Pacific Gas and
Electric Company ™

Randall J. Litteneker

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 7442
San Francisco, CA 94120

Street/Courier Address
Law Department
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 973-2179
Fax: (415) 973-0516
Internet: RJL9@pge.com

September 19, 2007

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Administrative Law Judge Dorothy Duda
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave., Room 5109
San Francisco, CA 94102

Administrative Law Judge Maryam Ebke
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Ave., Room 5101
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: R.06-03-004

Dear Judges Duda and Ebke:

Enclosed is a courtesy copy of Pacific Gas and Electric Company's filing of September 19, 2007 in R.06-03-004.

SELF-GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL RENEWABLE FUEL USE REPORT NO. 10 FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2007

This document was submitted to the Docket office using the new e-filing system, and has been assigned CPUC Confirmation number **0000008325**. In addition, the service of the document was accomplished by electronic service on all parties on the official service list R.06-03-004.

Very truly yours,

/s/

Randall J. Litteneker

RJL/pak

cc: President Michael Peevey
Commissioner John Bohn
Commissioner Rachelle Chong
Commissioner Dian Grueneich
Commissioner Timothy A. Simon
All Parties on the Official Service List in R.06-03-004

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Policies, Procedures and Rules for the California Solar Initiative, the Self-Generation Incentive Program and Other Distributed Generation Issues.	Rulemaking 06-03-004

SELF-GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL RENEWABLE FUEL USE REPORT NO.10 FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2007

RANDALL J. LITTENEKER
STACY W. WALTER

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 973-2179
Facsimile: (415) 973-9271
E-Mail: rjl9@pge.com

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 19, 2007

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Policies, Procedures and Rules for the California Solar Initiative, the Self-Generation Incentive Program and Other Distributed Generation Issues.	Rulemaking 06-03-004

SELF-GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL RENEWABLE FUEL USE REPORT NO. 10 FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2007

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, on behalf of the program administrators for the Self-Generation Incentive Program, hereby files the Tenth Semi-Annual Fuel Use Monitoring Report for operational projects that utilize renewable fuels, attached herein as Appendix A. This filing is in compliance with ALJ Duda's Ruling Granting Motion for Measurement and Evaluation Schedule Modification dated February 28, 2007.

The report provides the Commission with the results of on-site inspections of operational projects that utilize renewable fuels to assess compliance with the renewable fuel provisions of the Self-Generation Incentive Program. The report also compares costs between level 3 technology projects (those using non-renewable fuel) and level 3-R projects (those using renewable fuel).

Respectfully Submitted,

RANDALL J. LITTENEKER
STACY W. WALTER

By: /s/
RANDALL J. LITTENEKER

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 19, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC MAIL

I, the undersigned, state that I am a citizen of the United States and am employed in the City and County of San Francisco; that I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and not a party to the within cause; and that my business address is Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Law Department B30A, Post Office Box 7442, San Francisco, CA 94120.

On the 19th day of September 2007, I served a true copy of:

SELF-GENERATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM SEMI-ANNUAL RENEWABLE FUEL USE REPORT NO. 10 FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2007

By electronic service to the e-mail addresses for the parties listed on the official service list for R.06-03-004.

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 19th day of September 2007 at San Francisco, California.

/s/
PATRICIA KOKASON

Self-Generation Incentive Program
Semi-Annual Renewable Fuel Use Report No. 10
For the Six-Month Period Ending June 30, 2007

1. Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is to provide the Energy Division of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) with updated information on fuel use and installed costs of Self-Generation Incentive Program (SGIP) projects utilizing renewable fuel[1].

The report identifies the fuel use compliance of projects subject to renewable fuel use requirements (i.e., having non-renewable fuels comprise no more than twenty-five percent of their annual fuel consumption on an energy input basis). These projects, which are *exempt* from waste heat recovery requirements, are referred to as Renewable Fuel Use Requirements (RFUR) projects in this report.

In addition, the report includes comparisons between costs of RFUR projects and other projects that are subject to heat recovery requirements. The reason for this comparison is a concern that RFUR projects could have lower project costs than other projects, which could result in fuel switching. The analysis of project costs includes examination of waste heat recovery and fuel treatment equipment costs.

