



1. In this order, the Commission approves an uncontested settlement filed on February 22, 2011 between Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) and the California Parties<sup>1</sup> (collectively, the Parties), as discussed below. The settlement resolves claims arising from events and transactions in the western energy markets during the period January 1, 2000 through June 20, 2001 (Settlement Period), as they relate to SMUD.<sup>2</sup> The settlement consists of a “Joint Offer of Settlement and Motion for Shortened Comment Period, Expedited Disposition, and Other Procedural Relief” (Joint Offer of Settlement), a “Joint Explanatory Statement,” and a “Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement” (collectively, Settlement).<sup>3</sup>

2. The Parties filed the Settlement pursuant to Rule 602 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.<sup>4</sup> The Parties state that the Settlement becomes binding as of the execution date, and note that some of the operative provisions become effective only as of, or in relation to, the Settlement Effective Date, which is defined as the date of a Commission order, subject to certain conditions in the event the Commission modifies or conditions its approval of the Settlement and/or SMUD files a “Good Faith Motion” in the Los Angeles County Superior Court.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, the Parties explain that the

---

<sup>1</sup> The California Parties are Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SoCal Edison), the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California (CPUC), the People of the State of California *ex rel.* Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General. For purposes of the Settlement, the California Parties also include the California Department of Water Resources (CERS) (acting solely under authority and powers created by California Assembly Bill 1 of the First Extraordinary Session of 2001-2002, codified in Sections 80000 through 80270 of the California Water Code).

<sup>2</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 2.

<sup>3</sup> On March 11, 2011, Commissioner Cheryl A. La Fleur issued a memorandum to the file in sixty dockets, including Docket No. EL00-95, documenting her decision, based on a memorandum from the Office of General Counsel’s General and Administrative Law section, dated February 18, 2011, not to recuse herself from considering matters in those dockets.

<sup>4</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 385.602 (2010).

<sup>5</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 10; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 2.21, 1.75, 4.20. Under section 4.20 of the Settlement, SMUD may elect to, within 10 business days after the execution date, request authorization from the Los Angeles Superior Court in *The Electric Refund Cases*, JCCP No. 4512, to file a motion for

(continued...)

Settlement will terminate on the date of a final order rejecting the Settlement in whole or material part or accepting the Settlement with material conditions or modifications deemed unacceptable to any adversely affected Party.<sup>6</sup> The Parties also state that the Settlement may terminate if the California Parties fail to receive consideration that they are due under the Settlement.<sup>7</sup>

3. The Parties explain that the Settlement is the product of good faith negotiations between SMUD and the California Parties, and that the Settlement is in recognition of their mutual litigation risks.<sup>8</sup> The Parties state that the Settlement benefits SMUD's and the California Parties' customers by resolving those risks.<sup>9</sup> The Parties state that approval of the Settlement will avoid further litigation, provide monetary consideration, eliminate regulatory uncertainty, and enhance financial certainty.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the Parties state that the Settlement is a fair and reasonable resolution of the disputes between SMUD, on the one hand, and settling participants, on the other.<sup>11</sup> In addition, the Parties assert that the Settlement fairly protects the rights of non-settling participants.<sup>12</sup> Finally, the Parties note that the Commission and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit have encouraged settlements of claims related to transactions in the

---

determination of a good faith settlement under the California Code of Civil Procedure. That provision also explains that SMUD shall have the right to waive its right to file the motion, as well as its right to terminate the Settlement if such a motion is denied. *See also* Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 2.3.1.3.

<sup>6</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 10; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 2.3.1.

<sup>7</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 10; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 4.19.

<sup>8</sup> Joint Offer of Settlement at 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at 8.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) and California Power Exchange (CalPX) markets in the 2000 and 2001 time period.<sup>13</sup>

4. The Parties state that SMUD “disclaims” Commission jurisdiction over any aspect of the Settlement, but that the Parties have agreed to condition the Settlement on securing the Commission’s approval to ensure the release of funds from CAISO and/or CalPX and to ensure that the Parties’ respective claims pending before the Commission are fully resolved.<sup>14</sup>

5. As discussed below, the Commission approves the Settlement.

### **Background and Description of the Settlement**

6. In 2000, the Commission instituted formal hearing procedures under the Federal Power Act (FPA)<sup>15</sup> to investigate, among other things, the justness and reasonableness of public utility sellers’ rates in the CAISO and CalPX markets in Docket Nos. EL00-95-000 and EL00-98-000.<sup>16</sup> In 2002, the Commission directed its staff to commence a fact-finding investigation into the alleged manipulation of electrical and natural gas prices in the West in Docket No. PA02-2-000.<sup>17</sup> In 2003, the Commission directed its staff to investigate anomalous bidding behavior and practices in western energy markets in Docket No. IN03-10-000.<sup>18</sup> On the same day, the Commission issued two orders directing named entities to show cause why they had not participated in certain gaming

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* (citing *Pub. Utils. Comm’n of Cal.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,087, at 61,384 (2002) and *Pub. Utils. Comm’n of Cal. v. FERC*, No. 01-71051, slip op. at 3 (9th Cir. Oct. 23, 2006)).

