STATE OF CALIFORNIA ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

February 20, 2007 Advice Letters 2863-E/E-A

Rose de la Torre
Pacific Gas & Electric
77 Beale Street, Room 1088
Mail Code B10C
San Francisco, CA 94105

Subject: Contract for Procurement of Renewable Energy Resources Resulting from PG&E's 2005 Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Solicitation

Dear Ms. de la Torre:

Advice Letters 2863-E/E-A are effective December 14, 2006. Copies of the advice letters and resolution are returned herewith for your records.

Sincerely,

Sean H. Gallagher, Director
Energy Division

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Brian K. Cherry
Vice President
Regulatory Relations

77 Beale Street, Room 1087
San Francisco, CA 94105

Mailing Address
Mail Code B10C
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177

415.973.4977
Internal: 223.4977
Fax: 415.973.7226
Internet: BKC7@pge.com

July 25, 2006

Advice 2863-E
(Pacific Gas and Electric Company ID U39 E)

Public Utilities Commission of the State of California

<u>Subject</u>: **Contract for Procurement of Renewable Energy Resources Resulting from PG&E's 2005 Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Solicitation**

I. PURPOSE

By this advice letter, Pacific Gas and Electric ("PG&E") seeks the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission or CPUC) approval of two power purchase agreement(s) (PPAs) that PG&E has executed with developers of eligible renewable energy resources as a result of PG&E's 2005 RPS solicitation. The Commission's approval of the PPAs will authorize PG&E to purchase future deliveries of incremental supplies of renewable resources and contribute towards the 20 percent renewables procurement goal required by California's RPS statute.[1] The annual output of these projects is between 790 gigawatt-hours (GWh) and 1,210 GWh of new incremental generation.

The PPAs result from PG&E's August 4, 2005 Solicitation for renewable bids, which was authorized by Decision (D.) 05-07-039. Each PPA contains the non-modifiable standard terms and conditions for RPS contracts adopted by D.04-06-014 and will provide power from renewable resources at the least cost and best fit, as required by D.04-07-029. Each PPA includes the standard term that during the delivery term, the project will constitute an eligible energy resource certified by the California Energy Commission (CEC).

Deliveries from the PPAs are priced below the 2005 market price referent (MPR) and thus do not require any supplemental energy payments (SEPs) from the CEC.

[1] California Public Utilities Code section 399.11 et seq., as interpreted by D.03-07-061, the "Order Initiating Implementation of the Senate Bill 1078 Renewables Portfolio Standard Program", and subsequent CPUC decisions in Rulemaking (R.) 04-04-026.

The PPAs are being presented for CPUC review and approval as provided by the "RPS Solicitation – Contract Approval Milestones" contained in D.04-07-029. Utilities have been encouraged to submit the PPAs for approval in tranches. The first tranche of PPAs resulting from PG&E's 2005 RPS Solicitation was tendered by Advice 2827-E, filed on May 15, 2006, and consisted of three PPAs that will provide 735 GWh per year of incremental renewable energy. This advice letter presents PG&E's second tranche of PPAs resulting from the 2005 Solicitation and consists of two agreements -- an agreement with Northwest Geothermal Company ("Northwest Geothermal") and a second agreement with IAE Truckhaven I, LLC ("Truckhaven"). The PPAs are provided as Confidential Appendix A. These two PPAs will contribute in aggregate up to 1,210 GWh a year of incremental renewable energy.

Since these contracts were signed on or before September 30, 2006, PG&E will treat these contracts as available to demonstrate compliance with its 2005 APT, as authorized by D.05-07-039.

In 2005, the year of this RPS solicitation, PG&E's incremental procurement target (IPT) was 736 GWh. On March 1, 2006, PG&E reported its cumulative adjusted (2003-2005) IPT for 2005 as 1,149 GWh. With the approval of the two new PPAs, PG&E will have procured or contracted for deliveries of up to 1,945 GWh towards that target, or almost 170 percent of its 2005 IPT.[2]

PG&E requests the Commission issue a resolution no later than November 30, 2006 containing the findings required by the definition of "CPUC Approval" in Appendix A of D.04-06-014 and incorporated in the PPA so that PG&E's contracts for these renewable resources can remain in effect.[3] The requested form of approval is described in more detail under the heading, "Request for Commission Approval", below.

