

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

In the Matter of the Application of the Nevada
Hydro Company for a Certificate of Public
Convenience and Necessity for the Talega-
Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500-kV Interconnect.

A.07-10-005

**PROTEST OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E)
CONCERNING THE REVISED PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
SUBMITTED BY THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY, INC.**

JENNIFER R. HASBROUCK
LAURA B. RENGER
JANE LEE COLE

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-1040
Facsimile: (626) 302-2610
E-mail: jennifer.hasbrouck@sce.com

Dated: December 15, 2008

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

In the Matter of the Application of the Nevada
Hydro Company for a Certificate of Public
Convenience and Necessity for the Talega-
Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500-kV Interconnect.

A.07-10-005

**PROTEST OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E)
CONCERNING THE REVISED PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
SUBMITTED BY THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY, INC.**

I.

INTRODUCTION

Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”) respectfully submits its protest to the most recent revision to the Proponent’s Environmental Assessment (“Revised PEA”) dated November 13, 2008, submitted by the Nevada Hydro Company, Inc (“TNHC”). Similar to its previous PEAs that have been found by the Commission to be incomplete,¹ TNHC seeks a certificate of public convenience and necessity for a high-voltage transmission line extending from SCE’s existing 500 kV transmission system in western Riverside County to San Diego Gas & Electric Company’s (“SDG&E”) existing 230 kV transmission system in northern San Diego County, the Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500 kV Interconnect (“TE/VS Project” or “Project”). The Project is proposed for the purpose of interconnecting the Lake Elsinore Advanced Pumped Storage hydroelectric plant (“LEAPS” or “LEAPS Project”) to the transmission systems of SCE and SDG&E. The Revised PEA also introduces a new proposal of “additional network improvements and upgrades,” including 115 kV lines plus 12.5 kV distribution lines.

¹ See Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Related to the Nevada Hydro Company’s July 29, 2008 Proponent’s Environmental Assessment, September 2, 2008, pp. 1-2.

The Revised PEA is significantly similar to TNHC's earlier revised PEA issued on July 22, 2008, with relatively minor changes. The Commission found that the July PEA was "incomplete, in that it lacks sufficient details to allow a clear and comprehensive understanding of all aspects of the Project, and that the project description is insufficient, vague, confusing or missing."² SCE's original concerns about the July PEA still exist, as the Revised PEA does not cure these deficiencies.

Specifically, SCE is concerned that TNHC's proposed Lake switchyard site is unsuitable, two 115 kV circuits and 12.5 kV circuits pictured and discussed in the Revised PEA are unnecessary and unstudied, and the TE/VS Project itself is not fully studied by the CAISO and WECC. Moreover, the TE/VS Project should be contingent on construction of the LEAPS Project in order to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary project goals. Further, interconnecting the LEAPS Project to both SCE's and SDG&E's systems is unnecessary to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary project goals. The Revised PEA includes a new "objective" of fortifying and enhancing local reliability of the existing system, but fails to explain the need for this "objective" as it relates to the LEAPS project, the impact of these proposed changes on SCE's system, or how the proposed project is the superior alternative to satisfy the need. SCE has worked with CPUC Staff and TNHC and will continue to work with them on the development of a new substation in the Glen Ivy/Alberhill area that will serve as an alternative to the Lake switchyard site.

II.

THE PROPOSED LAKE SWITCHYARD SITE IS INFERIOR TO SCE'S PREFERRED ALBERHILL SUBSTATION SITE

As referenced in SCE's protest to TNHC's earlier PEA and as stated in the Revised PEA, SCE is developing a new 500/115 kV substation on an approximately 50-acre site in the Glen

² See Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Related to the Nevada Hydro Company's July 29, 2008 Proponent's Environmental Assessment, September 2, 2008, p. 2.

Ivy/Alberhill area of unincorporated Riverside County (the Alberhill site).³ TNHC recognizes that its proposed Lake switchyard site, adjacent to Lee Lake, may not be of sufficient size to accommodate the configuration of SCE's need for a substation in the area.⁴ SCE has advised TNHC that the size of the plot at the Lake switchyard location will not be sufficient for the full 500/115kv substation. SCE investigated another option for using the Lake switchyard site in which the substation would be split to the left and right of the dry wash at the site. This configuration also fails to provide sufficient space for the full substation.

