

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**03-26-08
02:38 PM

March 26, 2008

Agenda ID #7512
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 07-12-032

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Kim Malcolm. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Malcolm at kim@cpuc.ca.gov and the assigned Commissioner. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE for
Angela K. Minkin, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

ANG:sid

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ MALCOLM** (Mailed 3/26/2008)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Petition for Expedited Modification of
Energy Division Resolution E-4013
Approving the Utilities' Community
Choice Aggregation Service Agreements.

Application 07-12-032
(Filed December 21, 2007)

**ORDER RESOLVING THE PETITION OF
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY
FOR MODIFICATION OF RESOLUTION E-4013
APPROVING THE UTILITIES' COMMUNITY
CHOICE AGGREGATION SERVICE AGREEMENTS**

This decision modifies Resolution E-4013 by granting the application of the San Joaquin Valley Power Authority (SJVPA) requesting the Commission modify Resolution E-4013, by deleting Section 20 of the utilities' Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) Service Agreements relating to joint and several liabilities of members participating in a CCA program through a joint powers agency. We direct Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to remove from their tariffs and service agreements any requirement or condition of service that imposes joint and several liabilities on the members of a CCA joint powers agency for the debts and obligations of that joint powers agency.

1. Background

The Commission issued Resolution E-4013 on November 9, 2006, approving tariffs filed by the utilities regarding their respective CCA programs. The utilities filed the tariffs in February 2006 in compliance with Decision

(D.) 05-12-041, issued in Rulemaking (R.) 03-10-003, which adopted rules and policies regarding the CCA program. Among other things, the utilities' tariff filings sought modifications to the CCA Service Agreement. As originally filed in February 2005, the Service Agreement did not include a provision relating to the joint and several liabilities of members of a joint powers agency. However, the subsequent tariff filings included a requirement that the individual members of the CCA joint powers agency would be jointly and severally liable for CCA debts and obligations. SJVPA's subject application requests that the Commission order the utilities to remove this provision imposing joint and several liabilities on the members of the joint powers agency.

SJVPA's application explains that it is a joint powers agency in accordance with the authority conferred by Assembly Bill (AB) 117, consisting of the following members: Kings County and the cities of Clovis, Corcoran, Dinuba, Hanford, Kerman, Kingsburg, Lemoore, Parlier, Reedley, Selma and Sanger. SJVPA states its intent to serve customers within the service areas of SCE and PG&E. It explains that its joint powers agreement contains a provision that specifies that the liabilities of SJVPA shall be borne by SJVPA, and not by the members of SJVPA.

Because SJVPA's joint powers agreement potentially conflicted with the utilities' CCA Service Agreement, SJVPA requested that SCE and PG&E delete Section 20 from their service agreement for a joint powers agency. The utilities informed SJVPA that they were unwilling to delete Section 20. Subsequent discussions failed to resolve the matter in a way that is satisfactory to SJVPA. SJVPA also explains that this is the first time it has formally addressed the matter before the Commission because SJVPA had not yet been established during the Commission's deliberations in R.03-10-003 or by the time the Commission was

considering the utilities' CCA tariffs. The County of Marin replied to SJVPA's application, stating support for it.

On January 23, 2008, SDG&E, SCE, and PG&E filed a joint response to SJVPA's application. The response objects to the proposed modification on the basis that it would shift risk to utility customers in contradiction to AB 117, which authorized the creation of CCAs such as SJVPA. The utilities object to the filing of the application because Rule 16.4(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure requires that, if more than one year has elapsed since the effective date of the resolution proposed to be modified, the petitioner must explain why the petition could not have been presented within one year of the effective date of the resolution. The Commission accepted the application and herein resolves it because no party is prejudiced by its filing and the matter is one of public concern that is relevant to the ongoing oversight of the AB 117 CCA program.

Subsequently, on March 18, 2008, PG&E filed a motion seeking a hearing on the issues raised in this application and all bond and security issues the Commission agreed to consider in Resolution E-4133. This decision denies that motion on the basis that PG&E took the opportunity to address the issues in its response to the application and its motion did not make a convincing case that evidentiary hearings are required to resolve disputed issues of material facts. The Commission declines to expand the scope of this application to include all bond and security issues raised in Resolution E-4133.

2. Proposed Modification of Resolution E-4013

SJVPA's application requests the Commission modify that portion of Resolution E-4013 that approved Section 20 of the utilities' CCA tariffs and standard service agreement. SJVPA would have the Commission direct the

utilities to delete Section 20 of their respective CCA service agreements relating to joint and several liabilities of members participating in a CCA program through a joint powers agency. Section 20 of the CCA Service Agreement approved by the Commission in Resolution E-4013 provides as follows:

If CCA is a group of cities, counties or cities and counties participating as a group in a community choice aggregation program through a Joint Powers Agency established pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 366.2(c)(10)(B) and Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code, each such entity shall be jointly and severally liable to PG&E for the obligations under this Agreement.

