contexts. As noted, customer representative organizations receiving intervenor compensation are acting out of economic interests in proceedings regarding intervenor compensation while remain customers everywhere else. This means that unless an organization has “clear and substantial competitive interest” in the outcome of that particular proceeding, it is likely a customer representative organization with respect to that proceeding. Absent a showing of such a clear interest, the organization should be deemed to be acting consistently with its mission.

B. A range of factors can assist the Commission in evaluating the motivating interests behind a given set of activities.

Where the Commission feels a need to engage in a specific inquiry into the status of particular demonstration projects, the Commission can look to the rationales, funding source, and the nature of the collaborators to gain insight into the purpose of activities.

²¹ Assigned Commissioner Ruling on Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (R0410010) (August 29, 2005) 2005 WL 2148623 (Cal.P.U.C.)

The first indicative factor is the rationale for the project. In many instances, grant applications and project descriptions will often articulate the purposes and objectives of the demonstration project. Enunciated rationales such as proving innovative concepts or evaluating issues to support the development of a better grid, practices or policies strongly suggest customer interest purposes. Even when demonstration projects do not have pre-existing project descriptions, customer representative organizations will typically have articulable public interest objectives for demonstration projects. A project with a rational explanation as advancing the customer mission should be viewed as being conducted for the purpose of advancing customer interests.

The second factor is the source of the funding. Public interest foundation grants or government grants are made to further specific public interest aims. For example, many Energy Commission grants are specifically granted to advance new approaches that may benefit the public. Public grant funding indicates the project is conducted for a public purpose, from which customers benefit. Furthermore, the dedication of grant funding by the agency indicates that it represents the kind of project that private entities would be unlikely to pursue as a bona fide business opportunity for a lack of profitability. Reliance on public funding undercuts concerns that the public representative organization is actually representing some business or affluent client interests.²² Ultimately, demonstration projects funded by public interest sources should be presumed to be in the interests of the public as a whole.

²² D.86-05-007, 1986 Cal. PUC LEXIS 287 at *11.

The third indicative factor is the nature of the collaborating entities. Public entities, such as local governments, Community Choice Aggregators, or other public institutions themselves exist to represent the public interest. Local governments frequently engage in activities with a public interest component, in part because they represent customer interests. Elected bodies necessarily must demonstrate cost-effectiveness for the customers who voted them into office. Community Choice Aggregators are by definition public entities called into existence to represent the interest of local communities and customers. Collaboration with such organizations elected by customers or convened to represent customers should be viewed as consistent with an organization's customer interest mission.

C. Any alternative rule such that engaging in demonstration projects should jeopardize a customer representative's status would muddy the relationship between customer advocacy and demonstration projects.

The alternative standard implicitly presuming engagement in demonstration projects create a "clear and substantial competitive interest" completely muddies what should be a clear distinction in the purposes of such projects. Customer representative organizations first do projects so that they may engage in effective advocacy in Commission proceedings, whereas competitive entities engage in Commission proceedings in order to later pursue the economic opportunities that result. Suggesting that the involvement of commercial entities in demonstration projects indicates a customer representative organization has mixed interests completely reverses the actual rationale for demonstration projects. The fact that demonstration projects in the customer interest may

be partly funded by commercial entities does not render these projects something not in the customer interest. Indeed, some trials such as the Preferred Resources Pilot are *implemented* by Investor Owned Utilities, such as Southern California Edison, but this does not prevent the Commission from recognizing that the pilots do advance the public customer interest. While funding sources is not entirely immaterial, it is far from dispositive.

Worse, suggestions that mere involvement with commercial entities indicates a clear and substantial competitive interest even further removed from the reality of implementing demonstration projects in the customer interest. No demonstration project can be done without a contractor to build the hardware. Every demonstration project of relevance to the electrical system must engage with a utility of some kind in order to interconnect and participate in demonstrating energy services. The Commission should not confound working *with* renewable energy market participants with working *for* utilities and other renewable energy industry and market stakeholders. Any rule that prohibits customer representative organizations from working with for-profit entities to implement demonstration projects would either prohibit demonstration projects entirely or would require nonprofits to host entire development firms within their organizations. Neither is remotely practical.

V. Erecting barriers to customer representative conducting demonstration projects would be bad policy for customers.

Creating new barriers to customer representative organizations developing the kind of data, information, and expertise that the Commission needs for informed decision-

making would hinder the ability of the Commission to develop sound policy and stack the deck against customers. The better the technical accuracy of advocacy by all advocates, the more informed and more effective the ultimate policy of the Commission can be. Where customer representative organizations face difficulties in developing facts and expertise in order to make specific and technically sound recommendations, the Commission will be deprived of quality inputs into its decision-making process.

Furthermore, customer representative organizations frequently must contend with public utilities, investor owned utilities, and Community Choice Aggregators, which have far greater technical expertise and better information. As a result, customer representative organizations face a systemic disadvantage in proceedings. In the case of the Clean Coalition, a significant factor in our ability to bring forward sound proposals and craft informed arguments is the in-house expertise developed through demonstration projects. Erecting barriers to participation in demonstration projects would serve to eliminate technically proficient voices and to discourage customer representative organizations from pursuing effective advocacy approaches.

VI. Financial hardship analyses should recognize that funding for demonstration projects typically cannot support policy advocacy.

The Commission should recognize that funding for demonstration projects does not support advocacy at the Commission. Most grant funding for demonstration projects is typically under tight fiscal control and generally does not include funds for advocacy in venues such as the Commission.

A. Foundation and government grants for demonstration projects are restricted and cannot alleviate financial hardship of participating in a proceeding

The Commission should recognize that grant support from foundations, government entities, and donors to support demonstration projects does not provide financial capacity to participate in Commission proceedings. The analysis of financial hardship for organizations should turn on the benefit for individual customer relative to the costs of participation, and funding at-cost of separate related activities that cannot be spent on participation at the Commission should not suggest organizations have independent wealth to pursue customer advocacy.

Ultimately, a showing of financial hardship for groups or organizations, requires a “showing that the economic interest of individual members is small compared to the overall costs of effective participation.”²³ What matters first in that analysis is that the per customer benefits of a more cost-effective transition to renewable energy is smaller than the costs of effective participation. For example, the estimated savings of \$60 billion over 20 years analysis from Transmission Access Charges reform works out to under \$100 per person per year. This is clearly much less than the cost of actually pushing through successful reform. The fact that a customer organization receives at-cost funding for other activities that cannot be used to cover those costs of participation does nothing to change the analysis called for by statute.

First, moving beyond the relative costs analysis in statute, grant funding for demonstration projects cannot be properly viewed as covering the costs of participation at

²³ Pub. Util. Code§ 1802(g).

the Commission because such funding is prohibited from being spent on general advocacy in most instances. Grant funding for demonstration projects is unavailable because it is entirely encumbered, subject to tight fiscal management for the activities for which it is granted, and subject to audit. This funding cannot be diverted from those purposes to provide support for effective participation. Thus, demonstration project grants cannot be rationally viewed as available to defray the costs of participation at the Commission.

Second, virtually every national customer representative organization would be eliminated from the intervenor compensation program if the commission were to eliminate organizations receiving other funding, including foundation funding. Many national organizations receive substantial funds from foundations for various purposes. Often, however, these funds are not available to support policy advocacy. Thus, a move to disqualify such organizations based on the mere presence of any kind of grant or foundation funding would be a serious blow to the participation by environmental, customer, and social justice organizations.