In support of this request, the following confidential information is being submitted under seal. This material is protected from public disclosure because it consists of the contract agreement itself, price information, and analyses of proposed RPS contracts which may be protected pursuant to the affected utility's motion pursuant to Decision 06-06-066. A separate Motion for Confidentiality Protection of Electric Procurement Data of the confidential information is being concurrently filed with the Commission's Docket Office.

<u>Appendix A – Power Purchase Agreements</u>

<u>Appendix B -- SEP/MPR worksheets</u>

---

[2] See March 1, 2006 Compliance Filing of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, page 5.

[3] As provided by D.04-06-014, the Commission must approve each PPA and payments to be made thereunder, and find that the procurement will count toward PG&E's RPS procurement obligations, as either incremental procurement or procurement for baseline replenishment in order for an executed RPS PPA to be binding on the parties.

Appendix C – Confidential Contract Analysis

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECTS

The following table summarizes the substantive features of the PPA:

Generating Facility	Type	Term Years	MW Capacity	Annual Deliveries	Commercial Operating Date	Location
Northwest Geothermal	Geothermal	20	60 MW (option to expand to 120 MW)	420 GWh (option to expand to 840 GWh)	Phase I 01/01/2010 Phase II 10/01/2010 Option for Expansion Phase III 7/01/2011 Phase IV: 1/01/2012	Newberry, Volcano Oregon
IAE Truckhaven	Geothermal	20	49 MW	370 GWh	07/01/2010	Truckhaven California

Copies of the PPAs are provided as Confidential Appendix A.

III. CONTRACT ANALYSIS

A. Consistency with PG&E's Adopted RPS Plan.

California's RPS statute requires the Commission to review the results of a renewable energy resource solicitation submitted for approval by a utility. The Commission will then accept or reject proposed PPAs based on their consistency with the utility's approved renewable procurement plan.[4] PG&E's 2005 RPS Energy Procurement Plan (RPS Plan) was approved by D.05-07-039 on July 21, 2005. As required by statute, it includes an assessment of supply and demand to determine the optimal mix of renewable generation resources, consideration of compliance flexibility mechanisms established by the Commission, and a bid solicitation setting forth the need for renewable generation of various operational characteristics.[5]

The goal of PG&E's 2005 RPS Plan was to procure approximately 1 to 2 percent of PG&E's retail sales volume, or between 700 and 1,400 GWh per year, with delivery terms of 10, 15, or 20 years. Participants could submit offers for four specific products – as-available, baseload, peaking, and dispatchable resources.

1. Fit with Identified Renewable Resource Needs

In its approved 2005 RPS Plan, PG&E's portfolio assessment showed a "medium" need for baseload resources beginning in 2007. In order to meet the

[4] Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) section 399.14 subsec. (c).

[5] Pub. Util. Code sec. 399.14 subsec.(a)(3).

20 percent renewable energy target by 2010, PG&E requires incremental energy deliveries from newly contracted resources at an average rate of approximately 700 to 1,400 GWh per year. The PPAs under consideration are expected to contribute significantly toward PG&E's 20 percent by 2010 RPS goal.

2. Consistency with RPS Solicitation Protocol

The proposed PPAs are consistent with the RPS Plan because they were solicited, negotiated and executed through PG&E's implementation of its protocol for the Solicitation (Solicitation Protocol), which is the primary component of the 2005 RPS Plan.

