

**Questions to address in PRG Presentation of Proposed 2011 RPS Shortlist**

1. Provide a summary overview (number of bids, types of bids, project locations, comparison to previous solicitations, etc.) of the 2011 RPS solicitation.

Examples:

**Bundled Contracts** [PG&E would prefer to only compare 2011 RFO data to 2009 data. If necessary, we can provide prior years at a later date or in the shortlist report]

	<b>2011 RFP</b>	<b>2009 RFP</b>	<b>2008 RFP</b>	<b>2007 RFP</b>	<b>2006 RFP</b>
# of Pricing Proposals					
# of Sellers					
Total: Billions of kWh/yr					
Out-of-State: Billions of kWh/yr					
# of Generating Facilities					

**REC-only<sup>1</sup> Contracts** [PG&E will provide this info at PRG]

	<b>2011 RFP</b>	<b>2009 RFP</b>	<b>2008 RFP</b>	<b>2007 RFP</b>	<b>2006 RFP</b>
# of Pricing Proposals					
# of Sellers					
Total: Billions of kWh/yr					
Out-of-State: Billions of kWh/yr					
# of Generating Facilities					

2. Provide an overview of IOU’s LCBF methodology. (PG&E will provide a high level overview of the LCBF methodology during the PRG meeting)
  - a. Describe energy calculation, including specific forecasts used in calculation data response, not appropriate for PRG – takes time away (PG&E can work with Energy Division to schedule a time to have a detailed, technical discussion on the RA issue (items a and b) and not address it during the PRG.

<sup>1</sup> REC-only per SB 2 (1x) definition

- b. Describe the methodology used to calculate RA value – provide an illustration of how this calculation was applied to a sample bid. Explain how the calculation differs for local and system RA. Explain how the calculation takes into account RA from existing and new facilities - what year is it assumed that the marginal MW of contracted RA will come from a new facility; and whether the price of RA is assumed to jump in that year, rise slowly to that year, etc. data response, not appropriate for PRG – takes time away (see above)
    - c. Describe calculation and application of congestion cost adder, as required in D.11-04-030. (This is fully described in Attachment K – Least Cost Best Fit Protocol)
  3. How does the proposed shortlist fulfill IOU’s RPS portfolio need requirements? (During the PRG meeting we will provide a general discussion of our portfolio position and how we targeted projects for 2016 and later, and how we are treating out-of-state projects. PG&E, at Energy Division’s request plans on scheduling a separate meeting to address need and what our net positions will look like over the various compliance periods. PG&E proposes to address these issues in more detail at that time, and not during the PRG meeting)
    - a. Provide an overview of IOU’s current RPS portfolio risk-adjusted forecast (include assumptions).
    - b. Show current net short/long position in each compliance period and how the shortlisted projects fit into each of the three different compliance periods.
    - c. Show how the proposed projects will fit into IOU’s compliance strategy based on the proposed projects’ contract term lengths, estimated generation, and CODs.
    - d. Discuss any assumptions made about SB 2 (1x) implementation (i.e. product categories, flexible compliance, etc.) when it developed its shortlist.
4. Do any of the shortlisted projects have any affiliation with energy crisis counterparties (Powerex, TransAlta, Coral/Shell, Avista, Iberdrola, NV Energy/Nevada Power, Dynegy/NRG, Bonneville BPA, Western Area Power Administration WAPA)? It will be on list. (PG&E will identify the counterparties at the PRG, so it will be clear which of the counterparties listed in this question are on the shortlist)
5. Provide a list of all projects bid into the solicitation that meet all of the criteria below. Rank list by LCBF valuation metric (include project capacity, generation, contract term length, COD, net market value, price in project list): (PG&E will address this during PRG meeting. Energy Division has indicated that this issue is its top priority)

1. Obtained full site control; (We are interpreting this question as requiring a score of 10 in the PV calculator, which also means full site control over the gen tie right of way. Sellers may have full site control for the project, but not the gen-tie, and those projects will have lower scores.)
2. Received Phase I interconnection study results; and (This corresponds to a score of 6 on the PVC)
3. Project has applied for its CUP or AFC, or other definitive permit based on the project's jurisdiction, as applicable. The applicable permit or application has been deemed data adequate and/or the designated agency has initiated its review. No fatal flaws have been identified (e.g., protected species and/or land, high land mitigation requirement) that will prevent project development. (This corresponds to a score of 5 on the PVC)
  - a. In a table, compare your proposed shortlist with the list compiled from question 5. Include the following in your comparison: number of projects, total MW, total generation (GWh), CODs, technology mix, bid price range, and market value statistics (quartiles, mean, median, and range ). (We can provide this, but we think it makes more sense to provide you with mean, median and range, and not quartiles)
  - b. Identify which shortlisted projects overlap with the list compiled from question 5? If there is minimal or no overlap, explain why the proposed shortlist differs? Please be explicit. (As we discussed, we can explain the differences, but we developed our shortlist without seeing these criteria. We plan to focus this discussion on how we developed our shortlist, not on how it may differ.
6. Describe any qualitative factors used to finalize your proposed shortlist. How were they used (e.g. tie-breaker, cut-off, exclusion measures, etc.) and how did the rankings change? (PG&E will address this during PRG meeting)
7. Provide a scatterplot showing the relationship between RA value and transmission adder for each shortlisted bid, with bids differentiated on the scatterplot by shortlisting status and source of transmission adder (TRCR, Phase 1/System Impact Study, Phase 2/Facilities Study, LGIA, other – different colors or shapes could be used for the bids based on the type of adder) (Energy Division agreed that PG&E does not need to address this during PRG meeting, but should determine the best way to present potential trade-offs between RA value and increased transmission upgrade costs, and present this information in the future)
8. Please provide the following information in the tables below if not provided in overall solicitation summary. (PG&E will address this during PRG meeting)

### **Bundled Contracts - Bid Distribution by Price**

RPS Procurement and Market Development, Energy Division, CPUC

	<b>Average Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Min. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Max. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>
Quartile 1			
Quartile 2			
Quartile 3			
Quartile 4			

**Bundled Contracts - Bid Price Overview by Technology**

	<b>Average Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Min. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Max. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Number of Bids</b>
Solar: PV				
Solar: Thermal				
Wind				
Geothermal				
Hydro				
Biomass, MSW				
Other				

**REC-only Contracts – Bid Price Overview**

	<b>Average Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Min. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Max. Levelized Bid Price (\$/MWh)</b>	<b>Number of Bids</b>
Quartile 1				
Quartile 2				
Quartile 3				
Quartile 4				