SJVPA believes Section 20 is contrary to California law, which provides that, unless the Legislature expressly provides otherwise, members of a joint powers agency may avail themselves of the right under Government Code Section 6508.1 to specify in the joint powers agreement that the liabilities of the joint powers agency are not the liabilities of the members. Section 6508.1 states, in pertinent part that “the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the agency shall be debts, liabilities, and obligations of the parties to the agreement, *unless the agreement specifies otherwise.*” (Emphasis added.)

SJVPA argues that AB 117 could have expressly limited the ability of joint powers agencies to avail themselves of the right under Government Code Section 6508.1 with respect to joint and several liabilities of the participating members. Because AB 117 does not do that, SJVPA therefore believes the intent of AB 117 was to permit joint powers agencies operating as CCAs to avail themselves of the right under Government Code Section 6508.1 to expressly specify that the liabilities of joint powers agency are the liabilities of the joint powers agency itself, and not the joint and several liability of its members.

SJVPA also argues that Section 20 is not necessary on policy grounds, and that it will impede the creation and operation of CCAs in contravention of state policy.

The utilities respond that Section 20 is consistent with state law and is needed to protect utility customers from liabilities of a CCA and its member government agencies. The utilities believe there is no evidence to suggest the provision will impede the creation or operation of CCAs. The utilities argue that California law does not require that a joint power agency assume the debts and liabilities of the underlying members, but that the members are permitted under Government Code Section 6508.1 to assign those liabilities to the joint powers agency. The utilities argue that SJVPA's members knew or should have known of the utilities tariff requirements prior to creating their agreement and should have designed their joint powers agency agreement accordingly. The utilities dispute SJVPA's claim that Section 20 will dampen the progress of the CCA program.

Discussion. Resolution E-4013 adopted the utilities' proposed CCA tariffs with some modifications. The tariffs incorporate a standard CCA service agreement, which includes Section 20. The parties dispute the significance of this provision from the standpoint of law and policy. SJVPA believes Section 20 is unlawful and contravenes state policy to promote the development of CCA programs because local agencies will not be able to assume liabilities that may be appropriately allocated to other member jurisdictions. The utilities raise concerns that limiting the liability of a CCA's members will transfer risk inappropriately to utility customers, who may ultimately have to pay for the costs of a failed CCA that does not have adequate assets to cover its debts.

The parties do not dispute that California law permits a joint powers agency to assume liability for its debts and obligations. The parties do not

dispute that SJVPA is a joint powers agency that was lawfully created for the purpose of implementing a CCA program according to an agreement that specifies that its members shall not assume the liabilities of SJVPA. In creating SJVPA, its local government members have taken advantage of the discretion provided to them under Government Code Section 6508.1, which permits the members of a joint powers agency to specify that the obligations and debts of that agency shall remain with the joint powers agency. This discretion granted to local agencies in Government Code Section 6508.1 has not been modified as it might apply to a CCA.

The grant of discretion provided to local government agencies by the Legislature in Government Code Section 6508.1 cannot be overturned by a utility tariff. Section 20 of the utilities' tariffs effectively removes the discretion provided by the Legislature to local governments to create a joint powers agency that assumes the debts, liabilities, and obligations of that joint powers agency. Section 20 of the utilities' CCA service agreements is therefore in conflict with Government Code Section 6508.1 and impedes the authority and rights of local government agencies.

Furthermore, we are not convinced that Section 20 is necessary to protect utility customers. Some risk is inherent in new and innovative programs where, as here, other entities will assume significant liabilities for purchasing power in volatile markets. We can envision a circumstance where a CCA may fail and have inadequate resources to cover its liabilities. AB 117 does not, however, protect against all possible risks and implicitly accepts some risks on behalf of energy customers in the pursuit of the state's policy vision, which is to promote aggregated purchases of energy by agencies of local governments on behalf of their residents and businesses.

AB 117 and this Commission's implementation of it mitigate these risks to utility customers by, for example, specifying that utility customers shall not pay higher fuel costs as a result of CCA operations, requiring a CCA to demonstrate showing of creditworthiness, permitting the utilities to withhold payments to CCAs under certain circumstances, and requiring CCAs to post security bonds or security deposits.¹

The utilities have not imposed the same liability on the affiliates of privately-held energy service providers (ESPs), and have not provided any justification for treating these two entities differently, although CCAs and ESPs provide substantially similar services.²

For all of these reasons, we herein grant SJVPA's petition to modify Resolution E-4013 and direct the utilities to eliminate the requirements articulated in Section 20 from their tariffs and CCA services agreements. The utilities may not require that the members of CCA joint powers agencies assume joint and several liabilities for the debts and obligations of the joint powers agency.

3. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the Administrative Law Judge in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code

¹ Resolution E-4133, issued December 20, 2007 requires SJVPA to post a \$100,000 bond as part of its registration packet and stated the Commission's intent to review this issue generically in an appropriate proceeding. On January 23, 2008, PG&E filed an application for rehearing of this provision of the resolution, which the Commission addressed in D.08-03-023, issued in Application 08-01-015.

² SJVPA observes that PG&E thereby protected itself from the liabilities of its own ESP affiliate, PG&E Energy Services Ventures, LLC, which has since gone out of business.

and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

As we have stated, we intend to reconsider the bonding requirements currently approved for the utility tariffs. We may also consider other ways to protect customers from CCA failure. These issues would be considered in R.03-10-003 or the successor docket designed to address CCA program rules and policies.