PG&E generally followed the schedule set forth in its Solicitation Protocol, but ultimately, the schedule for concluding negotiations was necessarily extended. The resulting 2005 Solicitation schedule is shown below:

DATE	**EVENT**
August 4, 2005	PG&E issued Solicitation
August 11, 2005	Participants filed Notice of Intent to bid
August 18, 2005	Pre-Bid Conference
September 15, 2005	Participants submitted bids
September 30, 2005	PG&E summarized the bids; consulted with PRG
October 24, 2005	PG&E presented the shortlist
December 1, 2005	PG&E updated its PRG on the status of negotiations
January 12, 2006	PG&E updated its PRG on negotiations with short-listed bidders
March 29, 2006	PG&E updated its PRG on negotiations with short-listed bidders
May 3, 2006	PG&E informed its PRG of the subject contract terms for the projects to be included in the first advice filing
May 15, 2006	PG&E submits first tranche of PPAs for approval
June 15, 2006	PG&E updated its PRG on the status of the negotiations with shortlisted bidders
July 25, 2006	PG&E submits second tranche of PPAs for approval

Using the approved Solicitation Protocol and forms of power purchase agreements, PG&E commenced its solicitation on August 4, 2005. Bids were received until September 15, consistent with the published schedule. All of the accepted bids conformed to the Solicitation Protocol; that is, they offered power from eligible renewable energy resources, they were submitted using the standard forms, they executed the bid protocol and confidentiality agreements, and they posted the required bid deposit.

These bids were evaluated and scored in the manner prescribed in the Solicitation Protocol. In particular, evaluation of the offer price took into account PG&E's published Time of Delivery factors and imputed the potential cost of transmission adders. PG&E scored the offers pursuant to a methodology that attributed the proper weight to market valuation, portfolio fit, credit and other non-price factors of the Solicitation Protocol.

The bids were ranked according to the protocols, and were placed on PG&E's "Short List" and presented to PG&E's PRG on October 24, 2005. PG&E notified short-listed bidders and PG&E negotiations with short-listed bidders once they submitted the required bid deposit. The interim results of negotiations were presented to the PRG on several occasions between December 2, 2005 and July 19, 2006. At those meetings, the PRG had no objection to PG&E proceeding to execute the PPAs presented by this advice letter.

3. Consistency with PG&E's Long Term Procurement Plan

PG&E's long term procurement plan assumed the inclusion of the need for baseload resources. This same need was reflected in PG&E's 2005 RPS plan. Because the projects represented by these PPAs are new baseload geothermal and biomass technologies they contribute to meeting baseload requirements in both of the long term plans.

B. Consistency of bid evaluation process with Least-Cost Best Fit (LCBF) decision.

The LCBF decision directs the utilities to use certain criteria in their bid ranking. It offers guidance regarding the process by which the utility ranks bids in order to select or "shortlist" the bids with which it will commence serious negotiations. Much of the bid ranking criteria described in the LCBF decision is incorporated in PG&E's Solicitation Protocol and is discussed below.

1. Market Valuation

In its "mark-to-market analysis," which PG&E's analyst described at the Least Cost Best Fit workshop on May 25, 2004, the present value of the bidder's payment stream is compared with the present value of the product's market value to determine the benefit (positive or negative) from the procurement of the resource, irrespective of PG&E's portfolio. PG&E evaluates the bid price and indirect costs, such as the costs to the utility transmission system caused by interconnection of the resource to the grid or integration of the generation into the system-wide electrical supply.[6]

[6] PG&E's RPS Renewable Energy Procurement Plan, June 24, 2004, page (p.)6, lines (ll.) 4-18.

2. Portfolio Fit

Portfolio fit considers how well an offer variation's features match PG&E's portfolio needs. This analysis includes the anticipated transaction costs involved in any energy remarketing (i.e., the bid-ask spread) if the contract adds to PG&E's net long position. Because these deliveries are anticipated to occur at a time when PG&E is experiencing moderate need for baseload energy, the acceptance of these baseload deliveries should not result in significant remarketing costs.

C. Consistency with Adopted Standard Terms and Conditions.

The Commission set forth standard terms and conditions to be incorporated into RPS agreements in D. 04-06-014.

During the course of negotiations, the parties identified a need to modify some of the standard terms in order to reach agreement. These terms had all been designated as subject to modification at the bidder's request in Appendix A of D.04-06-014. Standard Terms and Conditions identified as "may not be modified" have not been modified.