B. Speculation about future earnings has been rejected from financial hardship considerations by the Commission

The Commission has considered and rejected allowing consideration of future earnings in financial hardship analyses. “Future earnings are not an element of the significant financial hardship definition, and we are not inclined to attempt to evaluate future earnings in determining financial hardship.”²⁴ Arguments have been raised that participation in commission proceedings might be conducted to somehow set the table for hypothetical future contract revenues, rather than out of customer interest (even setting

²⁴ D.98-4-059 (April 23, 1998), at 28.

aside that future demonstration projects do not generate such excess funds). However, this kind of unfounded speculation regarding future earnings has been squarely rejected by the Commission and has no place in evaluating whether customer representative organizations have *current* financial hardship based on future hypothetical earnings (which would not exist in any event). Ultimately, California law calls for an evaluation of the costs of participation and the relative benefits to individual customers. Speculation about other sources of funding that may hypothetically materialize does not appear in that statutory test.

V. Conclusion: The Commission should evaluate customer interest demonstration projects using the existing standards for distinguishing customer representative organizations from competitive businesses.

The Commission should draft new guidelines to clarify how to determine whether demonstration projects are consistent with representing customer interests. That new standard should apply the same standard to a customer organization's demonstration activities that applies to the customer organization itself: does the project advance the organization's customer interest mission? The demonstration activities of customer representative organizations should be presumed to be pursuant to the customer interest mission of the organization, unless there is a clear and substantial competitive benefit to the organization itself (e.g., to expand the market for the products or services offered by the organization) as shown by concrete and substantial evidence. Such an approach would remove a cloud that now exists over customer representative organizations that might want to demonstrate their points with real world data or to develop the kind of technical

expertise to participate effectively in Commission proceedings. The development of those technically informed customer perspectives should be warmly welcomed by the Commission and supported by the drafting of sensible guidance on this critical question.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DK' followed by a stylized flourish.

Doug Karpa

Policy Director

Clean Coalition

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue
Implementation and Administration, and
Consider
Further Development, of California
Renewables
Portfolio Standard Program.

Rulemaking 15-02-020
(Filed February 26, 2015)

Certificate of Service

I certify that I have today served a copy of

- 1) NOTICE OF EX PARTE WRITTEN COMMUNICATION BY CLEAN COALITION**
- 2) Clean Coalition Ex Parte Letter Recommending Intervenor Compensation Standards for Demonstration Projects**

to all parties on the Service List of R.15-02-020 this date via e-mail.

Executed on August 10, 2018, in Mill Valley, CA by:

/s/ Doug Karpa
Douglas M. Karpa
Clean Coalition
16 Palm Ct.
Menlo Park, CA
State Bar No. 266365
doug@clean-coalition.org



California
Public Utilities
Commission



[CPUC Home](#)

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

Proceeding: R1502020 - CPUC - OIR TO CONTIN

Filer: CPUC

List Name: LIST

Last changed: August 3, 2018

[Download the Comma-delimited File](#)

[About Comma-delimited Files](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Parties

C. C. SONG
SR. POLICY ANALYST
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: MARIN /CLEAN ENERGY

CHRISTIAN LENCI
PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.

DANIEL KING
SEMPRA U.S. GAS & POWER, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: SEMPRA U.S. GAS & POWER, LLC

DAVID X KOLK, PH.D
COLTON ELECTRIC UTILITY DEPT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: COLTON ELECTRIC UTILITY DEPT

MARC D JOSEPH
ATTORNEY
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO, PC
L.P.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
(US),
EMPLOYEES (CCUE)

MARCIE A. MILNER
VP - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA (US),
L.P.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: SHELL ENERGY NORTH AMERICA

ROBIN SMUTNY-JONES

SCOTT HARDING

DIR. - CALIFORNIA POLICY & REGULATION
IBERDROLA RENEWABLES, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000
FOR: IBERDROLA RENEWABLES, LLC

ENERGY RESOURCE PLANNER, SR.
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT

TIM MASON
POLICY DIRECTOR
LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN
ATTORNEY
DAVIS WRIGHT & TREMAINE, LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: LIBERTY UTILITIES (CALPECO
ELECTRIC) LLC

3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: 3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC

TAM HUNT
COMMUNITY RENEWABLES SOLUTIONS, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000
FOR: COMMUNITY RENEWABLE SOLUTION,

LLC

(CRS)

CHARLIE KARUSTIS
OWNER
YAVI ENERGY, LLC
517 BOSTON POST ROAD, NO.65
SUDBURY, MA 01776
FOR: YAVI ENERGY, LLC

THOMAS MELONE
C/O ALLCO RENEWABLE ENERGY LIMITED
WINDING CREEK SOLAR LLC
1740 BROADWAY, 15TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10019
FOR: WINDING CREEK SOLAR LLC

MICHAEL NORDLICHT
AGERA ENERGY, LLC
555 PLEASANTVILLE RD, S 107
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510
FOR: AGERA ENERGY, LLC

JOHN P. MURRAY
SR. ENERGY MGR.
AMERICAN POWERNET MANAGEMENT, LP
45 COMMERCE DRIVE
WYOMISSING, PA 19610
FOR: AMERICAN POWERNET MANAGEMENT,

LP

(APN)

BENJAMIN MATEK
INDUSTRY ANALYST / RESEARCH MGR.
GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ASSOCIATION
209 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., SE
WASHINGTON, DC 20003
FOR: GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ASSOCIATION (GEA)

KEVIN BOUDREAUX
ENERCAL USA LLC
7660 WOODWAY DRIVE, STE. 471A
HOUSTON, TX 77063
FOR: ENERCAL USA, LLC

JOHN H. RITCH
GEXA ENERGY CALIFORNIA, LLC
20455 STATE HIGHWAY 249, STE. 200
HOUSTON, TX 77070
FOR: GEXA ENERGY CALIFORNIA, LLC

DAVID F. SMITH
DIR - ENGINEERING AND OPERATIONS
TRANSWEST EXPRESS LLC
555 SEVENTEENTH STREET, STE. 2400
DENVER, CO 80202
FOR: TRANSWEST EXPRESS LLC

JASON R. SMITH
PRESIDENT
TRANSCANYON, LLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN ST., STE. 350
PHOENIX, AZ 85004
LLC
FOR: TRANSCANYON, LLC

JOSHUA A. NORDQUIST
DIR. - BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
ORMAT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
6225 NEIL ROAD
RENO, NV 89511
FOR: ORMAT NEVADA, INC.

SARAH K. FRIEDMAN
SENIOR CAMPAIGN REPRESENTATIVE
SIERRA CLUB
714 WEST OLYMPIC BLVD., STE. 1000
LOS ANGELES, CA 90015
FOR: SIERRA CLUB

YEP ENERGY
818 W. 7TH ST.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
FOR: YEP ENERGY (ENERCAL USA, LLC'S ESP
BUSINESS NAME)

JOHN L. GEIGER
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
1100 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90063-3200
FOR: COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JESSALYN ISHIGO
ENVIRONMENTAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT OFF.
AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.
1919 TORRANCE BLVD.
TORRANCE, CA 90501
FOR: AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO., INC.

KATHERINE HERNANDEZ
SR. ANALYST
CITY OF PICO RIVERA
6615 PASSONS BLVD.
PICO RIVERA, CA 90660
FOR: CITY OF PICO RIVERA, DBA PICO

DAVID GETTS
GEN. MGR.
SOUTHWESTERN POWER GROUP II, LLC
3610 N. 44TH ST., STE. 250
PHOENIX, AZ 85018
FOR: SOUTHWESTERN POWER GROUP II,
(SWPG)

OSCAR HERRERA
DEPT. OF WATER AND POWER
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
111 N. HOPE ST, RM., 1246
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
FOR: L.A. DEPT. OF WATER & POWER

RYAN HARWELL
DIRECT ENERGY BUSINESS, LLC
818 W. 7TH ST., 2ND FL.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
FOR: DIRECT ENERGY BUSINESS

TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.
818 W. 7TH ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017
FOR: TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.

