

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 3/21/2011 4:35:58 PM
To: 'Baker, Amy C.' (amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAc); Simon, Sean A. (sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Updated PDSR

Hi Amy,

We can get this information to you by tomorrow COB. However, please see the email below concerning some of the data you requested not being available.

Thanks,

[Redacted]
Pacific Gas & Electric
Energy Proceedings
[Redacted]

Hi Beth,

We can fill in Columns N – P and S – U. However, these contracts do not have a Guaranteed Commercial Operation Date, and they do not have to report Min or Max Energy. I can fill in the Actual COD for those Facilities already online. For those Facilities that are not online, the ECOD can be very hard to determine because there are no reporting requirements in the contract.

I can have this by COB tomorrow. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Velvet

From: Baker, Amy C. [mailto:amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 2:40 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]; Simon, Sean A.
Subject: RE: Updated PDSR

Hi Beth,
Could you let me know when you plan to have the MW/GWh/COD/operational status/location columns for the FIT contracts filled in?

Thanks

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 4:56 PM
To: Baker, Amy C.
Cc: Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Updated PDSR

Thanks, Amy.

Yes, we'd appreciate to be able to work with you to make this process easier. We really want to create an excellent product for you and for our internal uses.

Here is the most recent PDSR. It contains additional changes from Wednesday. Most are to conform with the template, but there have been a few content changes that we uncovered as well.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or needs. As always, we are continuously striving to improve our processes and data quality and any feedback is welcome.

Kind Regards,
Beth

[Redacted]
Pacific Gas & Electric
Energy Proceedings
[Redacted]

From: Baker, Amy C. [mailto:amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 9:31 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Updated PDSR

Hi Beth,
Thank you for the quick turn around. I am happy to discuss changes next time.

If it's hard to re-configure the database, I'd recommend just re-naming everything in Excel. This can be accomplished by outputting the data from the database into Excel and inputting a simple formula to change the name to the PDSR standard. If you want me to walk you through that, I'm happy to do so, it should be fairly easy for me to figure out.

Amy Baker, Analyst
Renewable Procurement and Resource Planning
California Public Utilities Commission
415.703.1691
amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov
<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/renewables>

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2011 5:35 PM
To: Baker, Amy C.
Cc: Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]
Subject: Updated PDSR

Hi Amy,

Here is an updated PDSR with corrections relating to the PV scores. I have also gone in and changed the PPA status to fit the menu selection. I will continue reviewing all the drop downs to ensure consistency.

As we are building our database to be able to replicate the PDSR template and menu drop down selections, is it possible that we learn of any changes for the next PDSR earlier rather than later? The feedback I've received is that it's not easy to reconfigure the interface each and every time the PDSR is issued. Perhaps we can meet next month to discuss?

I am having everyone scrub their data, looking for relationships across data columns, etc. I will provide that version to you on Friday.

Thanks much,
Beth

[Redacted]
Pacific Gas & Electric
Energy Proceedings
[Redacted]

From: Baker, Amy C. [mailto:amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2011 10:16 AM
To: [Redacted]; Allen, Meredith
Cc: [Redacted]; Simon, Sean A.
Subject: Inconsistencies in PDSR
Importance: High

Beth,

I came across an inconsistency with the Bright Source contracts in the PDSR. The permitting column states that two of the contracts have completed permits, but the Project Viability score section states that they are data adequate but not complete. I am not sure if this is a problem with the specific contract manager or with the PDSR as a whole. PG&E should review the PDSR Project Viability scores to make sure that they are consistent with the rest of the spreadsheet.

PG&E should review the Project Viability scores and **report back by COB tomorrow on any corrections**. I came across this error because we actually use this information and need it to be correct.

In addition, it looks like PG&E is having substantial data quality control problems with this report. This has been a problem in the past and it needs to be addressed. PG&E should review the rest of the spreadsheet and report on any additional errors **by the end of the week**.

Amy

Amy Baker, Analyst
Renewable Procurement and Resource Planning
California Public Utilities Commission
415.703.1691
amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov
<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/renewables>