<sup>14</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11.

<sup>15</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 791, *et seq.* (2006).

<sup>16</sup> *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 92 FERC ¶ 61,172 (2000).

<sup>17</sup> *Fact-Finding Investigation of Potential Manipulation of Electric and Natural Gas Prices*, 98 FERC ¶ 61,165 (2002).

<sup>18</sup> *Investigation of Anomalous Bidding Behavior and Practices in the Western Markets*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,347 (2003).

practices<sup>19</sup> or why their arrangements with other entities did not constitute gaming and/or anomalous bidding behavior.<sup>20</sup>

7. The Parties state that the Settlement resolves claims in the above-captioned proceedings as they relate to SMUD.<sup>21</sup> Any entity that directly sold or purchased energy from CAISO and/or CalPX during the Settlement Period (Participant) may elect to be bound by the terms of the Settlement as an “Additional Settling Participant.”<sup>22</sup> To opt in to the Settlement, a Participant must provide notice to the Commission, as well as serve notice to parties on the ListServes established for the Docket No. EL00-95 proceeding and in Docket No. EL03-137, *et al.*, no later than five business days following the Settlement Effective Date.<sup>23</sup> The Parties state that the rights of Participants that do not wish to opt into the Settlement will be unaffected by the Settlement, and that such Non-Settling Participants will not be guaranteed the benefits of the Settlement, but will still be paid refunds, if any, to which they are ultimately determined to be due through continued litigation.<sup>24</sup>

8. The Settlement’s monetary consideration is comprised of: (1) SMUD’s CAISO and CalPX receivables estimated to be \$18,673,207; and (2) the estimated interest on receivables in the amount of \$15,386,724 estimated through December 31, 2010, to be updated through the projected date of distribution.<sup>25</sup> Under the Settlement, CalPX will release \$31 million to SMUD.<sup>26</sup> The remaining receivables, estimated to be \$4,059,931,

---

<sup>19</sup> *American Elec. Power Serv. Corp.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,345 (2003).

<sup>20</sup> *Enron Power Mktg., Inc.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,346 (2003).

<sup>21</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 2.

<sup>22</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 1.1, 1.49, 8.1.

<sup>23</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 8.1.

<sup>24</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 1.46, 3.1, 8.1.

<sup>25</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 4.2, 4.4, and 4.61.

<sup>26</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 4.3.

including interest through December 31, 2010, are assigned under the Settlement to the California Parties and will be adjusted for interest from January 1, 2011 until the date of transfer to the California Parties.<sup>27</sup> The receivables remaining after the transfer to SMUD shall be transferred to the “Settling Supplier Refund Escrow,” subject to withholding certain amounts, including for any Deemed Distributions.<sup>28</sup> SMUD also assigns to the California Parties its entitlement to refunds on certain purchases made in the California markets.<sup>29</sup>

9. The Settlement provides that certain of the California Parties (PG&E, SDG&E, SoCal Edison, and CERS) will, subject to specified limitations, assume responsibility for the obligation for true-ups of SMUD’s receivables and associated interest related to SMUD’s sales in the CAISO and CalPX markets from May 1, 2000 through June 20, 2001, and any refund amounts that the Commission determines that SMUD owes to Non-Settling Participants in certain proceedings attributable to SMUD’s sales in the CAISO and CalPX markets from May 1, 2000 through June 20, 2001.<sup>30</sup> In addition, the Settlement provides that SMUD shall be liable for paying any refund offsets (i.e., Fuel Cost Allowance, Emissions Offset, and Cost Offset) attributable to SMUD’s sales in the CAISO and CalPX markets during this time period that the Commission or a court determines that SMUD owes.<sup>31</sup> The California Parties’ obligation to make payments on behalf of SMUD shall not exceed the total amount allocated and actually paid to the California Parties pursuant to the Settlement.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 11-12; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 4.4.

