

From: Lee, Cheryl
Sent: 5/3/2010 4:02:10 PM
To: Middlekauff, Charles (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=CRMd)
Cc: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAc); Douglas, Paul (paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: RE: PG&E's 2010 RPS Plan 4/9/10 Update

Charles,

We spoke last week regarding whether PG&E should or should not hold off on filing an updated solicitation protocol because there is now a proposed decision staying the TRECs decision.

The Commission provided direction on the updates in both the TREC decision and March 19, 2010 ALJ Mattson ruling. Also, assuming PG&E would like the opportunity to solicit/procure TRECs that should be reflected in its entire Plan. Thus, as we discussed before, while PG&E would like to limit the number of filings, a filed updated Plan pursuant to all Commission direction sooner than later could be less risky for PG&E since the later the changes are incorporated the higher the risk that PG&E's Plan approval and solicitation could be delayed or not approved.

If you have any questions, again, please feel free to call or e-mail.

Thank you,
Cheryl

From: Lee, Cheryl
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 4:46 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: 'Allen, Meredith'; Douglas, Paul
Subject: PG&E's 2010 RPS Plan 4/9/10 Update

[Redacted]

In the copy of PG&E's update to its 2010 RPS Procurement Plan I did not receive an updated solicitation protocol. The portion of PG&E's Plan I did receive seems to say that the pro forma will be updated (p. 42). I assume PG&E will be filing that along with an updated solicitation protocol in the relatively near future. Please confirm this assumption.

Thank you,
Cheryl

~~~~~

Cheryl Lee

Policy Analyst

Renewable Procurement and Resource Planning, Energy Division

California Public Utilities Commission

[cnl@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:cnl@cpuc.ca.gov)

(415) 703-2167