The PPAs represent a meeting of the minds by the developers and PG&E, and each term was bargained for in consideration of every other term. Each provision should be understood by the Commission as essential to the negotiated agreement between the parties and should not be disturbed by regulatory review. The reasonableness of an agreement should be examined as a whole, in terms of its ultimate impact on utility customers. The only reason to disturb a particular term would be if the Commission found that it violated public policy. PG&E submits that the agreement protects the interests of ratepayers while achieving the Commission's goal of increasing procurement from eligible renewable resources.

D. Consistency with the Transmission Ranking Cost decision

The RPS statute requires the "least cost, best fit" eligible renewable resources to be procured. Under the RPS program, the potential customer cost to accept energy deliveries from a particular project must be considered when determining a project's value for bid ranking purposes. PG&E's 2005 transmission ranking cost (TRC) report identified the remaining available transmission capacity and upgrade costs for PG&E substations at which renewable resources are expected to interconnect.

PG&E determined the TRC cluster at which each shortlisted project would interconnect to the transmission grid. Consistent with Commission Decisions, based on the potential of each project to contribute to transmission congestion, considering the project's generation profile, the offer to curtail during periods of congestion, if any, the associated proxy transmission network upgrades, and the associated capital costs that may be need to accommodate delivery at this cluster, PG&E assigned a transmission adder to each Offer for evaluation. This cost was compared against the cost of commercial alternatives to physically delivering the power to PG&E's load center, and the lower of the two costs was imputed to the cost of power from the proposed project.

E. Terms and conditions of delivery

Each project will be its own scheduling coordinator. The points of delivery will be California-Oregon Border Trading Hub (COB) and SP-15. Provision has been made for alternate points of delivery if the Independent System Operator's current zonal delivery system is changed from zonal to nodal. No other transmission-related issue required accommodation in the PPA.

F. Contract Price

The contract price of each PPA is confidential, market sensitive information that has been identified by D.06-06-066 as confidential for three years from the date the contract states that energy deliveries begin, or until one year following expiration, whichever comes first. Without waiving its right to protect the confidentiality of the contract price, PG&E publicly states that the levelized contract price for each of the PPAs does not exceed the 2005 MPR. As such, contract payments below the MPR are *per se* reasonable as measured according to the net present value calculations explained in D.04-06-015 and D.04-07-029. The net present value of the sum of payments to be made under the PPA is less than the net present value of payments that would be made at the market price referent for the anticipated delivery. Confidential Appendix B presents a detailed analysis of how the contract payments are below the MPR.

G. Qualitative factors

PG&E considered qualitative factors as required by D.04-07-029. While it was possible to include a diverse mix of renewable technologies in the short list, eventually certain technologies were found to confer significantly greater customer benefits. Neither of the bids asserted that its proposed project would contribute to local reliability or possess any of the qualitative factors identified for special consideration by D.04-07-029.

H. Project Milestones

Each of the PPAs identifies the construction start date and the commercial operation date as guaranteed project milestones. Each PPA also includes an appendix with additional milestones which the parties consider to be critical to meet the identified construction start and commercial operation dates. Based upon the developers' request for confidential treatment of commercial information, PG&E cannot publicly disclose the milestone information.

I. Project Viability

1. Financeability of resource.

It is PG&E's belief that there is a reasonable likelihood that each of the selected projects will be financed and completed as required by the PPAs and will be available to deliver energy by its guaranteed commercial operation date.

2. Production Tax Credit

The Northwest Geothermal PPA is not contingent nor is the pricing dependent on the extension of federal production tax credits as provided in Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. However, depending on the commercial operation deadline, sellers could potentially benefit from the extension of such tax credits.

The Truckhaven PPA contains a unilateral right for Truckhaven to terminate the PPA in the event that PTC legislation is not enacted by December 31, 2007 to extend the federal production tax credit to apply to facilities placed in service by December 10, 2010.