This information is provided to the Energy Division to assist staff in making recommendations to the Commission concerning modifications to the renewable project aspects of the Program. This report complies with Decision 02-09-051 (September 19, 2002) that requires the Program Administrators to provide updated information on completed renewable fuel use projects on a six-month basis.[2] The six-month reporting period for this report extends from January 1, 2007, to June 30, 2007, and includes analysis of all projects installed since the SGIP's inception.

[1] Renewable fuel use in the context of this report effectively refers to biogas fuels obtained from landfills, waste water treatment facilities and dairy anaerobic digesters.

[2] Ordering Paragraph 7 of Decision 02-09-051 states:
"Program administrators for the self-generation program or their consultants shall conduct on-site inspections of projects that utilize renewable fuels to monitor compliance with the renewable fuel provisions once the projects are operational. They shall file fuel-use monitoring information every six months in the form of a report to the Commission, until further order by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner. The reports shall include a cost comparison between Level 3 and 3-R projects…."
Ordering Paragraph 9 of Decision 02-09-051 states:
"Program administrators shall file the first on-site monitoring report on fuel-use within six months of the effective date of this decision [September 19, 2002], and every six months thereafter until further notice by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner."

2. Summary of Operational RFUR Projects

During this six-month reporting period five (5) additional RFUR projects were completed. Addition of these new projects brings the total to 29 RFUR projects operational in the Program as of June 30, 2007. A complete list of all SGIP projects utilizing renewable fuel is included as Appendix A. Principal characteristics of the recently completed RFUR projects include:

- Four of the five new projects coming on line during the reporting period are PG&E SGIP projects; the remaining project is an SCE SGIP project.
- Four of the five new RFUR projects use digester gas and the remaining project utilizes landfill gas. Three of the five projects are microturbines (MT) and the remaining two are internal combustion (IC) engines.
- Based on information from the inspection reports, four projects are designed to operate on 100% renewable fuels while one project is designed to use a blend of 87% digester gas and 13% natural gas.

The 29 operational RFUR projects represent over 10 MW of installed generating capacity. The prime mover technologies utilized by these projects are summarized in Table 1. Nearly 65% of the total capacity uses internal combustion engines. Fuel cells (FC) account for less than 8% of RFUR project capacity.

Table 1: Summary of Prime Movers for RFUR Projects

Prime Mover	No. Projects	Total Rebated Capacity (kW)
FC	2	750
MT	16	2,800
IC Engines	11	6,460
Total	**29**	**10,010**

While all RFUR projects could use as much as 25% nonrenewable fuel, most of them do not include any non-renewable fuel supply. The fuel supplies for RFUR projects are summarized in Table 2. Nearly 77% of the total RFUR project capacity is supplied with renewable fuel only.

Table 2: Summary of Fuel Supplies for RFUR Projects

Fuel Supply	No. Projects	Total Rebated Capacity (kW)
Renewable only	24	7,770
Renewable & nonrenewable	5	2,240
Total	**29**	**10,010**

Many of the renewable fuel use projects recover waste heat even though they are exempt from heat recovery requirements. Waste heat recovery incidence by renewable fuel type is summarized in Table 3. Verification inspection reports obtained from Program Administrators indicate that twenty of the twenty-nine RFUR projects recover waste heat. All but two of the digester gas systems include waste heat recovery. Waste heat recovered from digester gas systems is generally used to pre-heat waste water sludge prior to its being pumped to digester tanks. Less than half of the landfill gas systems include waste heat recovery. Those systems that do recover heat do not use it at the landfill site. Instead, the landfill gas is piped to a different site that has both electric and thermal loads.