DANA P. PALMER
MCGUIRE WOODS LLP
1800 CENTURY PARK EAST, 8TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067
FOR: DIRECT ENERGY SERVICES, LLC

INGER GOODMAN
JUST ENERGY SOLUTIONS INC.
6 CENTERPOINTE DRIVE, SUITE 750
LA PALMA, CA 90623-2520
FOR: JUST ENERGY SOLUTIONS, INC.
(FORMERLY COMMERCE ENERGY, INC.)

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
ATTORNEY
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
4766 PARK GRANADA, SUITE 209
CALABASAS, CA 91302
FOR: WESTERN POWER TRADING FORUM

RIVERA INNOVATIVE MUNICIPAL ENERGY
(DACC)
(PRIME)

(WPTF)/DIRECT ACCESS COALITION

GREGORY S. KLATT
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
4766 PARK GRANADA, STE. 209
CALABASAS, CA 91302
FOR: EDF TRADING NORTH AMERICA, LLC/EDF
RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC./TIGER NATIONAL
COMPNY
GAS, INC.

CAROL SCHMID-FRAZEE
ATTORNEY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE.
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

NGUYEN QUAN
REGULATORY AFFAIRS
GOLDEN STATE WATER COMPANY
630 EAST FOOTHILL BLVD.
SAN DIMAS, CA 91773
FOR: BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICES

GREG BASS
DIR - WESTERN REGULATORY AFFAIRS
CALPINE ENERGY SOLUTIONS, LLC
401 WEST A STREET, SUITE 500
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
FOR: CALPINE ENERGY SOLUTIONS, LLC
(FORMERLY NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY
SOLUTIONS LLC)

DONALD KELLY
EXE. DIRECTOR
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
3405 KENYON ST., STE. 401
520
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
FOR: UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
(UCAN)

THOMAS R. DARTON
VP & GENERAL COUNSEL
PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE, STE.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122
FOR: PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.

PAUL A. SZYMANSKI
SR. REGULATORY COUNSEL
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
ASSOCIATION
8330 CENTURTY PARK CT., CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

MARINA WEST
BOARD MEMBER
MORONGO BASIN CONSERVATION
PO BOX 24
JOSHUA TREE, CA 92252
FOR: MORONGO BASIN CONSERVATION
ASSOCIATON (MBCA)

ISAIAH HAGERMAN
DIR - ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
CITY OF RANCHO MIRAGE
69-825 HIGHWAY 111
RANCHO MIRAGE, CA 92270
FOR: RANCHO MIRAGE ENERGY AUTHORITY
(NEW CCA PROGRAM)

RUTH RIEMAN
VICE-CHAIR
CALIFORNIA DESERT COALITION
PO BOX 1508
YUCCA VALLEY, CA 92286
FOR: CALIFORNIA DESERT COALITION

KOFI ANTOBAM
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE
APPLE VALLEY CHOICE ENERGY (AVCE)

LORRIE L. STEELY
FOUNDER
MOJAVE COMMUNITIES CONSERVATION

14955 DALE EVANS PARKWAY
APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307
FOR: TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY | APPLE
CONSERVATION
VALLEY CHOICE ENERGY (AVCE)

PO BOX 2397
APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307
FOR: MOJAVE COMMUNITIES
COLLABORATIVE (MC3)

RICHARD RAVANA
PRESIDENT
ALLIANCE FOR DESERT PRESERVATION
PO BOX 3987
APPLE VALLEY, CA 92307
FOR: ALLIANCE FOR DESERT PRESERVATION
(ADP)

KEVIN EMMERICH
BASIN AND RANGE WATCH
102551 CEDAR CANYON ROAD
CIMA, CA 92323
FOR: BASIN AND RANGE WATCH

CHUCK BELL
LUCERNE VALLEY ECON. DEVELOPMENT ASSN.
ENERGY
PO BOX 193
APPLE VALLEY, CA 92356
FOR: LUCERNE VALLEY ECONOMIC
&
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (LVEDA)

GREG MICHAELS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE &
3450 14TH ST. STE. 420
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE
ENERGY

ROBERT JOHNSON
CITY MGR.
CITY OF SAN JACINTO
595 S. SAN JACINTO AVE., BLDG A
SAN JACINTO, CA 92583
CALIFORNIA
FOR: CITY OF SAN JACINTO, DBA: SAN
JACINTO POWER

PATRICK VANBEEK
COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA
2875 MICHELLE DR. STE 100
IRVINE, CA 92606
FOR: COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF

RYAN M.F. BARON
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, SUITE 1000
IRVINE, CA 92612
FOR: CLEAN POWER ALLIANCE OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA

HEATHER SWAN
LANCASTER POWER AUTHORITY
CITY OF LANCASTER
44933 FERN AVE.
LANCASTER, CA 93534
FOR: LANCASTER CHOICE ENERGY

TOM HABASHI
CEO
MONTEREY BAY COMMUNITY POWER AUTHORITY
70 GARDEN COURT, STE. 300
MONTEREY, CA 93940
FOR: MONTEREY BAY COMMUNITY POWER
AUTHORITY

KENNETH SAHM WHITE
ECONOMICS & POLICY ANALYSIS DIR
CLEAN COALITION
16 PALM CT.
MENLO PARK, CA 94025
FOR: CLEAN COALITION

JOE WIEDMAN
PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY AUTHORITY
400 COUNTY CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

LISA-MARIE G. CLARK
CPUC - LEGAL DIV.
505 VAN NESS AVE., RM. 4300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

FOR: PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY (PCE)

FOR: ORA

JAMES HENDRY
UTILITIES SPECIALIST
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM.
525 GOLDEN GATE AVE., 7TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3220
FOR: SFPUC

MICHAEL A. HYAMS
POWER ENTERPRISE-REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
525 GOLDEN GATE AVE., 7TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3220
FOR: CLEANPOWER SF

MATTHEW FREEDMAN
STAFF ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
785 MARKET STREET, 14TH FL
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
COUNCIL

CARL ZICHELLA
DIRECTOR - WESTERN TRANSMISSION
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
111 SUTTER ST., 20TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
FOR: NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE

NORA SHERIFF
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
PROGRAM
345 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 2450
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
FOR: CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY CONSUMERS
ASSOCIATIONS (CLECA)

ERICA BRAND
ACTING DIR. - CALIFORNIA ENERGY
THE NATURE CONSERVANCY
201 MISSION STREET, 4TH FL.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

LARISSA KOEHLER
ATTORNEY
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND
123 MISSION STREET, 28TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
COMPANY
FOR: ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND

MARK HUFFMAN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94106
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
(PG&E)

BRIAN T. CRAGG
ATTORNEY
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI & DAY , LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION (IEPA)

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG
ATTORNEY
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI & DAY, LLP
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: THE SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES
ASSOCIATION (SEIA)

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG
ATTORNEY
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI & DAY, LLP
505 SANSOME ST., STE. 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: SOLAR ELECTRIC SOLUTIONS, LLC

SEAN P. BEATTY
WEST REGION GEN. COUNSEL
NRG ENERGY, INC,
100 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: NRG ENERGY, INC.

