From:RedactedSent:3/16/2011 5:23:53 PMTo:Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe)Cc:Simon, Sean A. (sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov)Bcc:

Subject: Data Request AL 3735-E

Meredith,

Hope all is well. Energy Division is starting the review process for AL 3735-E (Shiloh III Wind Project). A list of questions is provided below pertaining to the PPA. Can you please have PG&E staff respond to the data request no later than the morning of Monday, March 21st.

Kind Regards,

Redacted	CFA
Renewable Ener	gy Policy Analyst
California Public	<b>Utilities</b> Commission
505 Van Ness A	venue
Fourth Floor	
San Francisco. (	CA 94102

## Data Request (AL 3735-E)

1) In Advice Letter 3735-E-A, PG&E and enXco increased the size of the Project to 100 MW from 60 MW. Has enXco already received site control for the full capacity of the facility? Confidential Appendix A (p. A-7) states that enXco continues to negotiate to gain additional site control that will facilitate a 100 MW project. If not, when does enXco expect to receive full site control for the 100 MW Project?

2) Has enXco already received a signed LGIA for 100 MW? In Confidential Appendix A (p. A-8), it states that a revised LGIA for the Project is expected to be signed in December 2010. If not, when does enXco expect to receive an approved LGIA?

3) Confidential Appendix A (p. A-8) also states that enXco anticipates an increase in the cost of the transmission upgrade as a result of the revised LGIA. Please re-calculate the new cost associated with the transmission upgrade and an increase in the size of the project from 60MW to 100MW. Please calculate the new net market value of the contract based on this new information.

4) Please calculate the percentage contribution from the Project versus PG&E's 2013 forecasted sales which incorporates the new delivery requirements under the contract (i.e. 341,053 MWh/year).

5) Please provide all PVC (project viability) and pricing information for bilaterals that have been offered to PG&E during the timeframe of the bilateral negotiations between Shiloh III and PG&E. This includes all bilaterals offered including rejected contracts.

Note: Question 5 is identical to the request Energy Division made during evaluation of the SGS-1, LLC contract.