From: Redacted

Sent: 6/9/2011 12:07:33 PM

To: 'Sergio.Islas@sce.com' (Sergio.Islas@sce.com); 'Taylor, Stephen R. - E&FP' (SRTaylor@semprautilities.com)

Cc: Poster, David (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=DxPU); Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); Redacted Redacted 'Simon, Jason' (jason.simon@cpuc.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: FW: Notes on your summary

Hi Sergio and Steve,

It was nice talking with you yesterday. Below are the 22 items (with Jason's comments in red and/or blue) that we discussed in our meeting with Jason on Monday. He's asked that I share these with you.

Please let me know if you'd like to set up a call to discuss/walk through these.

Thanks
Redacte

Redacted
Pacific Gas & Electric
Energy Proceedings
Redacted

From: Simon, Jason [mailto:jason.simon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 09, 2011 9:01 AM
To: Redacted
Subject: Notes on your summary

Team,

We can go through these at our team meeting this afternoon, but I wanted to put down on "paper" the notes from our meeting with Jason:

1) We can use the new PV calculator for the projects on the PDSR, thereby eliminating the need for scorers to score the PDSR projects and the RFO bids differently. (Good - also, all of the PV scores for contracts in the PDSR should be updated using version 2 of the PV calculator)

2) No need to provide AMF calculations for shortlisted/under negotiations projects. (Good)

3) For "negotiations terminated" and "contract terminated" projects - move these projects to a separate bucket at the bottom to the project list and include the date (e.g., August 2011) it was moved there. No need to update this information....just be sure it has the reason for negotiations or contract termination. (Good - also, create two different buckets as opposed to putting "negotiations terminated" and "contract terminated" in the same bucket.)

4) Same for "online" projects - move to a separate bucket at the bottom of the project list and include the date (e.g., August 2011) it was moved there. No need to update this information. (Good)

5) FITs: Will require the same reporting requirements that were listed in the RAM Commission Order. Jason will provide us which columns these will be...pretty much the same as what we had to do last time plus a few more around interconnection. (Good - also, this will be done after we get through the next filing in August)

6) "as-of" date of July 4, 2011 is fine. (Good)

7) Jason will be sure we'll be able to filter the spreadsheet for ease of use. (Good - not sure if I will have this done before or after August filing. Need to discuss with Amy first)

8) For projects that have no GCOD, we are allowed to put "N/A"...but need to define what "N/A" is in our data definitions. (Good)

9) PPA status for amendments (should the PPA status reflect the underlying contract or the amendment?) - Jason will follow up with us after discussing with appropriate folks. (If the amendment is just contemplated, I think it should stay as “CPUC approved” until the amendment is filed here. If there is an approved contract that is now the subject of an amendment, we should add something like “Approved by CPUC; amendment pending approval” to the drop down.)

10) CREZ (if outside California, is this applicable?) - Jason will follow up with us after discussing with the appropriate folks. (On the March 2011 PDSR template, the drop down list for the CREZ column included each of the states in the West, so they should at least indicate the state. Looking at it now, it would actually be better if they could assign the project to the appropriate out-of-state area identified in RETI Phase 2B (finalized May 2010), which is a little more granular. RETI imported that information from the Western Renewable Energy Zones initiative, where they were called Qualifying Resource Areas, and the map of QRAs with names is on page 6-2 of the RETI Phase 2B final report, http://www.energy.ca.gov/2010publications/RETI-1000-2010-002/RETI-1000-2010-002-F.PDF. There is a huge difference in geographic location across most of the states, and the resources vary greatly, too. Also, the west-wide planning initiative is using these same zone/area naming conventions, so it would be most helpful to have this info and thus be able to easily compare IOU procurement to various scenarios that people are putting together.)

11) Proposed prices - indicative bids not necessary. (Are you referring to indicative bids from older solicitations? If so, I believe we concluded not necessary)

12) CAISO ID number (is this the CAISO Resource ID number?) - Jason to get back to us. (Our database guy says yes)

13) Permit status (what constitutes "At Risk of Failure"?) - Jason will follow up. (They don’t have to use it, but don’t get rid of it. We added the “at risk of failure” option to project status (no longer in the report) a few years ago after PG&E added it themselves to show that a project was beyond just delayed, it was on the verge of failure. I would think it would be the same thing on

the permitting category – if the process is really not going well and it looks unlikely that the project will not get the requested permit, PG&E would choose this option. If it doesn't fit, they just choose a different option. They make this call on operational status (they listed some of their projects in their March 2011 filing as "Under development – at risk of failure" even though that wasn't an option), so they can decide on the appropriate probability threshold for this one, too.)

14) Compliance Report template changes - Jason does not deal with this at all; Sean Simon handles this report. Jason will have Sean call me. (Sean followed up and said no major changes)

15) Change Request Process - if we need to change the template (i.e., adding to the drop-down menus), we have been instructed to work with the other IOUs to get a change management process in place so that all templates will be updated accordingly. Beth to discuss with other IOUs and get back to Jason with a proposed process. (Good - see previous email)

16) The goal in Jason's mind is that we will be able to update this PDSR via our database (when up and running) on a monthly basis, thereby getting rid of the monthly slide deck that CM puts together. (Good - also, eliminate other duplicative work)

17) We will be required to update this report with the RFO bids sometime this Fall. We will not be required to update the other data in the report unless our database is in place by then. (Good)

18) Projects that were presented and discussed in the PRG meetings but have since been terminated (i.e., the REC tradable projects) should be added in a separate section at the bottom of the list - no need to update these projects...just be sure it has the date and reason for negotiations terminated. (Good)

19) Clean up the projects that have had "PPA Status" as "Inactive" in the previous PDSR filings (i.e., move them to "Negotiations Terminated" status), unless there are legitimate reason(s) for them to remain in "Inactive" state. (Good - and please define Inactive if you have not already done so)

20) ED would like to work with PG&E to consolidate other RPS data requests into the PDSR. This will decrease workload for both parties while increasing efficiency and consistency. (Good)

21) Jason will spend the next couple of days reviewing our data definitions and will provide additional columns with drop down selections by Thursday so we can put them in our template. (Good)

22) Jason should be able to get us a pretty solid PDSR template by June 15th, but we need to manage our team's expectations that changes may occur before the final is released. (Good)

Jason L. Simon, CFA
Renewable Energy Policy and Procurement
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
Fourth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 703-5906
http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/index.htm