

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 7/26/2011 5:28:10 PM
To: 'Kalafut, Jennifer' (jennifer.kalafut@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: [Redacted] Allen,
Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Bcc:
Subject: RE: Follow-up

Confidential Protected Material Enclosed
Pursuant to General Order 66-C, Pub. Util. Code § 583 and D.06-06-066
Not for Public Disclosure

Hi Jennifer,

Please find our responses to your questions below. Please note that the file sent to you on Friday, July 22 had an error in it. The row with Count number 8 [the second Sierra Pacific Ind. (Burney)] was a typo. We have deleted that row and replaced it with Covanta Mendota (which is Count number 3 in the attached file). We also added Column F "Historical All-in Price (\$/MWh) and Column G "Requested All-in Energy and Capacity Price" per your request. Pursuant to your conversation earlier today with [Redacted], I will send you our confidentiality declaration and matrix (as required under D.08-04-023 and D.06-06-066) tomorrow under separate cover.

In addition, I am enclosing our response to your various clarifying questions below. After reviewing the attached, please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

[Reda]

Q. I apologize for the multiple emails on this. However, I need to request an additional piece of information. That is, could you please provide the name of the independent evaluator for each of these contract negotiations as well.

Lewis Hashimoto from Arroyo Seco Consulting is the Independent Evaluator.

1. The attached shows that currently there are 11 facilities for a total of 260 MW currently on the IEP Settlement. I had thought that there were 17 biomass facilities - around 340 MW - originally on the IEP Settlement. Were DG Fairhaven and Mt. Lassen originally on the IEP Settlement? Any others?

Redacted

2. If the facilities are not currently being paid on the IEP fixed-price settlement (i.e. if Column H lists "No"), is it correct to assume that they are getting paid SRAC for energy deliveries? If not, what are their energy payments? What is the current SRAC?

Redacted

Redacted

3. Can you please send the MWh operating capacity of these facilities (average of production over past three years or another estimate along those lines would be acceptable)?

Redacted

From: Kalafut, Jennifer [mailto:jennifer.kalafut@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Monday, July 25, 2011 12:00 PM

To: Redacted

Cc: Redacted Allen, Meredith; Redacted

Redacted

Subject: RE: follow-up

Tom and Hugh,

I apologize for the multiple emails on this. However, I need to request an additional piece of information. That is, could you please provide the name of the independent evaluator for each of these contract negotiations as well.

Thank you.

Best,

Jen

From: Kalafut, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2011 11:36 AM

To: [Redacted]

Cc: [Redacted] Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: follow-up

Hi Tom,

Thank you for sending this. I have a few questions on the attached:

1. The attached shows that currently there are 11 facilities for a total of 260 MW currently on the IEP Settlement. I had thought that there were 17 biomass facilities - around 340 MW - originally on the IEP Settlement. Were DG Fairhaven and Mt. Lassen originally on the IEP Settlement? Any others?
2. If the facilities are not currently being paid on the IEP fixed-price settlement (i.e. if Column H lists "No"), is it correct to assume that they are getting paid SRAC for energy deliveries? If not, what are their energy payments? What is the current SRAC?
3. Can you please send the MWh operating capacity of these facilities (average of production over past three years or another estimate along those lines would be acceptable)?

Please reply with this information by the end of the day. I understand that this is limited time but I am presuming that you have most of this information on hand. If you cannot meet this deadline, please give me a call to discuss.

Best,

Jen

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2011 5:36 PM
To: Kalafut, Jennifer
Cc: [Redacted] Allen, Meredith; [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Subject: RE: follow-up

Confidential Protected Material Enclosed

Pursuant to General Order 66-C, Pub. Util. Code § 583 and D.06-06-066

Not for Public Disclosure

Jennifer:

Please find attached our response to the information you requested earlier today from Hugh Merriam, which contains commercially sensitive information that should be treated as confidential under D.06-06-066 and Section 583 of the Public Utilities Code. In addition, the information contained in the attached excel spreadsheet is proprietary customer information provided to PG&E in confidence and would be against the public interest if inadvertently or intentionally disclosed.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks!

Regards,

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2011 8:12 AM
To: 'Kalafut, Jennifer'

Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: follow-up

I sent it to [Redacted] yesterday afternoon. Let me follow up with him.

From: Kalafut, Jennifer [mailto:jennifer.kalafut@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2011 12:56 PM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: follow-up

Thanks again, [Redac] for all your help on the biomass issue. If you can get me information this afternoon yet, that would be most helpful.

Best,

Jen

Jennifer Kalafut

Energy Division

California Public Utilities Commission

Tel: 415.703.1475