

From: Baker, Amy C.  
Sent: 3/28/2011 1:26:32 PM  
To: Redacted  
Cc: Ikle, Judith (judith.ikle@cpuc.ca.gov); Redacted  
Redacted Allen, Meredith  
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAE); Kamins, Sara M.  
(sara.kamins@cpuc.ca.gov); Mathai-jackson, Grady (Law)  
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MGML)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: CONFIDENTIAL: PG&E Response to Energy Division Data Request on RPS  
Costs

Hi All,  
Would it be possible to get the MWh amounts associated with  
these costs?

Thanks

**From:** Redacted  
**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2011 6:22 PM  
**To:** Baker, Amy  
C.  
**Cc:** Allen, Meredith; Redacted Ikle, Judith; Kamins, Sara M.;  
Mathai-jackson, Grady (Law)  
**Subject:** RE: CONFIDENTIAL: PG&E  
Response to Energy Division Data Request on RPS Costs

**PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD - CONTAINS  
PROTECTED INFORMATION SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION  
583**

Amy -

Attached please find PG&E's  
*confidential second supplemental* response to your data request  
regarding an annual projection of RPS-eligible costs. Please note the attached file includes the  
scenario that assumes no re-contracting that you and David discussed.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank you,

Redacted

**From:** Baker, Amy C.

[mailto:amy.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]

**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2011 11:54

AM

**To:** Redacted

**Cc:** Allen, Meredith; Redacted

Ikle, Judith; Kamins, Sara M.; Mathai-jackson, Grady (Law)

**Subject:**

RE: CONFIDENTIAL: PG&E Response to Energy Division Data Request on RPS Costs

Did PG&E assume 100% re-contracting for this? The \$/MWh amounts don't seem to be making sense when dividing by PG&E's forecasted generation numbers.

**From:** Redacted

**Sent:** Friday, March 04, 2011 5:45 PM

**To:** Baker, Amy

C.

**Cc:** Allen, Meredith; Redacted Ikle, Judith; Kamins, Sara M.; Mathai-jackson, Grady (Law)

**Subject:** CONFIDENTIAL: PG&E Response to Energy Division Data Request on RPS Costs

**PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD - CONTAINS  
PROTECTED INFORMATION SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION  
583**

Amy -

Attached please find PG&E's *confidential* response and attachment to your data request regarding an annual projection of RPS-eligible costs, dated February 24, 2011.

Please note - Data reflects annual forecasted costs for all approved Post 2002 RPS PPAs as of the date of PG&E's August 2010 RPS Compliance Filing, including RPS-Eligible feed-in-tariff contracts and QF contracts.

Please note - PG&E has tentatively marked all QF pricing information as confidential but expects that some, if not most, of the QF contracts will be outside of the CPUC-defined confidentiality period. Upon completion of its review, PG&E intends to revise the confidentiality treatment in this data response.

**Response:**

<<Data\_Response\_ED\_RPS\_Costs\_3-4-2011.doc>>

**Confidential**

**Attachment:**

<<RPS

- ED Data Request 2011-2020 Contract Costs-CONF.xls>>

**Confidentiality Declaration and**

**Matrix:**

<<Final Conf


Matrix + Declarationfor RPS energy projections.pdf>>

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thank you.

Redacted

This email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law, including the attorney-client privilege. If the reader of this email is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Do not disclose the contents to anyone. If you have received this communication in error, please return the original message to the sender via email.

 Stay GREEN: Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