TNHC's discussion of aesthetics impacts of the Lake switchyard site does not consider that the site will require routing two separate 500 kV transmission line circuits (two sets of towers) crossing over Lee Lake and Temescal Canyon Road.⁵ In contrast, the alternative Alberhill site would require only one 500 kV transmission line circuit crossing Lee Lake and Temescal Canyon Road.

The Revised PEA did not evaluate the concealed or buried fault directly beneath the proposed Lake switchyard site. The western-most portion of TNHC's proposed site is crossed by a Late Quaternary age fault, but the Revised PEA did not evaluate fault rupture hazards at the Lake site. In addition, the proposed site may overlies an area defined by Riverside County as a moderate liquefaction hazard zone. At the alternative Alberhill site, the County defined the potential liquefaction hazards as low. Therefore, SCE believes that the two sites would not have "a generally comparable impact on geology and soils" as claimed by TNHC.

The Revised PEA does not evaluate the high-pressure natural gas transmission pipeline adjacent to the Lake switchyard site.⁶ Construction activities near such lines may present potential risks and hazards; the pipeline location and assessment should be provided in the Revised PEA. The risks at both the proposed Lake switchyard site and alternative sites should be evaluated.

³ Revised PEA at 6-87.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Revised PEA at 6-89.

⁶ Revised PEA at 6-90.

Potential flood hazards are not adequately addressed in the Revised PEA. Although the Revised PEA states that “as illustrated in FEMA’s applicable FIRM map, neither the proposed Lake switchyard nor the alternative Lake switchyard sites are located within a 100 year flood plain,”⁷ the Revised PEA does not address other potential flood hazards. Because the proposed site is adjacent to a FEMA-designated 500-year flood hazard zone, it should discuss this hazard. The Lake switchyard site is also immediately adjacent to a substantial active drainage channel which poses potential flooding and erosion hazards that were not addressed in the Revised PEA. Based on site-specific drainage issues, potential flooding appears to be greater at the proposed site than at the alternative switchyard site.

SCE will work with the Commission Staff, its consultants, and TNHC to locate a sufficiently large and accessible site for a timely environmental review.

III.

THE PROPOSED 115 KV CIRCUITS AND 12.5 KV CIRCUITS HAVE NOT BEEN SHOWN TO BE NEEDED, WERE NOT PART OF THE INTERCONNECTION REQUEST, AND HAVE NOT BEEN STUDIED

The Project Conceptual Single Line Diagram shows an installation of a single 500/115/13.8 kV transformer bank with two 115 kV circuits and two 12.5 kV circuits.⁸ TNHC states:

[T]he new Santa Rosa Substation will be constructed above ground and may later be integrated into the design of the LEAPS powerhouse. The substation will serve two local 115 kV circuits reinforcing SCE’s Skylark and Elsinore Substations. The approximate load is 100 MW per circuit, for a total of 200 MW of new load served. The load served is the Lake Elsinore area [sic] both incorporated and unincorporated Riverside County. The 115 kV circuits also supply starting and facilities power required by the LEAPS project. In addition, two 12.5 kV circuits will

⁷ Revised PEA at 6-95.

⁸ Revised PEA, Figure 3.1.1-3 at 3-8.

provide a direct connection to the Lake Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) to provide for their primary needs.⁹

The Commission Staff should not consider or review the 115 kV and 12.5 kV circuits described in the Revised PEA. The primary goals of the Project, as described by TNHC, are to take advantage of an existing water body and proximity to southern California energy markets to construct and operate a pumped storage facility and to connect it “to the CAISO-controlled grid” which allows the power to serve “the San Diego and Los Angeles metropolitan areas.”¹⁰ The two 115 kV circuits, the 12.5 kV circuits, and the Santa Rosa substation are not necessary to achieve the primary goals of the project.

In addition, these 115 kV and 12.5 kV facilities were not identified in the data submitted as part of the LEAPS interconnection requests. Thus, they have never been modeled in any of SCE’s studies. The two independent studies referenced by TNHC¹¹ also do not include a description or analysis of such facilities. Load flow, short-circuit duty, and contingency condition analyses must be performed before any definitive statements can be made about the impact of the facilities on the SCE and CAISO-controlled systems. Indeed, the CAISO has not reviewed or determined whether the 115 kV facilities would be considered network additions.

