

From: Kalafut, Jennifer

Sent: 7/7/2010 10:39:25 AM

To: Redacted

Cc: Redacted
Redacted Redacted
Redacted Lee, Evelyn C (Law)
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=ECL8); Redacted
Redacted Horner, Trina
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC); Redacted
Redacted Redacted
Redacted Redacted
Redacted

Bcc:

Subject: RE: PG&E: Revised response to CHP data request

Dear Redact

Thank you for sending the dataset. I was out of the office yesterday but will be working through the data today and tomorrow and will let you know if I have any questions.

Best,

Jennifer

From: Redacted
Sent: Friday, July 02, 2010 3:47 PM
To: Kalafut,
Jennifer
Cc: Redacted; Lee, Evelyn C (Law); Redacted
Redacted Horner,
Trina
Subject: PG&E: Revised response to CHP data
request

Jennifer,

Please find attached an Excel spreadsheet that provides PG&E's response to the additional questions you posed in your 5/25 email (below), and specifies NAICS codes for each facility. This information is as of June 30, 2010. Due to a variety of factors, PG&E's CHP facilities' data changes frequently. As a result, there is an unavoidable "time decay" of reliability resulting from such factors as contracts expiration/renewal, on-site customer load variance, and cessation of facility operations. Therefore, the material presented in the attached spreadsheet should be viewed as a snapshot that captures data at a single point in time, and not as an on-going reflection of CHP operations in the PG&E service area.

Regarding the spreadsheet, PG&E offers the following explanatory notes:

- The data set excludes:
 - Wind-only projects;
 - Solar-only projects;
 - Hydro-only projects;
 - Single-technology Net Energy Metered (NEM) projects.
- As requested by the ED, we have also included facility-operation applications that have either been withdrawn or are on-hold.
- We have added a " Comments" (column H) section to help explain any data/issues that require further explanation or that include notable aspects.
- We have also added the "NAICS 2" column. Codes herein describe the *activity* in the location rather than the main line of business of the entity or parent company . For example if Acme Gas and Oil Services Company provides steam to a hospital, the NAICS code will be that of a health care service

provider and not that of
an petroleum products enterprise.

- The estimated total may be high. this is because PG&E has included all QF facilities with which PG&E holds a contract, regardless of whether the corresponding facility is currently operating or not.

Regarding the specific questions raised in your email, PG&E answers as follows:

1) Column L ("Date terminated/withdrawn") is not formatted to show a date. I can re-format this but want to make sure that I'm getting the right information. If I format that field to a DD/MM/YY date, will the values be correct?

a

- Column L on the spreadsheet has been reformatted to show dates, and includes correct values.

2) Last year, we did a similar data request for performance information on QFs. I have been using that data too and have been matching up the performance data to the projects that you provided in this data request (so that we didn't have to ask you for the performance data again on QFs). However, I noticed six projects included in the 2009 data that are not in the data you just sent me:

01C045: 260,000 kW

02C041: 6,000
kW

08C022: 28,500
kW

12C021: 49,500 kW

13C082: 42,000 kW

18C052EO1: 49,600 kW

Should these be included in the current data set or is there a reason why you left them out?

- These projects should be included

. In addition, we performed a query of our operational QF database, which identified several more.

3) There are a couple duplicate ID numbers in the data set you sent me. Can you help me understand why these projects are listed twice: 25C002, 25C003?

- Duplicate Log Numbers: 25C002 and 25C003 each appeared twice, once identified as "yes" QF status, and once as "no" QF status. These are QF projects, so the entries that identified them as "no" have been deleted. In addition, there were eight other duplicates for QF contracts that had been extended after initial expiration (identified by the "EO1" or "EO2" suffix). These duplicates have also been deleted.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Best wishes
for a safe and happy Independence Day,

Redacted

From: Kalafut, Jennifer
[mailto:jennifer.kalafut@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010
6:19 PM
To: Redacted
Cc: Redacted

H.

Subject: FW: Revised CHP Spreadsheet

Dear Redact

Thank you
again for all you help compiling
the CHP data.

I've had a chance to go through data set
and have a few questions I was hoping you could help me
with:

1) Column L ("Date terminated/withdrawn") is not formatted to show a date. I can
re-format this but want to make sure that
I'm getting the right information. If I format that field to a DD/MM/YY date,
will the values be correct?

2) Last year, we did a similar data request for
performance information on QFs. I have
been using that data too and have been matching up the performance
data to the projects that you provided in this data request (so that we didn't
have to ask you for the performance data again on QFs). However, I noticed six projects included in the
2009 data
that are not in the data you just sent me:

01C045: 260,000 kW

02C041: 6,000
kW

08C022: 28,500
kW

12C021: 49,500 kW

13C082: 42,000 kW

18C052EO1: 49,600 kW

Should these be included in the current data set or is there a reason why
you left them out?

3) There are a couple duplicate ID numbers in the data set you sent me. Can you help me understand why these projects are listed twice: 25C002, 25C003?

In general, when we did this data request, we were hoping to have a nice complement to the QF performance data request that we did last year. However, in addition to the discrepancies listed above, there is a difference in the number of QF projects listed in the two data sets: the data set you just sent me lists 84 QF projects (81 of which are "operational") and the previous request resulted in 58 QF projects. This is confusing and it might be best to have a call with someone to talk this through. Thoughts? Can you recommend who I should talk to about this?

Best,

Jennifer

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 3:46 PM
To: Kalafut,
Jennifer
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject:
Revised CHP Spreadsheet

Jennifer,

Per our conversation, please find attached PG&E's submission in response to the Energy Division's 4/28 data request, modified to include a confidentiality header. Also per our conversation, I understand you will delete the version of the spreadsheet, entitled submitted via email last Friday.

Please contact me with any questions.

Redacted

<<ED CHP data request PGE 5 21 V2
confidential.xls>>