<sup>28</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 12; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 4.9.1.

<sup>29</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 12; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 4.14, 4.16.

<sup>30</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 12; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 3.1, 5.5, 5.6.

<sup>31</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 12; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 4.14.

<sup>32</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 13; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 5.8.

10. The Settlement includes an allocation matrix that allocates the Settlement proceeds among participants.<sup>33</sup> The proceeds will be distributed from the Settling Supplier Refund Escrow to each of the Settling Participants and/or, in the case of amounts allocated to any Non-Settling Participants, transferred to the California Parties in accordance with sections 5.2 and 5.5 of the Settlement.<sup>34</sup> In addition, certain specified Participants are designated as “Deemed Distribution Participants,”<sup>35</sup> which, according to the terms of the Settlement, are entities that have a net amount outstanding and payable to CAISO or CalPX and accordingly will receive an offset against amounts owed by the Deemed Distribution Participant to CAISO and/or CalPX for purposes of the Settlement.<sup>36</sup> The Settlement states that the Commission’s approval of the Settlement will allow CalPX to release SMUD’s receivables and estimated interest and will authorize CAISO and CalPX to conform their books and records to reflect the distributions.<sup>37</sup>

11. The Parties state that, in return for the specified consideration and subject to specified limitations, the Settlement resolves all claims between the California Parties and SMUD relating to transactions in the western energy markets during the Settlement Period for refunds, disgorgement of profits, or other monetary or non-monetary remedies, subject to specified limitations.<sup>38</sup> Specifically, the Parties state that SMUD and the California Parties mutually release and discharge each other as of the Settlement Effective Date from all existing and future claims before the Commission and/or under the FPA for the Settlement Period relating to payments or unlawful rates for electric capacity, energy and/or ancillary services, transmission congestion or line loss charges, or

---

<sup>33</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 13; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at Ex. A.

<sup>34</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 13; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 5.2, 5.5.

<sup>35</sup> Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement, Ex. B. The Deemed Distribution Participants include: Aquila Power Corporation; California Polar Power Brokers, LLC; Illinova Energy Partners, Inc.; PG&E; Powerex Corporation; and Western Area Power Administration.

<sup>36</sup> Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 1.19, 1.20.

<sup>37</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 13; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 6.1.

<sup>38</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 14; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 7.1.1.

market manipulation.<sup>39</sup> Likewise, the Parties state that SMUD and the California Parties mutually release each other from all past, existing, and future claims for civil damages and/or equitable relief concerning, pertaining to, or arising from allegations that: (1) SMUD or any California Party collected or charged unjust, unreasonable, or otherwise unlawful rates, terms, or conditions for capacity, energy, ancillary services, or transmission congestion during the Settlement Period; (2) SMUD or any California Party engaged in market manipulation in the western energy markets during the Settlement Period; (3) SMUD or any California Party was unjustly enriched by the released claims or otherwise violated any applicable tariff, regulation, law, rule, or order relating to transactions in the western energy markets during the Settlement Period; or (4) that any California Party is liable for payments to SMUD for congestion charges, transmission line losses, energy, capacity, or ancillary services during the Settlement period.<sup>40</sup> Subject to specified limitations and exclusions, Additional Settling Participants are deemed to provide and receive from SMUD the releases that the California Parties provide and receive (other than the Docket No. EL01-10 proceeding).<sup>41</sup>

12. The Parties state that they would not object to the Commission assuring CAISO and CalPX that they will be held harmless for their actions to implement the Settlement.<sup>42</sup>

### **Procedural Matters**

13. As noted above, the Parties filed the Settlement pursuant to Rule 602 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.<sup>43</sup> For the reasons described in the Joint Offer of Settlement, the Parties request that the Settlement be transmitted directly to the Commission for approval rather than being certified by an administrative law judge.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 14; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 7.2.1.

<sup>40</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 15; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at § 7.3.1.

<sup>41</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 15; Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement at §§ 7.4, 8.2.

<sup>42</sup> Joint Explanatory Statement at 15-16.

<sup>43</sup> 18 C.F.R. § 385.602 (2010).

<sup>44</sup> Joint Offer of Settlement at 3-4 (citing *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 131 FERC ¶ 61,082, at P 14 (2010) and *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,259, at P 14 (2009)).