SCE performs an annual planning assessment to identify required distribution-level upgrades needed to maintain service to load. TNHC’s proposal to use the Santa Rosa Substation as a means to reinforce SCE’s Skylark and Elsinore Substation will cause a paralleling in the underlying 115 kV system with the 500 kV system and will potentially result in significant system issues. These impacts have not yet been studied and should have been included as part of the PEA. Moreover, as a result of SCE’s annual planning assessment, SCE is developing a

⁹ Revised PEA at 3-111.

¹⁰ July Revision to PEA at 2-4; Revised PEA “Errata to Chapter 2, p.1.” TNHC also describes seven “objectives” of the transmission project: reduce congestion on the high-voltage CAISO grid; provide 1,000 MW of import capability to San Diego; provide 1,000 MW of import capability to San Diego under G-1/N-1 conditions; provide a 500 kV interconnection between SCE and SDG&E’s systems; further long-term interconnection planning; fortify and/or enhance local electrical facilities and systems; and provide access to the pumped storage facility. Only the last of those “objectives” is related and integral to the goals. July Revision to PEA at 2-4 to 2-5; Revised PEA “Errata to Chapter 2, p.1.”

¹¹ See July Revision to PEA at p. 2-2, fn. 8 and 9.

stand-alone project that satisfies the load requirement for this area.¹² Although TNHC states that its TE/VS Project will “upgrade” a number of SCE’s facilities and “eliminate” the need for other lines, TNHC fails to provide a sufficient description of the Project and necessary studies that would demonstrate that the proposal is superior to SCE’s own transmission plan for SCE’s system.¹³ Indeed, the Revised PEA is wholly deficient in showing the impact its proposed Project would have on SCE’s system.

Although the purpose of a PEA is to assess the environmental impacts of an applicant’s proposed project, TNHC’s Revised PEA provides no such assessment for the new 115 kV lines. For example, there are potential visual, land use, and planning impacts associated with additional 115 kV transmission lines between Santa Rosa Substation and the Elsinore and Skylark Substations. The Revised PEA provides no assessment of these or other impacts from the 115 kV facilities. Moreover, the Revised PEA fails to demonstrate that the proposed 115 kV routes are feasible and does not identify any alternative routes that were evaluated to assess whether an alternative has less environmental impact than the proposed 115 kV circuits. The Revised PEA’s Project Description presents insufficient detail to assess potential environmental impacts, including the existing setting (baseline conditions) along the proposed route, physical obstacles, overhead versus underground construction, pole type, design details, construction details, street locations, and other information that is critical to properly assess the environmental impact.

In summary, the 115 kV facilities described as part of the Santa Rosa Substation should not be considered in the review of the Revised PEA because the Revised PEA does not provide any environmental impact assessment for these proposed new 115 kV lines, their need has not been established, they were not part of TNHC’s interconnection request and thus were not studied, and construction of them will result in a parallel system arrangement causing potential

¹² TNHC mentions this project in the Revised PEA at 6-87 in its discussion of “Alternative No. 5.”

¹³ Indeed, not only does the Project Description lack sufficient detail, it has a number of errors. For example, the Revised PEA incorrectly references the capacity of the Valley substation and includes an inaccurate one-line diagram of SCE’s proposed Alberhill 500/115 kV project. The Revised PEA further includes figures regarding load tripping that have not been verified.

significant system issues. Furthermore, SCE is developing a stand-alone project to satisfy local load requirements in the area of the proposed facilities.

IV.

THE PROPOSED TE/VIS PROJECT HAS NOT BEEN SHOWN TO BE COST EFFECTIVE AND HAS NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY STUDIED

The Revised PEA does not provide a cost effectiveness analysis that would demonstrate that the TE/VIS Project is cost effective. Moreover, as with the 115 kV and 12.5 kV facilities, the PEA fails to provide sufficient analysis of the impact the TE/VIS project would have on the system. Although the Revised PEA describes the TE/VIS Project as “part of the transmission grid,” the TE/VIS Project has only been studied as a gen-tie and the CAISO has not reviewed or approved of the Project as a network addition. Moreover, WECC has not performed a path rating study on the TE/VIS Project.