3. Sponsor's creditworthiness and experience

The bidders were required to provide credit-related information as part of their bids. PG&E has reviewed this information and is satisfied that the counterparties to the PPAs possess the necessary credit and experience to perform as required by the parties' PPAs.

4. Project Status

The PPAs include guaranteed construction start dates and guaranteed commercial operation dates. The sellers' obligations to meet these milestones are supported by performance assurance securities.

IV. PRG Feedback

PG&E provided its PRG with reports on the progress of its 2005 RPS solicitation on seven occasions. The first briefing occurred on September 30, 2005, and focused on the results of PG&E's August 4, 2005 solicitation. The second briefing was October 24, 2005 at which PG&E reviewed the results of the bid evaluation and provided its preliminary short-list. At the third PRG briefing on December 1, 2005, PG&E reviewed the status of negotiations with short-listed bidders and responded to concerns raised at the previous presentation. At the

January 12 and March 29, 2006 meetings, PG&E provided the PRG with an overview of the projects it considered most likely to proceed to final agreement. These presentations included a general overview of the negotiated terms and conditions of these and other PPAs.

On May 3, 2006, PG&E provided the PRG with a status report of the 2005 Solicitation. The two projects that are the subject of this advice letter were described and presented in the context of the Solicitation results. There was no opposition to PG&E's execution of these contracts.

The PRG members have expressed general satisfaction with the manner in which PG&E arrived at its 2005 RPS shortlist and the resulting PPAs. The PRG supported PG&E moving forward with these PPAs.

V. Supplemental Energy Payments

As discussed in Section III.F and shown in Appendix B, the contract payments are below the MPR and no supplemental energy payments are required.

VI. Request for Commission Approval

The continued effectiveness of each PPA is conditioned on the occurrence of "CPUC Approval" as that term is defined in the PPA. Time is of the essence in the Commission's consideration and approval of this advice letter.

Therefore, PG&E requests that the Commission issue a resolution no later than November 30, 2006, that:

1. Approves each PPA in its entirety, including payments to be made by PG&E, subject to CPUC review of PG&E's administration of the Agreement.

2. Finds that any procurement pursuant to these Agreements constitutes procurement from eligible renewable energy resources for purposes of determining PG&E's compliance with any obligation that it may have to procure eligible renewable energy resources pursuant to the California Renewables Portfolio Standard (Public Utilities Code Section 399.11 et seq.), Decision 03-06-071, or other applicable law.

3. Finds that any procurement pursuant to these Agreements constitutes incremental procurement or procurement for baseline replenishment by PG&E from eligible renewable energy resources for purposes of determining PG&E's compliance with any obligation to increase its total procurement of eligible renewable energy resources that it

may have pursuant to the California Renewables Portfolio Standard, Decision 03-06-071, or other applicable law.

4. Finds that the cost of the contract between PG&E and developer are reasonable and in the public interest, and that approved payments are fully recoverable in rates over the life of the project.

5. Finds that any cost of bringing generation from the delivery point to PG&E's load center is a transmission cost associated with procurement that will be recorded in the Energy Resource Recovery Account for rate recovery;

6. Finds that any indirect costs of renewables procurement identified in Section 399.15 (a)(2) shall be recovered in rates.

Protests

Anyone wishing to protest this filing may do so by sending a letter by August 14, 2006, which is **20** days from the date of this filing. The protest must state the grounds upon which it is based, including such items as financial and service impact, and should be submitted expeditiously. Protests should be mailed to:

CPUC Energy Division
Attention: Tariff Unit, 4th Floor
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, California 94102

Facsimile: (415) 703-2200
E-mail: jjr@cpuc.ca.gov and jnj@cpuc.ca.gov

Copies should also be mailed to the attention of the Director, Energy Division, Room 4005 and Jerry Royer, Energy Division, at the address shown above.