Table 3: Summary of Waste Heat Recovery Incidence and Type of Renewable Fuel for RFUR Projects

Renewable Fuel Type	No. of Sites	Sites With Heat Recovery	Sites Without Heat Recovery
Digester Gas	18	16	2
Landfill Gas	11	4	7
Total	**29**	**20**	**9**

3. Fuel Use at RFUR Projects

As shown in Table 2, 24 of the 29 RFUR projects have 100% dedicated use of renewable fuel (i.e., there is no natural gas or other nonrenewable fuel supplied to the SGIP system). By definition all 24 of those projects are in compliance with the SGIP's renewable fuel use requirements. Of the remaining five projects:

- PG&E A-1313. No metered data are yet available to assess the actual fuel mix during this reporting period. This project came online in March 2007. During PG&E's February 2007 installation verification inspection the participant reported that the system was using 87% digester gas and 13% natural gas.

- SCE PY03-017. This internal combustion engine system was designed to use natural gas for back-up and piloting purposes. Metered data received from the SGIP participant indicate that natural gas usage was less than 25% of the total annual fuel input.

- SCE PY04-158 and SCE PY04-159. No metered data are yet available to assess the actual fuel mix during this reporting period During SCE's September 2006 installation verification inspection the participant reported that the system was using 80% digester gas and 20% natural gas. In the future Itron will install natural gas metering to verify that the nonrenewable consumption remains below the requisite 25% of annual fuel use on an energy input basis.

- SCE PY03-092. A natural gas metering system has been installed by SCG to monitor natural gas usage. Itron was to receive metered electric output data from the applicant[3]. Itron will use the electric output data along with the natural gas consumption data from SCG to verify that the nonrenewable energy input remains below the 25% cap on an annual basis.

Fuel use compliance for dual-fuel systems is summarized in Table 4. Overall, at least 25 (86%) of the RFUR projects comply with the SGIP's 25% nonrenewable cap. Itron is moving forward with installing fuel metering to enable definitive conclusions to be drawn about the remaining four projects.

Table 4: Fuel Use Compliance of RFUR Projects Utilizing Nonrenewable Fuel

Project ID No.	Program Administrator/ Funding Level	Technology/ Fuel Type	Capacity (kW)	Oper-ational Date[4]	Annual Natural Gas Energy Flow (MM Btu)[5]	Renewable Fuel Use (% of Total Energy Input)	Meets Program Renewable Fuel Use Requirements?
PY03-092	SCE/ Level 1	Fuel Cell/ Digester gas	500	3/11/2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
PY03-017	SCE/ Level 3-R	Engine/ Digester gas	500	5/11/2005	1.3	99.9%	Yes
PY04-158	SCE Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester Gas	296	11/15/2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
PY04-159	SCE Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester Gas	704	11/15/2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
1313	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbine Digester Gas	240	3/6/2007	N/A	N/A	N/A

"N/A" ≡ "Not Available". Metered data necessary to calculate estimates of natural gas energy use are not yet available. In the future these projects will be monitored to determine if they meet the SGIP's renewable fuel use provisions.

[3] Itron has not received metered data from the applicant. Consequently, Itron intends to install ENGO metering on this site in late summer/early fall of 2007.
[4] Since assignment of a project's operational date is subject to individual judgment, the incentive payment date as reported by the Program Administrators is used as a proxy for the operational date for reporting purposes.
[5] This field represents the natural gas consumption during the 12-month period ending 06/30/2007.

4. Cost Comparison between RFUR and Other Projects

Beginning in September 2002, RFUR projects were eligible for higher incentive levels than nonrenewable projects. The size of this incentive premium was designed to account for numerous factors, including:

- RFUR projects face higher fuel pre-treatment costs, offset by
- RFUR projects might not face heat recovery equipment costs, and
- RFUR projects do not face fuel purchase expenses

Concerns were expressed in CPUC Decision 02-09-051 that RFUR project costs could fall below nonrenewable project costs due to RFUR projects being exempt from waste heat recovery requirements. As a result, RFUR projects could potentially be receiving a greater than necessary incentive level which could lead to fuel switching. To address this concern, the CPUC directed the Program Administrators to monitor nonrenewable and RFUR project costs.

It is possible to use historical SGIP project cost data to examine fuel treatment and heat recovery costs faced by SGIP participants. Eligible installed costs for all fuel cell, microturbine, and internal combustion engine projects operational as of June 30, 2007, are summarized in Table 5. The summary distinguishes between fuel type and heat recovery incidence to facilitate independent examination of the principal factors influencing costs of projects utilizing renewable fuel.