V.

THE PROJECT SHOULD BE COORDINATED WITH AND CONTINGENT UPON THE LEAPS PROJECT

TNHC identifies the TE/VIS Project as a “stand alone transmission line authorization request to the Commission.”¹⁴ Although the Commission is not licensing the LEAPS project, it should not approve the TE/VIS Project in isolation, or as a “stand alone” project, separate from the hydro facility because any purpose and need for the Project is entirely dependent on LEAPS – if LEAPS is not constructed, many aspects of this project will not be needed. As discussed in Section III, above, the purpose and need for the Project is described in TNHC’s “primary goals”:

(1) [T]ake advantage of the unique combination of an existing water body, sufficient topographic variation (high head), and proximity to southern California energy markets to allow for the construction and operation of a modern and efficient pumped

¹⁴ Revised PEA at 3-62.

storage facility; and (2) connect the pumped storage facility to the CAISO-controlled grid in a manner which allows the stored power to serve the power needs of both the San Diego and Los Angeles metropolitan areas.¹⁵

If the CPUC grants a CPCN for the TE/VS Project, it should be made contingent on the construction of the LEAPs hydropower generation plant in order to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary purpose project goals. Construction should be consistent with the operating date of the generation plant.¹⁶

VI.

THE PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT CAN BE MET WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF ONE PART OF THE PROJECT – THE CONNECTION TO EITHER SCE’S SYSTEM OR SDG&E’S SYSTEM

TNHC’s “goals” of taking advantage of water/geography and interconnecting LEAPS to the CAISO grid to meet power needs in both San Diego and Los Angeles can be satisfied with the construction of only a portion of the TE/VS Project. Connecting to either SCE’s network or SDG&E’s network will provide the plant with access to the CAISO grid. Two radial interconnections that would connect the Project to both networks are unnecessary to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary project goals. Such single radial interconnections to one system are typical of new generation interconnection because two-line service is not necessary for a generation project the size of LEAPS. The radial generation-tie distances between LEAPS and SCE or LEAPS and SDG&E are similar to the radial gen-tie distances for other generation projects. Once the LEAPS Project is interconnected to the CAISO grid through either SCE’s or SDG&E’s system, the stored power will be capable of being used in both regions. Two interconnections are not necessary to achieve this goal.

¹⁵ July Revision to PEA at 2-4.

¹⁶ If the TE/VS Project were, in fact, a stand-alone transmission project, then it should have been reviewed under the CAISO’s transmission planning process.

VII.

CONCLUSION

SCE will work with Commission Staff and its consultants and TNHC to determine and study an appropriate substation site for the interconnection of the LEAPS project to SCE's system. The Commission should not issue a CPCN for the two 115 kV circuits because they are not necessary to satisfy the need for the Project, were not part of the interconnection request, and their effects on the system have not been studied. The TE/VS Project, or some portion of it, is needed only if the LEAPS Project is constructed; the CPCN should be contingent on the construction of LEAPS in order to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary project goals. A radial interconnection to either SCE or SDG&E is sufficient. Two generation tie lines are unnecessary to satisfy the Revised PEA-stated primary project goals. Moreover, SCE reserves the right to raise further objections if additional details about the Project and its intended use are provided. SCE intends to participate fully in the hearings on the TE/VS Project.

Respectfully submitted,

JENNIFER R. HASBROUCK
LAURA B. RENGER
JANE LEE COLE

/s/ Jennifer R. Hasbrouck

By: Jennifer R. Hasbrouck

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-1040
Facsimile: (626) 302-2610
E-mail: jennifer.hasbrouck@sce.com

Dated: December 15, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have this day served a true copy of the **PROTEST OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E) CONCERNING THE REVISED PROPONENT'S ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SUBMITTED BY THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY, INC.**, on all parties identified on the attached service list(s). Service was effected by one or more means indicated below:

Transmitting the copies via e-mail to all parties who have provided an e-mail address. First class mail will be used if electronic service cannot be effectuated.

Executed this **15th day of December, 2008**, at Rosemead, California.