The protest also should be sent via U.S. mail (and by facsimile and electronically, if possible) to PG&E at the address shown below on the same date it is mailed or delivered to the Commission.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Attention: Brian Cherry
Vice President, Regulatory Relations
77 Beale Street, Mail Code B10C
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, California 94177

Facsimile: (415) 973-7226
E-Mail: PGETariffs@pge.com

Effective Date:

PG&E requests that this advice filing become effective on **November 30, 2006.**

Notice:

In accordance with General Order 96-A, Section III, Paragraph G, a copy of this advice letter excluding the confidential appendices is being sent electronically and via U.S. mail to parties shown on the attached list and the service list for R.06-05-027 and R.01-10-024. Non-market participants who are members of PG&E's Procurement Review Group and have signed appropriate Non-Disclosure Certificates will also receive the advice letter and accompanying confidential attachments by overnight mail. Address changes should be directed to Rose De La Torre (415) 973-4716. Advice letter filings can also be accessed electronically at:

http://www.pge.com/tariffs

Vice President - Regulatory Relations

cc: Service List for R.06-05-027
Service List for R.01-10-024
Paul Douglas -- Energy Division

Attachments

Limited Access to Confidential Material:

PG&E has submitted the Appendices A, B, and C to the Energy Division staff as confidential utility information pursuant to Section 583 of the Public Utilities Code and has filed a motion to protect the confidentiality of the material pursuant to D.06-06-066, ordering paragraph 2. The material in Appendices A and B are an RPS contract and the MPR/price calculation, respectively, which are protected from public disclosure by item VII.(G) in Appendix I of D.06-06-066. The material in Appendix C consists of PG&E's analysis of the terms of the PPAs and is entitled to confidentiality protection pursuant to item VII, "Score sheets, etc." in

Appendix I. Access to the appendices will be subject to the final form of Protective Order authorized by the assigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to D.0606-066, ordering paragraph 14. In the meantime, PG&E will continue to rely upon the terms of the May 20, 2003 Protective Order in R. 01-10-024 Regarding Confidentiality of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) Power Procurement Information. Under the 2003 order, reviewing representatives of Market Participating Parties will not be granted access to Protected Material, but will instead be limited to reviewing redacted versions of documents that contain Protected Material.

Confidential Attachments:

Appendix A Power Purchase Agreements

Appendix B SEP/MPR worksheets

Appendix C Contract Analysis

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ADVICE LETTER FILING SUMMARY
ENERGY UTILITY

MUST BE COMPLETED BY UTILITY (Attach additional pages as needed)

Company name/CPUC Utility No. Pacific Gas and Electric Company U39M

Utility type:	Contact Person: David Poster
☒ ELC ☒ GAS	Phone #: (415) 973-1082
☐ PLC ☐ HEAT ☐ WATER	E-mail: dxpu@pge.com

EXPLANATION OF UTILITY TYPE			(Date Filed/ Received Stamp by CPUC)
ELC = Electric	GAS = Gas		
PLC = Pipeline	HEAT = Heat	WATER = Water	

Advice Letter (AL) #: **2863-E**

Subject of AL: Contract for Procurement of Renewable Energy Resources ((Truckhaven/Newberry)

Keywords (choose from CPUC listing): RPS Procurement

AL filing type: ☐ Monthly ☐Quarterly ☐ Annual ☒One-Time ☐ Other ______________________________

If AL filed in compliance with a Commission order, indicate relevant Decision/Resolution:

Does AL replace a withdrawn or rejected AL? If so, identify the prior AL:

Resolution Required? ☒ Yes☐ No

Requested effective date: **11-30-2006** No. of tariff sheets: 0

Estimated system annual revenue effect: (%): N/A

Estimated system average rate effect (%): N/A

When rates are affected by AL, include attachment in AL showing average rate effects on customer classes (residential, small commercial, large C/I, agricultural, lighting).