SETH D. HILTON
ATTORNEY

SETH D. HILTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW

STOEL RIVES LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, STE. 1120
1120
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: HYDRO PARTNERS
USE OF

(COALITION)

STEVE SHERR
SVP BUSINESS AFFAIRS & GEN. COUNSEL
FOUNDATION WINDPOWER, LLC
505 SANSOME STREET, STE 450
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: FOUNDATION WINDPOWER, LLC
AND

GREGORY JOHN STANGL
CEO
GROUP
PHOENIX ENERGY
950 LINCOLN BLVD. / BOX 29166
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94129
TRANSMISSION
FOR: PHOENIX ENERGY

MATTHEW BARMACK
DIR. - MARKET & REGULATORY ANALYSIS
CALPINE CORPORATION
4160 DUBLIN BLVD., SUITE 100
DUBLIN, CA 94568
FOR: CALPINE CORPORATION

LAURA WISLAND
SR. ENERGY ANALYST
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS
PRESIDENT
500 12TH ST., STE. 340
OAKLAND, CA 94607
FOR: UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS
OF

MELISSA BRANDT
SR. DIR PUBLIC AFFAIRS & GEN COUNSEL
EAST BAY COMMUNITY ENERGY
1111 BROADWAY, 3RD FLOOR
OAKLAND, CA 94607
FOR: EAST BAY COMMUNITY ENERGY (EBCE)
DIVERSITY

STOEL RIVES LLP
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, SUITE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: COALITION FOR THE EFFICIENT

TRANSMISSION INFRASTRUCTURE

SARA STECK MYERS
ATTORNEY
CEERT
122 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121
FOR: CENTER FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY
RENEWABLE TECHNOLOGIE (CEERT)

PUSHKAR WAGLE
BAY AREA MUNICIPAL TRANSMISSION

5440 EDGEVIEW DRIVE
DISCOVERY BAY, CA 94505
FOR: BAY AREA MUNICIPAL

GROUP

KATY MORSONY
ALCANTAR & KAHL
345 CALIFORNIA STREET, STE. 2450
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94602
FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS AND USERS
COALITION (EPUC)

MARK BYRON
WHOLESALE ELECTRICITY PROGRAM MGR.
UNIV. OF CALIF. OFFICE OF THE

1111 FRANKLIN ST., 6TH FL.
OAKLAND, CA 94607
FOR: THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY

CALIFORNIA

LISA BELENKY
SR. ATTY
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
1212 BROADWAY, STE. 800
OAKLAND, CA 94612
FOR: CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL

SHERIDAN PAUKER
PARTNER
KEYES & FOX LLP
436 14TH STREET, SUITE 1305
OAKLAND, CA 94612
FOR: VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY ALLIANCE

TANDY MCMANNES
ABENGOA SOLAR
I KAISER PLAZA, STE. 1675
OAKLAND, CA 94612-3699
FOR: ABENGOA SOLAR

ALEX MORRIS
SR. DIR., POLICY & REGULATORY AFFAIRS
CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
2150 ALLSTON WAY, SUITE 210
BERKELEY, CA 94704
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
(CESA)

GREGG MORRIS
DIRECTOR
THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
2039 SHATTUCK AVE., SUITE. 402
BERKELEY, CA 94704
FOR: GREEN POWER INSTITUTE

JULIA LEVIN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
BIOENERGY ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
PO BOX 6184
ALBANY, CA 94706
FOR: BIOENERGY ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
CENTER

JULIA A. LEVIN
ON BEHALF OF WATERSHED CENTER
106 SAINT ALBANS ROAD
KENSINGTON, CA 94708
FOR: THE WATERSHED CENTER / THE
WATERSHED RESEARCH AND TRAINING

NANCY RADER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
CALIFORNIA WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION
PARTNERS
1700 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 17
BERKELEY, CA 94709
FOR: CALIFORNIA WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION

ARTHUR HAUBENSTOCK
ATTORNEY
SUSTAINABLE ENERGY STRATEGY
175 ELINOR AVE., STE. G
MILL VALLEY, CA 94941
FOR: HARVEST POWER CALIFORNIA, LLC

L. JAN REID
COAST ECONOMIC CONSULTING
3185 GROSS ROAD
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95062
FOR: L. JAN REID

MICHAEL J. MINKLER
GENERAL MANAGER
UTICA WATER AND POWER AUTHORITY
1168 BOOSTER WAY / PO BOX 358
ANGELS CAMP, CA 95222
FOR: UTICA WATER AND POWER

AUTHORITY

(UTICA)

GARSON KNAPP
LIBERTY POWER CORP.
131 - A STONY CIRCLE, STE. 500
SANTA ROSA, CA 95401
FOR: LIBERTY POWER DELAWARE,
LLC/LIBERTY POWER HOLDINGS

STEVEN S. SHUPE
GENERAL COUNSEL
SONOMA CLEAN POWER AUTHORITY
50 SANTA ROSA AVE., 5TH FL.
SANTA ROSA, CA 95404
FOR: SONOMA CLEAN POWER

MATTHEW MARSHALL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
REDWOOD COAST ENERGY AUTHORITY

CHRISTIANA DARLINGTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CLERE INC

633 3RD STREET
EUREKA, CA 95501
FOR: REDWOOD COAST ENERGY AUTHORITY
PRODUCT
(RCEA)

CHRISTIANA DARLINGTON
DARLINGTON LEGAL SERVICES
110 MAPLE ST.
OPERATOR
AUBURN, CA 95603
FOR: PLACER COUNTY AIR POLLUTION
CONTROL DISTRICT (PCAPCD)

CHRISTIANA DARLINGTON
ATTORNEY
CLERE, INC.
5622 BLACK WILLOW STREET
ROCKLIN, CA 95677
FOR: MARIPOSA BIOMASS PROJECT
PARTNERSHIP

KRISTIN SICKE
ASSISTANT GEN. MGR.
YOLO COUNTY FLOOD COUNTRLO
CAUCUS
34274 STATE HIGHWAY 16
WOODLAND, CA 95695
FOR: YOLO COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND
ASSOCIATION
WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

BLUMBERG
GLACIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.
720 14TH ST.
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: GLACIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

JULEE M. BALL
EXECUTIVE DIR.
CALIFORNIA BIOMASS ENERGY ALLIANCE
P.C.
1015 K STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: CALIFORNIA BIOMASS ENERGY ALLIANCE

KIMBERLEY DELFINO

1130 DIABLO COURT
AUBURN, CA 95603
FOR: CALAVERAS HEALTHY IMPACT
SOLUTIONS (CHIPS)

JORDAN PINJUV
COUNSEL
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
250 OUTCROPPING WAY
FOLSOM, CA 95630
FOR: CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM
OPERATOR (CAISO)

CHRISTIANA DARLINGTON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CLERE INC
5622 BLACK WILLOW ST.
ROCKLIN, CA 95677
FOR: CAMPTONVILLE COMMUNITY

DANIELLE O. MILLS
DIRECTOR
AMERICAN WIND ENERGY ASSOC CA
1970 MEADOW OAK LANE
MEADOW VISTA, CA 95722
FOR: AMERICAN WIND ENERGY
CALIFORNIA CAUCUS (AWEA)

DAVID PEFFER
ATTORNEY
BRAUN BLAISING SMITH & WYNNE, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: SILICON VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY
AUTHORITY (SVCEA)

JUSTIN WYNNE
ATTORNEY
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH,
P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: CALIFORNIA MUNICIPAL UTILITIES
ASSOCIATION (CMUA)

MATTHEW KLOPFENSTEIN

CALIF. PROGRAM DIR.
DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE
LLC
1303 J STREET, STE. 270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE

ATTORNEY
GONZALEZ, QUINTANA, HUNTER & CRUZ,
915 L STREET, STE. 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: NLINE ENERGY, INC.

ROBERT PALMESE
EDF INDUSTRIAL POWER SERVICES (CA), LLC
455 CAPITOL MALL COMPLEX, STE 217
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: EDF INDUSTRIAL POWER SERVICES
(CA), LLC

SCOTT BLAISING
ATTORNEY
BRAUN BLAISING SMITH WYNNE P.C.
915 L STREET, STE. 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: PIONEER COMMUNITY ENERGY

ANDREW BROWN
CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY, INC.
2600 CAPITOL AVE., STE. 400
LLP
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
FOR: CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY, INC.