/s/ Christine M. Sanchez
Christine M. Sanchez, Case Analyst
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770



California Public
Utilities Commission

CPUC Home

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Service Lists

PROCEEDING: A0710005 - THE NEVADA HYDRO CO.

FILER: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

LIST NAME: LIST

LAST CHANGED: DECEMBER 1, 2008

[DOWNLOAD THE COMMA-DELIMITED FILE](#)
[ABOUT COMMA-DELIMITED FILES](#)

[Back to Service Lists Index](#)

Parties

ARNOLD B. PODGORSKY
WRIGHT & TALISMAN, P.C.
1200 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
FOR: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

MICHAEL J. THOMPSON
ATTORNEY AT LAW
WRIGHT & TALISMAN, P.C.
1200 G STREET, N.W., SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
FOR: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

JOHN BUSE
CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
5656 S. DORCHESTER AVE. NO 3
CHICAGO, IL 60637
FOR: CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

JENNIFER HASBROUK
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PO BOX 800
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, PO BOX 800
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

REXFORD WAIT
THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY
2416 CADES WAY
VISTA, CA 92081
FOR: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

PAUL A. SZYMANSKI
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET HQ 12
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

LEE REEDER
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR & WATERKEEPER
INLAND EMPIRE WATERKEEPER
3741 MERCHED DRIVE, UNIT F2
RIVERSIDE, CA 92503
FOR: INLAND EMPIRE WATERKEEPER

GENE FRICK
4271 BAGGETT DR
RIVERSIDE, CA 92505
FOR: SANTA ANA MOUNTAINS TASK FORCE OF
THE SIERRA CLUB, AND FRIENDS OF THE
FOREST (TRABUCO DISTRICT) AND THE SANTA
ROSA PLATEAU

JOHN PECORA
16336 GRAND AVENUE

RUTH ATKINS
PRESIDENT

LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530
FOR: JOHN PECORA

LAKE ELSINORE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
15237 LAKE TRAIL CIRCLE
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530
FOR: LAKE ELSINORE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

RONALD E YOUNG, P.E., DEE
GENERAL MANAGER
ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT
31315 CHANEY STREET
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92531-3000
FOR: ELSINORE VALLEY MUNICIPAL WATER
DISTRICT

DOUGLAS PINNOW
7 VIA DEL LAGO
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92532
FOR: DOUGLAS PINNOW

GREGORY HEIDEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5039
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
FOR: DRA

STEPHEN E. VELYVIS
MILLER STARR REGALIA
5TH FLOOR
1331 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596
FOR: FRIESEN FOCUS, FERNANDEZ TRUST,
JOSEPH FERNANDEZ & JOAN FERNANDEZ

Information Only

GREGORY M. MURPHY
BURKE WILLIAMS AND SORENSEN, LLP
444 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, SUITE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
LAW DEPARTMENT, ROOM 370
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 370
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

JANE LEE COLE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE.
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

JANE LEE COLE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
2244 WALNUT GROVE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

DAVID KATES
THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY
2416 CADES WAY
VISTA, CA 92081
FOR: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

DONALD C. LIDDELL, PC
DOUGLAS & LIDDELL
2928 2ND AVENUE
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103
FOR: DOUGLAS & LIDDELL

JENNIFER PORTER
POLICY AND OUTREACH MANAGER
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY
8690 BALBOA AVENUE, STE. 100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

KEVIN O'BEIRNE
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

JOHN BROWN
BEST BEST & KRIEGER
3750 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, SUITE 400
RIVERSIDE, CA 92502

LINDA RIDENOUR
33628 BRAND AVE
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530
FOR: LAKE ELSINORE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

RICHARD LEE
555 BIRCH STREET
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530

GAYLE LARSSON
RANCHO CAPISTRANO
17721 RODEO ROAD
LAKE ELSINORE, CA 92530-7527

ANNE STRUM
23863 NUTWOOD WAY
MURRIETA, CA 92562

ANNIE & ALAN OMENS
41955 AVENIDA LA CRESTA
MURRIETA, CA 92562
FOR: PROTEST LETTER

BOB & MARY BOEM
42890 AVENIDA PERRIS
MURRIETA, CA 92562

CHRISTINE A. GIRALDIN
40080 VIA CABALLOS
MURRIETA, CA 92562

DAN MATRISCIANO
ACTING CHAIRMAN
SOUTHWEST RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRESAFE COUN
C/O RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRE STATION 75
MURRIETA, CA 92562