Table 5: Summary of Completed Project Costs by Technology, Heat Recovery Provisions, & Fuel Type

Tech	Includes Renewable Fuel?	Includes Heat Recovery?	No. Projects	Eligible Installed Costs ($/Watt)				
				Range	Median	Mean	Std. Dev.	Size-Weighted Average
FC	Yes	Yes	2	9.41 - 9.85	9.63	9.63	0.31	9.70
	Yes	No	0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
	Yes	Yes or No	2	9.41 - 9.85	9.63	9.63	0.31	9.70
	No	Yes	10	5.06 - 18.00	6.92	8.50	4.22	7.22
IC Engine	Yes	Yes	12	1.21 - 5.70	2.69	2.89	1.16	2.81
	Yes	No	1	1.71 - 1.71	1.71	1.71	-------	1.71
	Yes	Yes or No	13	1.21 - 5.70	2.64	2.80	1.16	2.79
	No	Yes	187	0.85 - 6.53	2.26	2.38	0.90	2.22
MT	Yes	Yes	13	2.26 - 11.30	3.99	5.13	2.69	4.55
	Yes	No	8	1.23 - 5.39	3.83	3.57	1.39	2.85
	Yes	Yes or No	21	1.23 - 11.30	3.90	4.53	2.37	3.87
	No	Yes	97	0.70 - 6.39	3.15	3.19	1.14	3.03

Besides the cost of waste heat recovery equipment, fuel clean up costs may account for much of the differential between renewable and nonrenewable project costs. The bases of heat recovery equipment and fuel clean up equipment cost comparisons are described below.

Heat Recovery Equipment Costs

All of the projects using renewable fuel include fuel conditioning equipment. Approximately half of the renewable fuel projects include heat recovery even though most of them were not required to. Any difference observed between the average costs of these two groups could be due to the difference in provisions for heat recovery. This relationship is expressed symbolically in Equation 1. For example, the heat recovery difference for microturbines ($1.56) is calculated as $5.13 minus $3.57.

$$\Delta Heat\ \mathrm{Recovery} = \begin{pmatrix} RFUR \\ w/\ HR \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} RFUR \\ w/o\ HR \end{pmatrix} \qquad \textbf{Equation 1}$$

Fuel Treatment Equipment Costs

All of the nonrenewable fuel projects include heat recovery equipment. Many of the renewable fuel projects include heat recovery even though most of them were not required to. Any difference observed between the costs of these two groups could be due to the difference in provisions for fuel treatment. For example, the fuel treatment difference for internal combustion engines ($0.51) is calculated as $2.89 minus $2.38.

$$\Delta Fuel\ Treatment = \begin{pmatrix} RFUR \\ w/\ HR \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} NG \\ w/\ HR \end{pmatrix} \qquad \textbf{Equation 2}$$

Weighted Average RFUR Equipment Costs

All of the nonrenewable fuel projects include heat recovery equipment. Many of the renewable fuel projects include heat recovery even though most of them were not required to. The difference observed between the costs of these two groups summarizes the average overall influence of different SGIP requirements. For example, the RFUR difference for internal combustion engines ($0.42) is calculated as $2.80 minus $2.38.

$$\Delta RFUR = \begin{pmatrix} RFUR \\ w/\ or\ w/o\ \ HR \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} NG \\ w/\ HR \end{pmatrix} \qquad \textbf{Equation 3}$$

Uncertainty Analysis

Project cost data are available for all completed projects. The sampling error included in 'difference of means' results calculated for projects completed in the past is zero because project cost data are available for all of these projects. However, the key question faced by the CPUC and other program designers is:

How accurately do the cost differences calculated for projects completed in the past represent the cost differences that are likely to be faced by program participants in the future?

This question is more difficult to answer. The answer depends on many factors, including:

1. The number of projects completed in the past.
2. The variability exhibited by cost data for the projects completed in the past.
3. The possible changes in system costs through time yielded by experience, economies of scale, or technology innovation.

Cost comparison discussions for microturbines, internal combustion engines, and fuel cells are presented below. Difference of means results are augmented with 90% confidence intervals about these means.