14. Pursuant to Rule 602(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.602(f) (2010), and the Notice Shortening Comment Period issued on February 25, 2011, initial comments on the Settlement were to be submitted no later than March 4, 2011, and reply comments were to be submitted no later than March 11, 2011. Initial comments were timely filed by CAISO and CalPX, either in support of or not opposing the Settlement. In addition, initial comments were timely filed by Portland General Electric Company and Idaho Power Company and IDACORP Energy L.P. (collectively, Settled Suppliers). Reply comments were timely filed by SMUD and the California Parties (Joint Reply Comments).

15. On March 4, 2011, Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE) submitted a brief filing in Docket No. EL00-95, which states in its entirety: "CARE objects to [the] settlement[.]" This four-word comment otherwise provides no details as to the grounds for CARE's opposition or even identifying the settlement to which it refers. We infer that the filing was directed at this Settlement given that it was filed on the due date for initial comments. Even so, we cannot meaningfully respond to CARE's filing because it fails to provide any basis for its stated objection.<sup>45</sup> Because of this failure, we conclude that CARE has effectively waived its objection to the Settlement.<sup>46</sup> We therefore find that the Settlement is uncontested.

16. We agree with the Parties that it is appropriate for the Commission to review this Settlement without certification by an administrative law judge.

## **Substantive Matters**

### **A. "Hold Harmless" Protection**

17. Both CAISO and CalPX note that the circumstances of this Settlement warrant hold harmless treatment for CAISO and CalPX because they, along with their directors, officers, employees, and consultants, will implement a number of the Settlement's

---

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g., *Columbia Gas Transmission Corp.*, 51 FERC ¶ 61,194, at 61,536 (1990) (affirming that party waived objections to a settlement for failing to timely file comments and that "[i]n any event, the comments received were too vague to form a basis for Commission action.").

<sup>46</sup> See 18 C.F.R. § 385.602(f)(3) (2010) ("Any failure to file a comment constitutes a waiver of all objections to the offer of settlement."). While CARE filed a "comment" in that it submitted a filing styled as such, that filing is so vague and devoid of substance that we cannot reasonably conclude that it constitutes a legitimate comment on the Settlement itself.

provisions.<sup>47</sup> Accordingly, CalPX requests that the following “hold harmless” language be incorporated into any Commission order approving the Settlement:

The Commission recognizes that CalPX will be required to implement this settlement by paying substantial funds from its Settlement Clearing Account at the Commission’s direction. Therefore, except to the extent caused by their own gross negligence, neither officers, directors, employees nor professionals shall be liable for implementing the settlement including but not limited to cash payouts and accounting entries on CalPX’s books, nor shall they or any of them be liable for any resulting shortfall of funds or resulting change to credit risk as a result of implementing the settlement. In the event of any subsequent order, rule or judgment by the Commission or any court of competent jurisdiction requiring any adjustment to, or repayment or reversion of, amounts paid out of the Settlement Clearing Account or credited to a participant’s account balance pursuant to the settlement, CalPX shall not be responsible for recovering or collecting such funds or amounts represented by such credits.<sup>48</sup>

18. CalPX states that this is the same “hold harmless” provision that the Commission has approved in other orders approving settlements.<sup>49</sup> In their Joint Reply Comments, the Parties reiterate that they do not oppose incorporation of “hold harmless” language in the order approving the Settlement.<sup>50</sup>

#### **Commission Determination**

19. The Parties do not oppose a “hold harmless” provision that is similar to the provisions in other settlements involving the California Parties and approved by the

---

<sup>47</sup> CAISO Comments at 3-6; CalPX Comments at 2-4.

<sup>48</sup> CalPX Comments at 4.

<sup>49</sup> *Id.* at 3-4.

<sup>50</sup> Joint Reply Comments at 5.

Commission.<sup>51</sup> Consistent with the Commission's precedent,<sup>52</sup> the Commission determines that CalPX and CAISO will be held harmless for actions taken to implement this Settlement. Accordingly, this order incorporates the "hold harmless" language set out above, with one modification. Specifically, as incorporated by this order, the language shall be read to apply to both CAISO and CalPX.

**B. CAISO's Interpretation of Section 6.1.3.6 of the Settlement**

20. In its comments, CAISO states that it interprets section 6.1.3.6 of the Settlement ("Accounting Treatment of Calculations for Non-Settling Participants") to mean that, although CAISO will continue to include SMUD in its refund calculations, at the end of the refund rerun process, CAISO will need to adjust its books to reflect that no refunds will be paid by SMUD in these proceedings to parties in the CAISO markets for the Settlement Period, except for those monies that have been paid out under the Settlement. CAISO notes that in proceedings involving other settlements between the California Parties and non-jurisdictional entities, the California Parties had confirmed that CAISO's interpretations of identical provisions were correct. Thus, CAISO assumes that section 6.1.3.6 of this Settlement should be interpreted in the same manner. CAISO states that, as with other adjustments necessary to implement the Settlement, as well as other settlements entered into by the California Parties in these proceedings, it will work closely with settling parties to make appropriate modifications to its books and records.