Tariff schedules affected: N/A

Service affected and changes proposed[1]:N/A

Pending advice letters that revise the same tariff sheets:

Protests and all other correspondence regarding this AL are due no later than 20 days after the date of this filing, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission, and shall be sent to:

CPUC, Energy Division
Attention: Tariff Unit
505 Van Ness Ave.,
San Francisco, CA 94102
jjr@cpuc.ca.gov and jnj@cpuc.ca.gov

Utility Info (including e-mail)

PG&E Gas and Electric Advice Filing List
General Order 96-A, Section III(G)

ABAG Power Pool
Accent Energy
Aglet Consumer Alliance
Agnews Developmental Center
Ahmed, Ali
Alcantar & Elsesser
Ancillary Services Coalition
Anderson Donovan & Poole P.C.
Applied Power Technologies
APS Energy Services Co Inc
Arter & Hadden LLP
Avista Corp
Barkovich & Yap, Inc.
BART
Bartle Wells Associates
Blue Ridge Gas
Bohannon Development Co
BP Energy Company
Braun & Associates
C & H Sugar Co.
CA Bldg Industry Association
CA Cotton Ginners & Growers Assoc.
CA League of Food Processors
CA Water Service Group
California Energy Commission
California Farm Bureau Federation
California Gas Acquisition Svcs
California ISO
Calpine
Calpine Corp
Calpine Gilroy Cogen
Cambridge Energy Research Assoc
Cameron McKenna
Cardinal Cogen
Cellnet Data Systems
Chevron Texaco
Chevron USA Production Co.
Childress, David A.
City of Glendale
City of Healdsburg
City of Palo Alto
City of Redding
CLECA Law Office
Commerce Energy
Constellation New Energy
CPUC
Cross Border Inc
Crossborder Inc
CSC Energy Services
Davis, Wright, Tremaine LLP
Defense Fuel Support Center
Department of the Army
Department of Water & Power City
DGS Natural Gas Services
Douglass & Liddell
Downey, Brand, Seymour & Rohwer
Duke Energy
Duke Energy North America
Duncan, Virgil E.
Dutcher, John
Dynegy Inc.
Ellison Schneider
Energy Law Group LLP
Energy Management Services, LLC
Exelon Energy Ohio, Inc
Exeter Associates
Foster Farms
Foster, Wheeler, Martinez
Franciscan Mobilehome
Future Resources Associates, Inc
G. A. Krause & Assoc
Gas Transmission Northwest Corporation
GLJ Energy Publications
Goodin, MacBride, Squeri, Schlotz &
Hanna & Morton
Heeg, Peggy A.
Hitachi Global Storage Technologies
Hogan Manufacturing, Inc
House, Lon
Imperial Irrigation District
Integrated Utility Consulting Group
International Power Technology
Interstate Gas Services, Inc.
IUCG/Sunshine Design LLC
J. R. Wood, Inc
JTM, Inc
Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips
Marcus, David
Matthew V. Brady & Associates
Maynor, Donald H.
McKenzie & Assoc
McKenzie & Associates
Meek, Daniel W.
Mirant California, LLC
Modesto Irrigation Dist
Morrison & Foerster
Morse Richard Weisenmiller & Assoc.
Navigant Consulting
New United Motor Mfg, Inc
Norris & Wong Associates
North Coast Solar Resources
Northern California Power Agency
Office of Energy Assessments
OnGrid Solar
Palo Alto Muni Utilities
PG&E National Energy Group
Pinnacle CNG Company
PITCO
Plurimi, Inc.
PPL EnergyPlus, LLC
Praxair, Inc.
Price, Roy
Product Development Dept
R. M. Hairston & Company
R. W. Beck & Associates
Recon Research
Regional Cogeneration Service
RMC Lonestar
Sacramento Municipal Utility District
SCD Energy Solutions
Seattle City Light
Sempra
Sempra Energy
Sequoia Union HS Dist
SESCO
Sierra Pacific Power Company
Silicon Valley Power
Smurfit Stone Container Corp
Southern California Edison
SPURR
St. Paul Assoc
Stanford University
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan
Tabors Caramanis & Associates
Tecogen, Inc
TFS Energy
Transcanada
Turlock Irrigation District
U S Borax, Inc
United Cogen Inc.
URM Groups
Utility Cost Management LLC
Utility Resource Network
Wellhead Electric Company
Western Hub Properties, LLC
White & Case
WMA