Microturbine Project Cost Comparisons

Cost comparison results for microturbines are summarized in Table 6. These data show, for instance, that the average incremental cost associated with presence of heat recovery was $1.56 per Watt for SGIP participants with Completed projects. When this value is used to estimate the incremental cost of heat recovery not just for Completed projects but also projects that will be completed in the future it is necessary to summarize the uncertainty of the estimate.[6]

Table 6: Microturbine Project Cost Comparison Summary

Physical Difference	Difference of Means ($/Watt)	90% Confidence Interval ($/Watt)
Heat Recovery	1.56	-0.22 to 3.34
Fuel Treatment	1.94	1.25 to 2.63
RFUR	1.34	0.77 to 1.91

The 90% confidence intervals presented in Table 6 summarize uncertainty in estimates of the incremental costs associated with several key physical differences for the population comprising projects already Completed as well as those that will be completed in the future. For heat recovery the lower bound of the confidence interval is negative. This counter intuitive result implies that systems without heat recovery might be more expensive. The statistical analysis of

[6] Uncertainty is assessed by calculating confidence intervals around the point estimates. When n_1 & $n_2 \geq 30$ then a Z-Test is used to determine confidence intervals. When n_1 or $n_2 < 30$ then a t-Test is used.

available cost data does not rule out the possibility that systems without heat recovery cost more than those with heat recovery. The possibility of this unlikely result, along with the very large confidence interval, are simply due to the small quantity of and considerable variability exhibited by cost data available for SGIP projects completed in the past. This is a representative example of the general rule that caution must be exercised when interpreting summary statistics when sample sizes are small.

Internal Combustion Engine Project Cost Comparisons

Cost comparison results for internal combustion engines are summarized in Table 7. Results for the incremental difference due to heat recovery are not presented because all but one (1) renewable internal combustion engine project completed to date has included heat recovery even though it was not required by the SGIP. The differences between means are small in comparison to the variability exhibited by past costs of renewable fuel projects. This variability combined with relatively small numbers of renewable fuel projects results in very large confidence intervals.

Table 7: Internal Combustion Engine Project Cost Comparison Summary

Physical Difference	Difference of Means ($/Watt)	90% Confidence Interval ($/Watt)
Fuel Treatment	0.51	0.06 to 0.96
RFUR	0.42	-0.02 to 0.86

Fuel Cell Project Cost Comparisons

Due to the sensitivity of fuel cells to contaminants in the gas stream, gas clean up costs for fuel cells powered by renewable fuels, which contain sulfur, halide and other contaminants, should be higher than gas clean up costs for fuel cells operating off of cleaner fuels such as natural gas. Cost comparison results for fuel cells are summarized in Table 8. Results for the incremental difference due to heat recovery are not presented because all renewable fuel cell projects completed to date have included heat recovery even though they were not required to by the SGIP. The 90% confidence interval for fuel cells is very large.

Table 8: Fuel Cell Project Cost Comparison Summary

Physical Difference	Difference of Means ($/Watt)	90% Confidence Interval ($/Watt)
Fuel Treatment	1.13	-4.49 to 6.75
RFUR	1.13	-4.49 to 6.75

Cost Comparison Summary

Comparison of the installed costs between renewable and non-renewable fueled generation systems operational as of June 30, 2007, reveals that average nonrenewable generator costs have been lower than average renewable-fueled generator costs. However, these averages pertain to past program participants. The fundamental question motivating examination of RFUR project costs is stated explicitly below:

Do SGIP project cost data for past participants suggest that project costs are changing in ways that could necessitate modification of incentive levels received by future SGIP participants?

Confidence intervals calculated for populations comprising both past *and* future SGIP participants are very large. This suggests that data for past projects shouldn't be used as the sole basis for SGIP program design elements affecting future participants. Engineering estimates, budget cost data, and rules-of-thumb likely continue to be more suitable for this purpose at this time.