BRIAN S. BIERING
ATTORNEY
ELLISON SCHNEIDER HARRIS & DONLAN
2600 CAPITOL AVE., SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
FOR: DAIRY CARES

JEDEDIAH GIBSON
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
LLP
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
FOR: BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE

RONALD LIEBERT
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON SCHNEIDER HARRIS & DONLAN
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, STE. 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816
FOR: OTAY LANDFILL GAS, LLC

ANDREW B. BROWN
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP
DISTRICT
2600 CAPITAL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5931
FOR: ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS
(AREM)

ELAINE SISON-LEBRILLA
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY
6201 S STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95817
FOR: SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY
DISTRICT (SMUD)

MARK HENWOOD
HENWOOD ASSOCIATES, INC.
7311 GREENHAVEN DRIVE, STE. 275
SACRAMENTO, CA 95831
FOR: MARK HENWOOD

KAREN NORENE MILLS
ATTORNEY
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
FOR: CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU

FEDERATION

ROBERT PALMESE
PALMCO POWER CA
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DR., STE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
FOR: PALMCO POWER CA

CALPINE POWERAMERICA-CA, LLC
2730 GATEWAY OAKS DR., STE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
FOR: CALPINE POWERAMERICA-CA, LLC

TENASKA POWER SERVICES CO
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DR., STE 150 N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
FOR: TENASKA POWER SERVICES CO.

TERI BROWN
CONSULTANT
TENASKA POWER SERVICES CO.
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DR, STE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833-3505
FOR: TENASKA CALIFORNIA ENERGY
MARKETING, LLC

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DAY CARTER & MURPHY LLP
COOPER
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, STE. 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864
FOR: AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS
ASSOCIATION (AECA)

ANDREW J. MCCLURE, ESQ.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MINASIAN, MEITH, SOARES, SEXTON &
1681 BIRD STREET / PO BOX 1679
OROVILLE, CA 95965-1679
FOR: NEVADA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

ETTA LOCKEY
SR. COUNSEL
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH ST., STE. 1500
PORTLAND, OR 97232
FOR: PACIFICORP D/B/A PACIFIC POWER

Information Only

AARON (YICHEN) LU
PROGRAM COORDINATOR
CITY OF SAN DIEGO
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALIA SCHOEN
PUBLIC POLICY MGR.
BLOOM ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALLISON SMITH
ATTORNEY
STOEL RIVES LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALVIN S. PAK
ATTORNEY
LAW OFFICES OF ALVIN S. PAK
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

AMY BARR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ANTHONY KEKULAWELA
PORT OF OAKLAND
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: PORT OF OAKLAND

BARBARA BARKOVICH
CONSULTANT
BARKOVICH & YAP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BELEN VALENZUELA
IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BRANDI FICHTNER
KIRKWOOD MEADOWS PUD
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: KIRKWOOD MEADOWS PUD

BREWSTER BIRDSALL, P.E., QEP
SR. ASSOCIATE
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BRIAN THEAKER
DIR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
NRG ENERGY, INC. - WEST
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
POOLING

BRUCE MCLAUGHLIN
BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: POWER & WATER RESOURCES

AUTHORITY

CAITLIN LIOTRIS
SENIOR CONSULTANT
ENERGY STRATEGIES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CASE COORDINATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CATHIE ALLEN
PACIFICORP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF
ASSISTANT GEN. COUNSEL
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAMON FRANZ
DIRECTOR - POLICY & ELECTRICITY MARKETS
TESLA, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DANIEL BARAD
BIOMASS CAMPAIGN ORGANIZER / REP.
SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DANIELLE CHUPA
CORDOBA CORPORATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVID BROWNLEE, JR.
CITY OF NEEDLES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF NEEDLES

DAWN ANAISCOURT
DIR - CPUC REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DIANE LUCCHETTI
CITY OF UKIAH
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF UKIAH

EBCE REGULATORY
EAST BAY COMMUNITY ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

EMILY P. SANGI
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

EVELYN KAHL
COUNSEL
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

FELIX LEBRON
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

FRED LYNN
RANCHO CUCAMONGA MUNICIPAL UTILITY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: RANCHO CUCAMONGA MUNICIPAL UTILITY

FREEMAN S. HALL
SOLAR ELECTRIC SOLUTIONS, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

GRANT FUJII
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

HERMAN LEUNG
CITY OF PASADENA
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF PASADENA

HOWARD V. GOLUB
ATTORNEY
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CLEAN POWER ALLIANCE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

JAN PEPPER
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JAN PEPPER
ELECTRIC DIV., MGR.
SILICON VALLEY POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: SILICON VALLEY POWER

JANET OPPIO
ALAMEDA MUNICIPAL POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: ALAMEDA MUNICIPAL POWER

JANICE DIAS
PORT OF STOCKTON
SERVICES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: PORT OF STOCKTON UTILITIES

JENELE DAVIDSON
VICTORVILLE MUNICIPAL UTILITIES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: VICTORVILLE MUNICIPAL SERVICES

JENNIFER CREGAR
PROJECT SUPERVISOR
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JENNIFER W. SUMMERS
CALIFORNIA REGULATORY AFFAIRS
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JEREMY WAEN
SR. REGULATORY ANALYST
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JESSICA HILGART
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JIM STEFFENS
CITY OF BANNING, CALIFORNIA
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF BANNING

JON ABENDSCHEIN
CITY OF PALO ALTO
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF PALO ALTO

KANNA VANCHASWARAN
CITY OF CERRITOS
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF CERRITOS
DISTRICT

KAREN PALMER
TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES

KATIE JORRIE
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KATIE RAMSEY
CLEAN COALITION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KAVYA BALARAMAN
REPORTER
CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KAZEEM B. OMIDIJI
REGULATORY CASE MANAGER
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KEVIN SIMONSEN
ENERGY USERS FORUM
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CO 00000

KEVIN WOODRUFF
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LAUREN HUDSON
EXPERT CASE MGR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LAURENCE G. CHASET
COUNSEL
KEYES FOX & WIEDMAN, LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LEGAL DIVISION
CPUC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LEILANI JOHNSON KOWAL
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LESLIE ALMOND
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY

LINDA NOVICK
HARVEST POWER
EMAIL ONLY

EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

M. GRADY MATHAI-JACKSON
ATTORNEY
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MARK SORENSEN
BIGGS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: BIGGS MUNICIPAL UTILITIES

MCE REGULATORY
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MELISSA PRICE
LODI ELECTRIC UTILITY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: Lodi Electric Utility

MIKE CADE
ALCANTAR & KAHL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PATRICK FERGUSON
ATTORNEY
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CALPINE CORPORATION

PAUL HAUSER
TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: TRINITY PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT

PETER T. PEARSON
CONTRACT AND COMPLIANCE MGR.
CONSULTANTS,

EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MAGGIE CHAN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MCE COMPLIANCE
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MEL GRANDI
CITY OF UKIAH
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF UKIAH

MICHAEL TENNEYCK
CITY OF CORONA
DEPT OF WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF CORONA

MOHIT CHHABRA
SCIENTIST
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PAUL ESFORMES
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PETER MILLER
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PHILLIP REESE
C/O REESE-CHAMBERS SYSTEMS

MONTEREY BAY COMMUNITY POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PJOY T. CHUA
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

REGULATORY FILE ROOM
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

REIKO KERR
PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPT.
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF RIVERSIDE

ROB HICKEY
GRIDLEY ELECTRIC UTILITY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: GRIDLEY ELECTRIC UTILITY

ROBERT GEX
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
TRANSMISSION/INTERCONNECTION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SANDEEP ARORA
ASST. V.P.-
LS POWER DEVELOPMENT, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SANGEETHA LOSARI
LOS ANGELES DEPT OF WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SCOTT LESCH
PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPT.
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF RIVERSIDE

