

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512**DOCKET**
04-AFC-1

DATE JUL 5 2006

RECD 5 2006

TO: ALL PARTIES

RE: San Francisco Electric Reliability Power Project
Proof of Service List
Docket No. 04-AFC-01

Attached is the Proof of Service List for the above mentioned project. Current as of July 5, 2006. The Proof of Service List on the Energy Commission's Web Site at <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/sanfrancisco/index.html> has also been updated. Please use this list for your future filings and submittals.

Dated: July 5, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maggie Read", written over a horizontal line.

Maggie Read
Hearing Adviser's Office
California Energy Commission

Attachment

**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRIC
RELIABILITY PROJECT**

**Docket No. 04-AFC-01
PROOF OF SERVICE
*Revised 7/05/06**

INSTRUCTIONS: All parties shall 1) send an original signed document plus 12 copies OR 2) mail one original signed copy AND e-mail the document to the web address below, AND 3) all parties shall also send a printed OR electronic copy of the documents that shall include a proof of service declaration to each of the individuals on the proof of service:

**CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
Attn: Docket No. 04-AFC-01
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.state.ca.us**

APPLICANT

**Barbara Hale, Power Policy Manager
San Francisco Public Utilities
Commission
1155 Market Street, 4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
BHale@sfgwater.org**

**Applicant Project Manager
Karen Kubick
SF Public Utilities Commission
1155 Market St., 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
kkubick@sfgwater.org**

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

**Steve De Young
De Young Environmental Consulting
4155 Arbolado Drive
Walnut Creek, CA 94598
steve4155@astound.net**

**John Carrier
CH2MHill
2485 Natomas Park Drive, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95833-2943
jcarrier@ch2m.com**

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

**Jeanne Sole
San Francisco City Attorney
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlet Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682
Jeanne.sole@sfgov.org**

**Emilio Varanini III
Special Counsel
California Power Authority
717 K Street, Suite 217
Sacramento, CA 95814
drp.gene@spcglobal.net**

INTERESTED AGENCIES

Electricity Oversight Board
770 L Street, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814
esaltmarsh@eob.ca.gov

Donna Jordan
CA Independent System Operator
151 Blue Ravine Road
Folsom, CA 95630
djordan@caiso.com

Dept. of Water Resources
SERS
Dave Alexander
3310 El Camino Avenue, Ste. 120
Sacramento, CA 95821-9001
dalexan@water.ca.gov

INTERVENORS

Jeffrey S. Russell
VP West Region Operations
Mirant California, LLC
P.O. Box 192
Pittsburg, California 94565
Jeffrey.russell@mirant.com

Mark Osterholt
Mirant California, LLC
P.O. Box 192
Pittsburg, California 94565
mark.osterholt@mirant.com

San Francisco Community Power
c/o Steven Moss
2325 Third Street # 344
San Francisco, CA 94107
steven@sfpower.org

Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc.
(CARE)
Michael E. Boyd, President
5439 Soquel Drive
Soquel, California 95073
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

Lynne Brown – Member, CARE
Resident, Bayview Hunters Point
24 Harbor Road
San Francisco, California 94124
L_brown123@yahoo.com

Robert Sarvey
501 West Grantline Road
Tracy, CA 95376
sarveyBob@aol.com

Michael J. Carroll
Latham & Watkins LLP
650 Town Center Drive, Suite 2000
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
michael.carroll@lw.com

Potrero Boosters Neighborhood
Association
Dogpatch Neighborhood Association
Joseph Boss
934 Minnesota Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
joeboss@joeboss.com

ENERGY COMMISSION

JAMES D. BOYD, Commissioner
Presiding Member
jboyd@energy.state.ca.us
lbeckstr@energy.state.ca.us

JOHN L. GEESMAN, Commissioner
Associate Member
jgeesman@energy.state.ca.us

Stan Valkosky
Chief Hearing Officer
svalkosk@energy.state.ca.us

Gary Fay
Hearing Officer
gfay@energy.state.ca.us
mread@energy.state.ca.us

Bill Pfanner
Project Manager
bpfanner@energy.state.ca.us

Margret J. Kim
Public Adviser
pao@energy.state.ca.us

Dick Ratliff
Staff Counsel
dratliff@energy.state.ca.us


DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, Maggie Read, declare that on July 5, 2006, I deposited copies of the attached Committee Ruling re: Joint Motion of CARE and Sarvey to Strike Opening Brief of Applicant and Ruling re: CARE's Request for Reconsideration, in the United States mail at Sacramento, CA with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

