

From: Bawa, Niki
Sent: 8/26/2010 5:31:12 PM
To: Redacted
Cc: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); Simon, Sean A. (sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: August PG&E Contract Update

Hi David,

The changes sound good. For #2, just to clarify, we are interested to know about all projects that were removed from the previous month, be they removed due to the project coming online or the project being cancelled for some reason. Thank you.

Regards,

Niki

Niki S. Bawa [REDACTED]

Renewable Procurement and Resource Planning

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Ave

San Francisco, CA 94102

415.703.2197

niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/renewables>

From: Redacted
Sent: Thursday, August 26, 2010 5:18 PM
To: Bawa, Niki
Cc: Allen, Meredith; Simon, Sean A.
Subject: RE: August PG&E Contract Update

Niki:

For #1, it should be easy to add the solicitation year to the report. We would prefer to keep the list in alphabetical order and simply add a line for each project indicating the year of solicitation/bilat, as it is easier to find projects this way and easier to process on our end.

For #2, we can add a section to do this to the summary sheet. What this would usually result in is a project appearing on the summary section two months in a row. For example, one month, it would be

listed in the COD section of the summary. The next month, it would be listed in the "Removed" section.

Also, re: our follow-ups from this month's call:

- **CURE's comments on AV Solar Ranch's draft EIR:** According to AV Solar Ranch, this was a comment directed at the EIR process and the inclusion of the IBEW's interests rather than a protest of the project. AV Solar Ranch continues to expect its Final EIR on 9/15/2010.
- **SPS Alpaugh's election of thin film PV:** This change to the report was simply a correction. In early discussions with SPS Alpaugh, we weren't sure if they were going to use thin film or crystalline. The proposed two different annual generation amounts: 113 GWh/yr for crystalline and 84 GWh/yr for thin film. They elected to go with thin film technology, and the advice letter, PDSR, and contract all reflect the 84 GWh/yr amount.

David

From: Bawa, Niki [mailto:niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 5:19 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Allen, Meredith; Simon, Sean A.
Subject: August PG&E Contract Update

Hi David,

It was good to touch base during the meeting today. The project updates were very helpful. Sean and I were discussing ways to make the process a little more efficient and we were wondering if you could integrate the following two changes to the monthly report going forward.

- 1) Organize the presentation by solicitation year rather than by alphabetical order. If it is easier to populate this information by alphabetical order due to the database you use, then it would be helpful if you could add a line to each project stating which solicitation the project was from or, if the contract is bilateral, what year the bilateral was executed.
- 2) In the Executive Summary, could you enter an additional section that provides a list of the projects from the previous month's report that are no longer listed and a short description of the reason for the project's delisting. It would help us to keep track of the change in projects from month to month. For example, I noticed that Big Creek Water Works is no longer listed in the August monthly report and I assume it came online, but it would be helpful for us to keep track of such changes if they are listed in the executive summary.

Give me a call if you would like to discuss. Thank you. Have a good evening.

Kind Regards,

Niki

Niki S. Bawa

Renewable Procurement and Resource Planning

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Ave

San Francisco, CA 94102

415.703.2197

niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/renewables>