DICK & JAN HARRIS
38557 VIA MAJORCA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

ED & GERT LA FASO
43200 TENAJA RD.
MURRIETA, CA 92562

HAROLD RAMSER
39100 AVENIDA LA CRESTA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

JACK R. WARREN
21285 AVENIDA INSOOK
MURRIETA, CA 92562

JERRY FOSTER
20047 CORTE FLORENIA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

KEITH E. CARD
19050 ALBORADO
MURRIETA, CA 92562

KELLY SMITH
39100 VISTA DEL BOSQUE
MURRIETA, CA 92562

LORI SWINGLE
38000 VIA BAYA
MURRIETA, CA 92562
FOR: LCPOA MEMBER

MRS. CHARLES T. FEENEY
38835 AVENIDA LA CRESTA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

PAUL S. NASH
20855 AVENIDA CASTILLA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

ROBERT BANOCZI
38275 VIA HUERTA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

STEVE FULGHAM
LCPOA
39100 VISTA DEL BOSQUE
MURRIETA, CA 92562

SUSAN DAVIS
37961 CALLE DE LOBO
MURRIETA, CA 92562

TALLY HOFFMAN
43455 CORONA CALA CAMINO
MURRIETTA, CA 92562

WILLIAM C. THRALLS
38351 VIA MAJORCA
MURRIETA, CA 92562

BOB WINN
21410 AVENIDA DE ARBOLES
MURRIETA, CA 92562-9102

HARRIET MICHLIN
38632 VIA MAJORCA
MURRIETA, CA 92562-9316

YVONNE BANER
43434 BUISNESS PARK DRIVE
TEMECULA, CA 92590

JOHN LLOYD
23164 CANNERY RD.
WILDOMAR, CA 92595

MICHAEL & JOANN JUHA
PO BOX 1024
WILDOMAR, CA 92595

GARRY BROWN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & COASTKEEPER
ORANGE COUNTY COASTKEEPER
3151 AIRWAY AVE. SUITE F-110
COSTA MESA, CA 92626

PHYLLIS TAYLOR
27325 VIA CAPRI
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CA 92675

LINDA COPPOLA
1311 PAJERO DRIVE
CORONA, CA 92882

JACQUELINE AYER
2010 WEST AVENUE K, NO. 701
LANCASTER, CA 93536

LOULENA A. MILES
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD., SUITE 1000

FOR: JACQUELINE AYER

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080

KASIA SMOLEN
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PAUL C. LACOURCIERE
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY

PETER V. ALLEN
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER
101 SECOND STREET, SUITE 1800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-3606

JULIE L. FIEBER
FOLGER LEVIN & KAHN LLP
275 BATTERY STREET, 23RD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

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

CASE COORDINATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 770000; MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

ARTHUR F. COON
MILLER, STAR & REGALIA
1331 NO. CALIFORNIA BLVD., FIFTH FLOOR
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596
FOR: FRIESEN FOCUS LLC, THE FERNANDEZ
TRUST AND JOSEPH AND JOAN FERNANDEZ

PHILIPPE AUCLAIR
11 RUSSELL COURT
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598

MRW & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1814 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 720
OAKLAND, CA 94612
FOR: MRW & ASSOCIATES INC.

KEVIN WOODRUFF
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES, INC.
1100 K STREET, SUITE 204
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES, INC.

State Service

BILLIE C. BLANCHARD
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHLOE LUKINS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JENSEN UCHIDA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JOSEPH A. ABHULIMEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
ROOM 4209
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MICHAEL YEO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
ROOM 4103
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NICHOLAS SHER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4007
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT ELLIOTT
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY DIVISION
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TRACI BONE
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5206
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

VICTORIA S KOLAKOWSKI

FRITTS GOLDEN

CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 5117
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 935
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

MARISA MITCHELL
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 935
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

SUSAN V. LEE
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, ROOM 935
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

CLARE LAUFENBERG
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET, MS 46
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

JUDY GRAU
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET MS-46
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512

[TOP OF PAGE](#)
[BACK TO INDEX OF SERVICE LISTS](#)