Appendix A: List of All SGIP Projects Utilizing Renewable Fuel

All SGIP projects supplied with renewable fuel are listed in Table 9. RFUR (Renewable Fuel Use Requirements) projects subject to renewable fuel use requirements and exempt from heat recovery requirements are identified in the column titled 'RFUR Project'. Only a small portion of these projects is also equipped with a nonrenewable fuel supply. These projects are identified in the column titled 'Any Nonrenewable Fuel Supply?'.

Table 9: SGIP Projects Utilizing Renewable Fuel

Project ID No.	Program Administrator/ Funding Level	Technology/ Fuel Type	Capacity (kW)	Oper-ational Date[7]	RFUR Project?	Any Nonrenewable Fuel Supply?
0007-01	SDREO/ Level 3	Microturbines/ Digester Biogas	88	8/30/2002	No	No
PY02-055	SCE/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	420	4/18/2003	Yes	No
PY01-031	SCE/ Level 3	Engine/ Landfill gas	970	9/29/2003	No	No
110	PG&E/ Level 3	Engine/ Digester gas & Nat. Gas	900	10/23/2003	No	Yes
PY02-074	SCE/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	300	2/12/2004	Yes	No
0026-01	SDREO/ Level 3	Microturbines/ Digester gas	120	4/23/2004	No	No
514	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester gas	90	5/19/2004	Yes	No
0023-01	SDREO/ Level 3	Microturbines/ Digester gas	360	9/3/2004	No	No
379	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	280	1/14/2005	Yes	No
PY03-092	SCE/ Level 1	Fuel Cell/ Digester gas	500	3/11/2005	Yes	Yes
640	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	70	4/14/2005	Yes	No
641	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	70	4/14/2005	Yes	No
PY03-045	SCE/ Level 1	Fuel Cell/ Digester gas	250	4/19/2005	Yes	No
PY03-008	SCE/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	70	5/11/2005	Yes	No
PY03-017	SCE/ Level 3-R	Engine/ Digester gas	500	5/11/2005	Yes	Yes
842A	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester gas	60	5/27/2005	Yes	No
747	PG&E Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester gas	60	7/18/2005	Yes	No

[7] Since assignment of a project's operational date is subject to individual judgment, the incentive payment date as reported by the Program Administrators is used as a proxy for the operational date for reporting purposes.

Table 6: SGIP Projects Utilizing Renewable Fuel (Continued)

Project ID No.	Program Administrator/ Funding Level	Technology/ Fuel Type	Capacity (kW)	Oper-ational Date	RFUR Project?	Any Nonrenewable Fuel Supply?
PY03-038	SCE Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester gas	250	7/12/2005	Yes	No
483	PG&E/ Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester gas	300	1/13/2006	Yes	No
313	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester gas	300	3/16/2006	Yes	No
1297	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Digester Gas	280	4/7/2006	Yes	No
856	PG&E/ Level 3-R	Microturbines/ Landfill gas	210	5/5/2006	Yes	No
658	PG&E/ Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester gas	160	5/22/2006	Yes	No
833	PG&E/ Level 3-N	Microturbines/ Digester gas	70	9/1/2005	No	Yes
1222	PG&E Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Landfill gas	970	3/24/2006	Yes	No
1308	PG&E Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester gas	400	11/17/2006	Yes	No
1316	PG&E Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Landfill gas	970	10/2/2006	Yes	No
1505	PG&E Level 2	IC Engines/ Landfill gas	970	11/24/2006	Yes	No
PY04-158	SCE Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester Gas	296	11/15/2005	Yes	Yes
PY04-159	SCE Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Digester Gas	704	11/15/2005	Yes	Yes
PY05-093	SCE Level 3-R	IC Engines/ Landfill Gas	1030	09/1/2006	Yes	No
298	PG&E Level 3-R	Microturbine/ Digester Gas	30	08/04/2004	Yes	No
1313	PG&E Level 3-R	Microturbine/ Digester Gas	240	07/17/2006	Yes	Yes
1528	PG&E Level 2	Microturbine/ Digester Gas	70	03/16/2007	Yes	No
1559	PG&E Level 2	IC Engines/ Digester Gas	160	11/16/2006	Yes	No
1298	PG&E Level 3N	Microturbine/ Digester Gas	250	01/19/2007	No	Yes