**Commission Determination**

21. Consistent with our order approving the settlement between the California Parties and Northern California Power Agency,<sup>53</sup> we find that CAISO's interpretation of section 6.1.3.6 of the Settlement is reasonable. We note that, in footnote 33 of the Joint Explanatory Statement, the Parties explain that the Commission confirmed CAISO's

---

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*; Joint Explanatory Statement at 19.

<sup>52</sup> *See, e.g., San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,249, at P 17 (2010) (incorporating "hold harmless" language from earlier settlements); *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,242, at P 19 (2009) (same); *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,002, at P 17 (2009) (same); *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,004, at P 21 (2009) (same); *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 126 FERC ¶ 61,007, at P 38 (2009) (same).

<sup>53</sup> *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 131 FERC ¶ 61,083, at P 23 (2010) (NCPA Settlement Order).

interpretation of that same provision in the NCPA Settlement Order and that the Parties rely upon that interpretation as well.

### **C. Settled Supplier Comments**

22. Settled Suppliers state that they generally do not oppose the Settlement; however, they explain that they are concerned about section 8.4.3 of the Settlement (“Prior Settlements”). Section 8.4.3 provides that approval of the Settlement by the Commission “shall constitute a finding by FERC that this Agreement is substantially similar to the Prior Settlements.”<sup>54</sup> Settled Suppliers note that the California Parties have previously confirmed, informally, that the provision is intended to apply only to those entities that have signed on to the Settlement. On that basis, Settled Suppliers state, they have no objection. However, they explain that if section 8.4.3 is interpreted to bind Non-Settling Participants to a provision in a settlement that they choose not to join, solely by virtue of the Commission’s approval of that settlement, they believe that this provision overreaches and they would therefore object and request that it be clarified or modified.<sup>55</sup>

23. In their Joint Reply Comments, the Parties confirm Settled Suppliers’ understanding of section 8.4.3 of the Settlement, and state that the provision is not intended to bind Non-Settling Participants.

### **Commission Determination**

24. As discussed above, the Parties have confirmed that section 8.4.3 is not intended to bind Non-Settling Participants. Based on this representation, we find that Settled

---

<sup>54</sup> Settlement and Release of Claims, § 8.4.3. “Prior Settlements” is defined in the Settlement as “those settlements memorialized by settlement agreements entered into by the California Parties prior to the Settlement Effective Date that (i) are substantially similar, in whole or in relevant part, to the terms and conditions of” the Settlement and/or other settlements identified in Exhibit C to the Settlement “and (ii) have been approved by FERC on or prior to the Settlement Effective Date.” Settlement and Release of Claims Agreement, § 1.60.

<sup>55</sup> Settled Suppliers explain that, under the structure of the settlements between the California Parties and suppliers in these proceedings, each settled entity has the right to analyze each settlement that is filed, decide whether it is substantially similar to its own settlement, and determine whether it would have an obligation to opt into that settlement. According to Settled Suppliers, this “is a settlement-specific analysis and is not conducive to a generic finding by the Commission that contains no analysis of the different components of the settlements.” Settled Supplier Comments at 3.

Suppliers' concerns have been resolved and as a result, Settled Suppliers do not oppose the Settlement. We find that the Parties' and Settled Suppliers' interpretation of section 8.4.3 is reasonable.

### **Conclusion**

25. The Settlement appears to be fair and reasonable and in the public interest, and is hereby approved. The Commission's approval of the Settlement does not constitute approval of, or precedent regarding, any principle or issue in this proceeding. The Commission also concludes that SMUD's attempt to "disclaim" Commission jurisdiction over the Settlement is not germane in these circumstances.<sup>56</sup> Only the Commission may disclaim its jurisdiction under the FPA.<sup>57</sup>

### **The Commission orders:**

The Settlement is hereby approved, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission. Commissioner Spitzer is not participating.

( S E A L )

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.

---

<sup>56</sup> *See supra* P 4.

<sup>57</sup> *See, e.g.,* NCPA Settlement Order, 131 FERC ¶ 61,083 at P 42; *San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.*, 119 FERC ¶ 61,092, at P 29 (2007).