SHANNON EDDY
LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION

SHARON YANG
DIRECTOR OF LEGAL SERVICES
LIBERTY UTILITIES (WEST REGION)
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, AA 00000

STEPHEN HOLABAUGH
TRUCKEE DONNER PUBLIC UTILITIES DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: TRUCKEE DONNER PUBLIC UTILITIES
DISTRICT

STEVEN F. GREENWALD
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: LIBERTY UTILITIES (CALPECO
ELECTIRC) LLC

STEVEN HANDY
REDDING ELECTRIC UTILITY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: REDDING ELECTRIC UTILITY

STEVEN K. ENDO, P.E.
WATER & POWER
CITYOF PASADENA
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF PASADENA WATER & POWER

TERRY CROWLEY
CITY OF HEALDSBURG
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF HEALDSBURG
DISTRICT

THERESA PHILLIPS
LASSEN MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: LASSEN MUNICIPAL UTILITY

THOMAS R. DEL MONTE
PHOENIX BIOMASS ENERGY, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

TOM MILLER
CITY OF SHASTA LAKE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF SHASTA LAKE

TONY BRAUN
BRAUN BALISING MCLAUGHLIN PC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

TONY GONCALVES
ROSEVILLE ELECTRIC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONL, CA 00000
FOR: ROSEVILLE ELECTRIC

UDI HELMAN
HELMAN ANALYTICS
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

VALERIE PUFFER
CITY OF GLENDALE WATER & POWER
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: GLENDALE WATER & POWER

VAN DAO
ASSOCIATE PROJECT DEVELOPMENT
NRG ENERGY, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

VANESSA LARA
MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: MERCED IRRIGATIN DISTRICT

VANESSA XIE
ISLAND ENERGY
CITY OF PITTSBURG
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF PITTSBURG D/B/A ISLAND
ENERGY

VINCE BRAR
CITY OF CERRITOS
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CITY OF CERRITOS

WILLIAM DIETRICH
SENIOR CONSULTANT
DIETRICH CONSULTING
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PALMCO ENERGY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CAMERON-DANIEL, P.C.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KAREN TERRANOVA
ALCANTAR & KAHL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

MIKE LEVIN
DIR - GOVN'T AFFAIRS
FUELCELL ENERGY, INC.
3 GREAT PASTURE ROAD
DANBURY, CT 06810

KIMBERLY RAI
AGERA ENERGY LLC
555 PLEASANTVILLE RD S 107
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

TONY WETZEL
DIR - ASSET OPTIMIZATON
EPP SERVICE CO.
1605 N. CEDAR CREST BLVD., NO. 509
ALLENTOWN, PA 18104

ERIKA SCHMITT
CUSTOMIZED ENERGY SOLUTIONS, LTD.
1528 WALNUT STREET, 22ND FL.
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102

KIRA BRYERS
CUSTOMIZED ENERGY SOLUTIONS LTD.
1528 WALNUT STREET, 22ND FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102

CHRISTA HODNETT
MANAGER, CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
TENASKA POWER SERVICES CO.
1701 E. LAMAR BLVD., SUITE 100
ARLINGTON, TX 76006

KARA MORGAN
TRANSWEST EXPRESS LLC
555- 17TH STREET, STE. 2400
400
DENVER, CO 80202

KELLY CRANDALL
EQ RESEARCH, LLC
1400 16TH ST., 16 MARKET SQR., STE.
DENVER, CO 80202

DANIEL RAMIREZ
ANALYST
ENERGY STRATEGIES, LLC
215 SOUTH STATE STREET, STE 200
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

ROBERT D. SMITH
VP, TRANSMISSION PLANNING & DEVELOP
TRANSCANYON, LLC
400 EAST VAN BUREN ST., STE 350
PHOENIX, AZ 85004

PAUL THOMSEN
GOVERNMENT AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
6225 NEIL ROAD
RENO, NV 89511

BRANDON SMITHWOOD
MGR. - CALIF. STATE AFFAIRS
SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 90000

JEAN-CLAUDE BERTET
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
POWER
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER & POWER
111 N HOPE STREET, SUITE 340
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

RANDY S. HOWARD
LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF WATER AND
111 NORTH HOPE STREET, ROOM 921
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
FOR: L.A. DEPT OF WATER & POWER

MATTHEW H. LANGER
COO
CLEAN POWER ALLIANCE
555 WEST 5TH ST., 35TH FL.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

NATASHA KEEFER
DIR - PWR PLANNING & PROCUREMENT
CLEAN POWER ALLIANCE
555 WEST 5TH ST., 35TH FL.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

TED BARDACKE
CLEAN POWER ALLIANCE OF SOUTHERN CALIF.
555 WEST 5TH ST., 35TH FL.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

MAYA GOLDEN-KRASNER
SR. ATTORNEY
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
CLIMATE LAW INSTITUTE
660 S. FIGUEROA ST, SUITE 1000
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

STEVEN ZURETTI
DIR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
BROOKFIELD ENERGY MARKETING INC.
601 S. FIGUEROA ST., STE. 2200
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

LUJUANA MEDINA
REGULATORY MANAGER
ENERGYRSC
EMAIL ONLY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

ABRAHAM ALEMU
RESOURCE PLANNING & DEV. MANAGER
CITY OF VERNON
4305 SANTE FE AVENUE
VERNON, CA 90058
FOR: CITY OF VERNON

DAN MARSH
MGR, RATES AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LIBERTY UTILITIES (CALIFORNIA)
9750 WASHBURN ROAD
DOWNEY, CA 90241-7002

EDWARD JACKSON
DIR - REVENUE REQUIREMENTS
LIBERTY UTILITIES (CALIFORNIA)
9750 WASHBURN ROAD / PO BOX 7002
DOWNEY, CA 90241-7002

MILISSA MARONA
DIR - GOV'T & UTILITY RELATIONS
CODA ENERGY
135 E. MAPLE AVE.
MONROVIA, CA 91016

HIMANSHU PANDEY
ASST. POWER PRODUCTION SUPERINTENDENT
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 W. MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK, CA 91502
FOR: CITY OF BURBANK

LINCOLN BLEVEANS
POWER RESOURCES MANAGER
BURBANK WATER & POWER
164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK, CA 91502
FOR: CITY OF BURBANK

YAREK LEHR
AZUSA LIGHT & WATER
729 N. AZUSA AVENUE
AZUSA, CA 91702
FOR: CITY OF AZUSA - LIGHT AND WATER
DEPT.

JOHN D BALLAS
CITY ENGINEER
CITY OF INDUSTRY
PO BOX 3366
CITY OF INDUSTRY, CA 91744
FOR: CITY OF INDUSTRY

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
8631 RUSH STREET
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

KATIE SLOAN
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 800
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

JANET S. COMBS, ESQ.
SR. ATTORNEY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. / PO BOX 800
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770-3714

CHAD COLTON
LAW CLERK
TOSDAL LAW FIRM
777 S. HIGHWAY 101, STE. 215
SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075

TY TOSDAL
ATTORNEY
TOSDAL LAW FIRM
777 S. HIGHWAY 101, SUITE 215
SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075
FOR: SOLANA ENERGY ALLIANCE
(CESA)

DONALD C. LIDDELL
ATTORNEY
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE

DON KELLY
EXE. DIR.
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK
3405 KENYON STREET, SUITE 401
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110

JOHN W. LESLIE, ESQ
ATTORNEY
DENTONS US LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 92121

KELLY FOLEY
PILOT POWER GROUP
520
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE, SUITE 520
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE, STE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

BRANDON HENZIE
REGULATORY CASE MGR.
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK CT., CP32F
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

DEAN A. KINPORTS
REGULATORY CASE MGR.
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32F
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

JENNIFER WRIGHT
REGULATORY CASE MGR.
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32F
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

CENTRAL FILES
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK CT, CP31-E
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

DESPINA NIEHAUS
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32H
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

PETER T. PEARSON
ENERGY SUPPLY SPECIALIST
BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE
42020 GARSTIN DRIVE, PO BOX 1547
BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315-1547

JANETTE OLKO
ELECTRIC UTILITY DIVISION MANAGER
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY
14325 FREDERICK ST., STE. 9

RYAN M.F. BARON
ATTORNEY
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
18101 VON KARMAN AVENUE, STE 1000

MORENO VALLEY, CA 92552

CARRIE THOMPSON
CITY OF ANAHEIM
201 S. ANAHEIM BLVD., STE. 802
ANAHEIM, CA 92805
FOR: CITY OF ANAHEIM - INTEGRATED
RESOURCES DIV.