OR

Transmission via electronic mail was consistent with the requirements of California Code of Regulations, title 20, sections 1209, 1209.5, and 1210. All electronic copies were sent to all those identified on the Proof of Service list above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



[signature]

BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF:

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRIC RELIABILITY
PROJECT

DOCKET No. 04-AFC-1

RULING RE CARE'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

At the May 31, 2006 evidentiary hearing the Hearing Officer ruled against CARE's attempt to introduce into evidence, over Applicant's objection, the transcript of a January 12, 2004, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) hearing. On June 5, 2005, CARE requested reconsideration and clarification of the ruling.¹ We reconsider the ruling here and again deny admission of the transcript into evidence.

I. BACKGROUND

At the evidentiary hearing on April 27, 2006, Applicant objected to CARE's initial attempt to introduce into evidence the transcript of a CPUC hearing held on January 12, 2004. (4/27/06 RT 7-8.) The subject of the CPUC evidentiary hearing was the Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing construction of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV Transmission Project.²

CARE sought to include the hearing transcript as an attachment to the testimony of CARE's witness Martin Homec. Applicant objected on the grounds that the transcript testimony was hearsay and that CARE had failed to demonstrate that the witness cited in the CPUC transcript, PG&E employee Manho Yeung, was

¹ CARE also raises this matter, at some length, in its June 26, 2006 Opening Brief. (Opening Brief, pp. 8-13.)

² Application 02-09-043.

not available to testify in person as CARE's witness. Because CARE failed to appear at the CEC's April 27, 2006, evidentiary hearing, the Committee took the admissibility question under submission. (4/27/06 RT 7:25-9:11.)

On May 11, 2006 CARE filed a "Request for Subpoena on Manho Yeung [of] PG&E." The Committee denied CARE's subpoena request on May 17, 2006. In its ruling, the Committee found that CARE's request was an attempt to reopen the topic of Local System Effects after the evidentiary record on that topic had been closed.

At the May 31, 2006 evidentiary hearing, CARE again attempted to introduce the CPUC transcript, as an attachment to Mr. Homec's testimony, under the topic of Alternatives. Once again, Applicant objected to admission of the transcript. (5/31/06 RT 253:24-254:5.) The Committee excluded the transcript from evidence, but did mark it for identification as Exhibit 59. (5/31/06 RT 256:18-20, 258:1-2.) On June 5, 2006, CARE filed its request for reconsideration and clarification of the ruling denying admission of Exhibit 59.

II. DISCUSSION

Applicant's objection to the prior testimony of PG&E's Mr. Yeung is that the statement is hearsay. Hearsay evidence is an utterance made outside of the hearing, which is introduced to prove the truth of matter at issue. Such hearsay is often excluded in civil suits. However, hearsay may be admissible in administrative hearings, if only to supplement or explain other evidence. [20 Cal. Code of Regs., § 1212(d).] Exceptions to the hearsay rule recognize certain circumstances which render hearsay evidence sufficiently reliable to overcome objections. Applicant based its initial hearsay objection on the fact that CARE had failed to show PG&E's Mr. Yeung was unavailable to testify at the SFERP hearing. CARE countered that its attempt to gain Mr. Yeung's attendance was

frustrated by the Committee ruling against CARE's request to subpoena Mr. Yeung.

We again reject CARE's efforts to introduce into evidence the prior testimony of Mr. Yeung for several reasons. Even assuming *arguendo* that Mr. Yeung was not available, the subject of the CPUC hearing at which his testimony occurred was the certification of the Jefferson-Martin 230 kV transmission line, *not* the certification of the SFERP. Thus, while Applicant was a party to the CPUC proceeding, its attorney lacked the same interest and motive to cross examine Mr. Yeung as Applicant would naturally have in the case at hand. Perhaps, as a result, ambiguities in Mr. Yeung's testimony were left unchallenged. The statement by Mr. Yeung, which is specifically relied upon by CARE, referred to a five-year planning horizon starting in October of 2003, during which the SFERP would allegedly not be required for reliability. (12/12/04 RT 468:8 -11; see *also* 5/31/06 RT 265:17-20.)³ However, even assuming CARE's reliance on the "five-year statement" is well placed, the statement is inconsistent with numerous other statements by Mr. Yeung in which he specifically limited his comments on the SFERP to the year 2006. Thus, when the transcript is viewed in the light most favorable to CARE's witness Mr. Homec, the prior testimony is internally inconsistent and therefore not material or probative.