4. Assignment of Proceeding

President Michael R. Peevey is the assigned Commissioner and Kim Malcolm is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. Resolving the subject application to modify Resolution E-4013 serves the interests of the public in promoting a reasonable CCA program, as envisioned by AB 117 and the Commission's consideration of the subject application would not impose any hardship or prejudice any party.

2. Section 20 of the utilities' tariffs and CCA service agreements, as described herein, require the members of a CCA joint powers agency to assume joint and several liability for the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the CCA joint powers agency.

3. The utilities' tariffs would not impose joint and several liabilities on the affiliates of ESPs and the utilities do not make a distinction between CCAs and ESPs that would justify treating the two types of organizations differently for purposes the allocation of liability.

4. On balance, the provisions of Section 20, as approved in Resolution E-4133, are not necessary to protect the interests of utility ratepayers in light of other

provisions of law and policy designed to protect utility customers from the failure of a CCA.

Conclusions of Law

1. The requirements of Section 20 of the utilities' CCA tariffs and service agreements, as described herein, impede the authority conferred upon local governments by Government Code Section 6508.1 to create joint powers agency agreements that relieve member agencies from liability for the debts and obligations of the joint powers agency.

2. No provision of law circumscribes the rights of local agencies to create CCA joint powers agencies under agreements that exempt the members of the joint powers agency from joint and several liability for the debts, liabilities, and obligations of the joint powers agency.

3. Utility tariffs may not impede the intent of the Legislature with regard to the rights and authority of local governments.

4. SCE, SDG&E and PG&E should be ordered to amend their tariffs and service agreements to eliminate any requirement or condition of service that impose on a CCA joint powers agency's members joint and several liability for the debts and obligations of the CCA joint powers agency.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall, within 10 days of the effective date of this order, modify their tariffs to remove any requirement that imposes joint and several liability on the members of a joint powers agency for the debts and obligations of that joint powers agency that is created for the purpose of undertaking Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) as described in Assembly Bill 117 and related statutes. The tariffs or service

agreements of PG&E, SCE and SDG&E for CCA customers shall not unilaterally impose such liability or make it a condition of service.

2. To the extent set forth herein, the San Joaquin Valley Power Authority's application for modification of Resolution E-4133 is granted.

3. Application 07-12-032 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated March 26, 2008, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ FANNIE SID

Fannie Sid

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Updated on 26-MAR-2008 by: AJH
A0712032 LIST

***** PARTIES *****

Scott Blaising
JUSTIN WYNNE
BRAUN & BLAISING, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO CA 95814
(916) 682-9702
blaising@braunlegal.com
For: San Joaquin Valley Power Authority

Tim Rosenfeld
HMW INTERNATIONAL INC.
131 CAMINO ALTO, SUITE D
MILL VALLEY CA 94941
(415) 389-1348
tdr-hmw@sbcglobal.net
For: County of Marin

Jonathan D. Pendleton
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B10A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 973-2916
jlpc@pge.com
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Kim F. Hassan
Attorney At Law
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ-12
SAN DIEGO CA 92101
(619) 699-5006
khassan@sempra.com
For: San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Janet S. Combs
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
PO BOX 800
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-1524
janet.combs@sce.com
For: Southern California Edison Company

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Kim Malcolm
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5005
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102 3298
(415) 703-2822
kim@cpuc.ca.gov

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Dennis J. Herrera
City Attorney
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 554-4637

Paula Fernandez
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 554-4623
paula.fernandez@sfgov.org

Tamlyn M. Hunt
Energy Program Director
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
26 W. ANAPAMU ST., 2ND FLOOR
SANTA BARBARA CA 93101
(805) 963-0583 122
thunt@cecmail.org

Michael C. Burke
President
ENERGY CHOICE, INC
8714 LINDANTE DRIVE
WHITTIER CA 90603
(562) 947-6977
Mburke50@msn.com

Paul Fenn
LOCAL POWER
4281 PIEDMONT AVE.
OAKLAND CA 94611
(510) 451-1727
paulfenn@local.org

Ann Moore
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910
(619) 691-5037
amoore@ci.chula-vista.ca.us

Therese L. Mueller
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL ROOM 234
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Updated on 26-MAR-2008 by: AJH
A0712032 LIST

Brian Cherry
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MAIL CODE B10C
PO BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94177
(415) 973-4977
bkc7@pge.com

Christopher J. Warner
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B10A
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-2069
cjw5@pge.com
For: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Clifford J. Gleicher, Esq.
Attorney At Law
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PO BOX 7442
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120
(415) 973-2095
CJGf@PGE.com
For: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Akbar Jazayeri
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2241 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
PO BOX 800
ROSEMEAD CA 91770
(626) 302-3630
akbar.jazayeri@sce.com

Karyn Gansecki
BRUCE FOSTER
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
601 VAN NESS AVENUE, STE 2040
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102-6310
(415) 673-1116

Michel Peter Florio
Attorney At Law
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK (TURN)
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 350
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102
(415) 929-8876 X302
mflorio@turn.org