SHELLY-ANN MAYE
REGULATORY MGR.
TRANSCANYON, LLC
666 GRAND AVENUE, STE. 500
DES MOINES, CA 94000
FOR: TRANSCANYON

SUE MARA
CONSULTANT
RTO ADVISORS, LLC
164 SPRINGDALE WAY
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062

DAVID A. SILBERMAN
GENERAL COUNSEL
SAN MATEO COUNTY COUNSEL'S OFFICE
400 COUNTY CENTER, 6TH FL.
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

AUTHORITY

MILA A. BUCKNER
ATTORNEY
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
AUTHORITY
601 GATEWAY BLVD., STE. 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

DAN WILLIS
PLANNING AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE
SFPUC
525 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE, 7TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
234

CLEANPOWER SF REGULATORY
SFPUC

IRVINE, CA 92612
FOR: DESERT COMMUNITY ENERGY (DCE)

GARY KEEFE
UTILITY DIRECTOR
CITY OF LOMPOC
UTILITY DEPARTMENT
100 CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
LOMPOC, CA 93438-8001
FOR: CITY OF LOMPOC

EMILY LESLIE
ENERGY REFLECTIONS
1028 MONTE VERDE DR
PACIFICA, CA 94044

ANDREW STEVENSON
REGULATORY AFFAIRS MGR.
HYDRO SIERRA ENERGY LLC
PO BOX 6978
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063
FOR: HYDRO SIERRA ENERGY LLC

MATTHEW J. SANDERS
DEPUTY COUNTY COUNSEL
SAN MATEO COUNTY COUNSEL'S OFFICE
400 COUNTY CENTER, 6TH FLOOR
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063
FOR: PENINSULA CLEAN ENERGY

HILARY STAVER
REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
SILICON VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY
333 W. EL CAMINO REAL, STE. 290
SUNNYVALE, CA 94087

SUZY HONG
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL
1 DR. CARLTON B GOODLETT PLACE, RM
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

ADENIKE ADEYEYE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

525 GOLDEN GATE AVE.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

COMMISSIONER GUZMAN ACEVES
ROOM 5303
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

AUSTIN M. YANG
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PL, RM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682

ERIC BORDEN
ENERGY POLICY ANALYST
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
785 MARKET STREET, STE. 1400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

CATHERINE WATKINS
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

JOANIE YUEN
CASE MGR
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., MC B23A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

MATTHEW GONZALES
SR CASE MGR
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE ST., RM. 918, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

MELICIA CHARLES
SUNRUN INC.
595 MARKET STREET, 29TH FL.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

MICHAEL ALCANTAR
ATTORNEY AT LAW
BUCHALTER, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
55 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

MONICA SCHWEBS
MORGAN LEWIS BOCKIUS, LLP
ONE MARKET, SPEAR STREET TOWER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1596

FRANCESCA WAHL
SR. POLICY ASSOCIATE, BUS. DEVELOPMENT
TESLA, INC.
444 DE HARO STREET, STE. 101
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

ALISON TORBITT
NIXON PEABODY LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 18TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

BUCK ENDEMANN
ATTORNEY
K&L GATES, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO, STE 1200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

JOHN MCINTYRE
ATTORNEY
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI & DAY, LLP
505 SANSOME ST., STE. 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

LILLY B. MCKENNA
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 30TH FL.
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

LOUISE DYBLE
ATTORNEY
WINSTON & STRAWN
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, STE. 3500
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

LUISA F. ELKINS
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI & DAY, LLP

MEGAN SOMOGYI
ATTORNEY

505 SANSOME ST., STE. 900
LLP
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, & DAY,
505 SANSOME ST., STE. 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

THOMAS W. SOLOMON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

MICHAEL B. DAY
ATTORNEY
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, & DAY,
505 SANSOME STREET, STE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3133
FOR: ABENGOA SOLAR

JOSEPH M. KARP
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
101 CALIFORNIA STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5894

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST STE 303
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-2242

JENNIFER K. POST
CHIEF COUNSEL
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY LAW DEPT.
77 BEALE STREET, B30A / PO BOX 7442
(B30A)
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

WILLIAM V. MANHEIM
ATTORNEY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET / PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

MATTHEW A. FOGELSON
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
LAW DEPT.
77 BEALE ST., MC B30A-2487 / PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442

MEGAN M. MYERS
ATTORNEY
LAW OFFICES OF SARA STECK MYERS
122 - 28TH AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

ALEXEY ORKIN
CONSULTANT
FLYNN RESOURCE CONSULTANTS INC.
5440 EDGEVIEW DRIVE
DISCOVERY BAY, CA 94505

BARRY R. FLYNN
FLYNN RESOURCE CONSULTANTS, INC.
5440 EDGEVIEW DRIVE
DISCOVERY BAY, CA 94505

KERRY HATTEVIK
REG. DIR.- WEST GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
NEXT ERA ENERGY RESOURCES LLC
829 ARLINGTON BLVD.
EL CERRITO, CA 94530

KATHY TRELEVEN
KATHY TRELEVEN CONSULTING
103 BANDOL CT.
SAN RAMON, CA 94582

JENNIFER WEBERSKI
CONSULTANT ON BEHALF OF:
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND
49 TERRA BELLA DRIVE
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

SARAH QURESHI
NEXTERA ENERGY
2392 EAST 24TH STREET
OAKLAND, CA 94601

ALLIE DETRIO
POLICY MANAGER
PROGRAM
ENGIE SERVICES
PRES.
500 12TH STREET, SUITE 300
OAKLAND, CA 94607

RACHEL BIRD
DIR - POLICY & BUS. DEVELOPMENT, WEST
BORREGO SOLAR SYSTEMS, INC.
360 22ND STREET, SUITE 600
OAKLAND, CA 94612

ANDY KATZ
LAW OFFICES OF ANDY KATZ
2150 ALLSTON WAY , STE. 400
BERKELEY, CA 94704

JEANNE M. SOLE'
DEPUTY DIR - POWER RESOURCES
SAN JOSE CITY
200 E. SANTA CLARA ST., 14TH FL.
SAN JOSE, CA 95113
FOR: SAN JOSE CLEAN ENERGY

JEFF KASPAR
DEPUTY PORT DIRECTOR OF PROPERTY & ENVIR
PORT OF STOCKTON
2201 W. WASHINGTON STREET
STOCKTON, CA 95203-2942
FOR: PORT OF STOCKTON

ED FRANCIOSA
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354

WES MONIER
STRATEGIC ISSUES AND PLANNING MANAGER
TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT
333 EAST CANAL DRIVE, PO BOX 949
TURLOCK, CA 95381-0949
FOR: TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT

CB HALL
SONOMA CLEAN POWER
50 SANTA ROSA AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR

CYNTHIA CLARK
MANAGER, WHOLESALE ELECTRICITY
UNIV. OF CALIF. - OFFICE OF THE
1111 BROADWAY . SUITE 1450
OAKLAND, CA 94607

TIM LINDL
COUNSEL
KEYES & FOX LLP
436 14TH STREET, STE. 1305
OAKLAND, CA 94612

PHILLIP MULLER
PRESIDENT
SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS
436 NOVA ALBION WAY
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

C. SUSIE BERLIN
LAW OFFICES OF SUSIE BERLIN
1346 THE ALAMEDA, STE. 7, NO. 141
SAN JOSE, CA 95126

DAVID OLIVARES
ELECTRIC RESOURCE
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
PO BOX 4060
MODESTO, CA 95352
FOR: MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT

GREG SALYER
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354

DALE ROBERTS
SONOMA COUNTY WATER AGENCY
404 AVIATION BLVD.
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403

JAMES H. CALDWELL, JR
1650 E. NAPA STREET
SONOMA, CA 95476

SANTA ROSA, CA 95404

STUART ROBERTSON
ROBERTSON-BRYAN, INC.
EASTSIDE POWER AUTHORITY
9888 KENT ST
ELK GROVE, CA 95624-9483
FOR: EASTSIDE POWER AUTHORITY

CALIFORNIA ISO
250 OUTCROPPING WAY
FOLSOM, CA 95630

MATTHEW SWINDLE
CEO & FOUNDER
NLINE ENERGY, INC.
5170 GOLDEN FOOTHILL PARKWAY
EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762

REGULATORY MANAGER
WELLHEAD ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.
650 BERECUT DRIVE, STE. C
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811

ALLISON C. SMITH
ATTORNEY
STOEL RIVES LLP
500 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 1600
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

AUDRA HARTMANN
PRINCIPAL
SMITH, WATTS & HARTMANN
925 L STREET, SUITE 220
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

DAN GRIFFITHS
ATTORNEY
P.C.
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: SILICON VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY
AUTHORITY (SVCEA)

DAVID PEFFER
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH,
915 L STREET, SUITE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

KATE KELLY
DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE
1303 J STREET, SUITE 270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

LAURA FERNANDEZ
ATTORNEY
BRAUN BLAISING SMITH WYNNE, P.C.
915 L STREET, STE 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

LINDA JOHNSON
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

MICHAEL BOCCADORO
WEST COAST ADVISORS
925 L STREET, SUITE 800
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS
ASSOCIATION (AECA)

NANCY SARACINO
MANAGING ATTORNEY
WESTERN ENERGY & WATER
500 CAPITOL MALL, STE. 2350
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

REGULATORY CLERK
BRAUN BLAISING SMITH WYNNE, PC
915 L STREET, STE. 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

RUTHANN G. ZIEGLER
ATTORNEY
MEYERS NAVE
555 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 1200
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: PIONEER COMMUNITY ENERGY (PIONEER)

SARAH KOZAL
ATTORNEY
WESTERN ENERGY & WATER
500 CAPITOL MALL, STE. 2350
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SARAH TAHERI
SO. CALIF. PUBLIC POWER AUTHORITY
915 L STREET, STE. 1410
P.C.
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC POWER
AUTHORITY (SCPPA)

SCOTT BLAISING
ATTORNEY
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH,
915 L STREET, STE. 1480
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN J. KEENE
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN & SMITH, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN KELLEY
POLICY DIRECTOR
INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS ASSN.
1215 K STREET, SUITE 900
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

C/O WEST COAST ADVISORS
AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSN.
925 L STREET, SUITE 800
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

HARRIET A. STEINER
ATTORNEY
BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
500 CAPITOL MALL, STE. 1700
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-4704
FOR: VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY ALLIANCE

(VCEA)

DOUGLAS KERNER
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
LLP
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

BRIAN S. BIERING
ATTORNEY
ELLISON SCHNEIDER HARRIS & DONLAN
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905
FOR: AMERICAN WIND ENERGY

ASSOCIATION

CALIFORNIA CAUCUS

JEFFERY D. HARRIS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER HARRIS & DONLAN LLP
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

LYNN M. HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

CAREY MORRIS
CONSULTANT, CONTRACT ADMIN.
TENASKA POWER SERVICES CO.
2710 GATEWAY OAKS DR, STE 150N
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

KEVIN TAGGART
PRINCIPAL MANAGEMENT ANALYST
COUNTY OF BUTTE
25 COUNTY CENTER DRIVE, STE. 200
OROVILLE, CA 95928
FOR: BUTTE COUNTY

DAVID R. BRANCHCOMB
SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES
AFFAIRS
PO BOX 496028
REDDING, CA 96049

VIRINDER SINGH
DIR - REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE

EDF RENEWABLE ENERGY
1000 SW BROADWAY, SUITE 1880
PORTLAND, OR 97205

MARGARET MILLER
DIR - REGULATORY & MKT DEVELOPMENT
AVANGRID RENEWABLES
1125 NW COUCH STREET
PORTLAND, OR 97209

DEBI WINNEY
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH ST., STE. 600
PORTLAND, OR 97232

POOJA KISHORE
PACIFICORP
825 NE MULTNOMAH, STE. 600
PORTLAND, OR 97232

State Service

ANGELA GOULD
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BRENT TARNOW
CPUC - ENERGY DIV.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CHLOE LUKINS
ORA DIV.
COMMISSION
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

FOREST KASER
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES

EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MICHAEL JASKE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MITCHELL SHAPSON
STAFF ATTORNEY
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES

EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

NICHOLAS FUGATE
SUPPLY ANALYSIS OFFICE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

THERESA DANIELS
ENERGY SPECIALIST 1
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EMAIL ONLY

AMANDA SINGH
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EMAIL ONLY, CA 94102
BRANC

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ANNE E. SIMON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
BRANC
ROOM 5118
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

BRANDON T. GERSTLE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHERYL LEE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC
BRANCH
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRISTIAN KNIERIM
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRISTOPHER MYERS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
ROOM 4104
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID PECK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PRESIDENT PICKER
ROOM 4108
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

EHREN SEYBERT
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER PETERMAN
BRANC
ROOM 5303
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JAMES MCGARRY
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JASON HOUCK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER RANDOLPH
JUDGES
ROOM 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JEANNE MCKINNEY
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
ROOM 5112
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JULIE A. FITCH
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
BRANCH
ROOM 5107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

KAJ PETERSON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

KARIN M. HIETA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
PROGRAM
ROOM 5010
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MARIA AMPARO WORSTER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY EFFICIENCY BRANCH
PERMITTING B
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NILGUN ATAMTURK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
BRANCH
ROOM 5024
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PAUL DOUGLAS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND PERMITTING B
BRANC
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT MASON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 5016
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SANDY GOLDBERG
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN
ROOM 5202
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SYCHE CAI

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

LEE-WHEI TAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PRICING AND CUSTOMER
ROOM 4102
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NATHAN BARCIC
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

PATRICK CUNNINGHAM
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

POONUM AGRAWAL
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT
AREA
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROSANNE O'HARA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5039
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: ORA

SEAN A. SIMON
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER RECHTSCHAFFEN
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TOVAH TRIMMING

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4107
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: ORA

XIAN "CINDY" LI
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
BRANC
ROOM 4104
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHERYL COX
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT
300 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

EMILY CHISHOLM
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

KATHARINE LARSON
CALIFORINA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 9TH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

GABRIEL HERRERA, ESQ.
OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS 14
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

WILLIAM DIETRICH
MGR. - EFFICIENCY DIV.
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS-26
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

[Top of Page](#)

[Back to INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)