However, when the transcript is more appropriately read in its entirety, it becomes abundantly clear that Mr. Yeung's prior testimony regarding the SFERP was specifically limited to the year 2006. On no less than eight occasions during the cross examination of Mr. Yeung, the questions and Mr. Yeung's answers were limited to the year 2006. (12/12/04 RT 467: 5-10, 21-26; 469: 4-5, 20-26; 470:2-3.) Because the SFERP is still in the licensing process and cannot possibly come on line in the year 2006, the prior testimony of Mr. Yeung regarding the SFERP is irrelevant.

³ Mr. Yeung's PG&E attorney noted at the time that the questions and answers were, "Vague and ambiguous as to time. In 2006, or forever?" (12/12/04 RT 469:1-2.)


III. RULING

The prior testimony of Manho Yeung given at the January 12, 2004, CPUC hearing on the Martin-Jefferson 230 kV Transmission Project is immaterial and irrelevant to this proceeding. Therefore, the transcript of the prior testimony contained in Exhibit 59 is inadmissible.

Dated July 5, 2006 at Sacramento, California.



JAMES D. BOYD
Commissioner and Presiding Member
San Francisco Electric Reliability Project AFC Committee



JOHN L. GEESMAN
Commissioner and Associate Member
San Francisco Electric Reliability Project AFC Committee

BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION
FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO ELECTRIC
RELIABILITY PROJECT

DOCKET No. 04-AFC-01

COMMITTEE RULING RE:
JOINT MOTION OF CARE AND SARVEY
TO STRIKE OPENING BRIEF OF APPLICANT

I. BACKGROUND

On June 26, 2006, Intervenors CARE and Sarvey (Intervenors) filed their *Joint Motion of CARE and Intervenor Sarvey to Strike Opening Brief of Applicant* (Joint Motion). In their pleading the Intervenors cite the deadline for opening briefs given by the Hearing Officer as "...due on June 26, 2006 by close of business..." (5/31/06 RT 269). Close of business at the Energy Commission is 5:00 p.m. Applicant's opening brief was electronically served on parties at 5:53 p.m. on June 26, 2006. Intervenors' requested remedy for Applicant's fifty-three minute tardiness is to entirely strike Applicant's brief, arguing that, "[t]o do otherwise will demonstrate prejudice against Intervenors in violation of our due process and equal protection rights." (Joint Motion, p. 1.)

II. DISCUSSION

We do not condone Applicant's acknowledged failure to meet a required deadline. In this instance, however, Intervenors' claim of prejudice is without merit. The fifty-three minute disadvantage Applicant imposed upon all parties as a result of its failure to meet the deadline is but a tiny fraction of the 14-day period the Committee allowed between the filing deadlines for both the opening and closing briefs. Intervenors have not been substantially prejudiced. In fact, Intervenors themselves failed to serve their opening briefs to the proper email


address for Applicant's counsel. Thus, Applicant was denied the benefit of receiving Intervenor's briefs until the day following the deadline, a "prejudice" to Applicant which far exceeds that experienced by Intervenor's.

III. Ruling


Intervenor's failure to properly serve their opening briefs on Applicant eliminates any equitable argument they may have had based on Applicant's untimely filing. Furthermore, the remedy Intervenor's seek is entirely disproportionate to the inconvenience they may have undergone.

Intervenor's Joint Motion is ***DENIED***.

Dated July 5, 2006, at Sacramento, California.



JAMES D. BOYD
Commissioner and Presiding Member
San Francisco Electric Reliability Project AFC Committee



JOHN L. GEESMAN
Commissioner and Associate Member
San Francisco Electric Reliability Project AFC Committee