

From: Simon, Sean A.
Sent: 6/15/2011 9:17:20 PM
To: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe);
sean_simon@cpuc.ca.gov (sean_simon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: [Redacted];
paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov (paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: Re: enXco discussion at PRG

Meredith,

Sure, time permitting, but personally I think the agenda is full with the issues at hand. I would like to propose meeting soon to discuss PG&E's rps procurement strategies and portfolio management. I envision something similar to the big-tent meeting we had several weeks ago, but more focused on procurement decision making process (vs. policy issues). We can discuss this tomorrow, time permitting of course, or in the near future.

Thanks,
Sean

----- Reply message -----

From: "Allen, Meredith" <MEAe@pge.com>
Date: Wed, Jun 15, 2011 8:49 pm
Subject: enXco discussion at PRG
To: "sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov" <sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc: "paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov" <paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov>, [Redacted]

Sean,

Thanks for the clarification. We were hoping to discuss with you. Does it work to add this item to list of issues to discuss late tomorrow afternoon?

Meredith

From: Simon, Sean A. [mailto:sean.simon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2011 01:26 PM
To: Allen, Meredith
Cc: Douglas, Paul <paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov>; [Redacted]
Subject: enXco discussion at PRG

Meredith,

I have been thinking about yesterday's PRG conversation about the enXco Shiloh IV bilateral offer. At the meeting, I expressed concern that it was imprudent to move forward with any RPS contract in advance of seeing

the results of the 2011 solicitation. I also suggested that PG&E may request that enXco bid the project into the solicitation. After thinking about this further, I do not think that it is so important that the project formally bid into the solicitation given the timing constraint for enXco to prepare a bid in a weeks time. That said, in no case do I think that PG&E should execute any bilateral agreements prior to seeing the 2011 solicitation offers. Once PG&E has decent grasp of the cost and value of the offers received, it would then make sense to evaluate any bilateral offers against the solicitation offers. PG&E should strive to make sure that the bilateral offers can be compared to the solicitation offers on an apples to apples basis (for example, include transmission adders and use the same energy/capacity forwards to determine net market value).

Feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions.

Regards,
Sean

Sean A. Simon | Energy Division - Analyst | CA Public Utilities Commission | Tel (415) 703-3791
<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/renewables>

Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this e-mail is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and it may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient (or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us by telephone call at the number listed above.