

From: Simon, Jason
Sent: 9/2/2011 10:07:08 AM
To: Lizette.Amaro@sce.com (Lizette.Amaro@sce.com)
Cc: Laura.Genao@sce.com (Laura.Genao@sce.com); Redacted
Redacted Allen, Meredith
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); jpierce@semprautilities.com
(jpierce@semprautilities.com); cathy.karlstad@sce.com (cathy.karlstad@sce.com);
Douglas, Paul (paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov); Douglas, Paul
(paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: 2011 Shortlist Workpapers - Please Review by next Thursday

Thanks Lizette.

I'll get back to you with comments early next week and we will have the shortlist workpapers finalized for your group to start populating.

I glazed over your comments and have a couple of thoughts. I'm forwarding this to the entire group because they could prove helpful to everyone.

First, SCE and others can easily just dump the information in (i.e. over-write the dropdown list in the cells) if the information conforms to what the cell is specifically asking for (i.e. what you are dumping is listed in the dropdown menu and is in the format that we require). We need to maintain data uniformity and integrity for data management purposes. This is the way we are doing it. That should make it extremely easy for SCE and everyone else.

Second, SCE and others will be receiving the revised IE section shortly. SCE and others will be using the revised template.

Third, if the price and renewable premium for two different bids for the same project are different, the CPUC wants to see that information.

Fourth, the product buckets are not defined. We obviously cannot give you guidance or we would. However, pursuant to language in the statute, SCE and the other IOUs will be able to make assumptions as to what bucket a project falls into without further guidance from the CPUC. I understand that SCE and others are making the argument that any project can fall into any bucket. However, define the buckets with assumptions that SCE is making based on language in the statute, include these assumptions in the shortlist workpapers (we will add a box or something), and choose only one bucket per project. That should be relatively easy.

Fifth, you bring up a good point about the PVC scores. We will include a column to indicate who scored the project. In other words, we require PVC scores for all of the projects.

Thanks again and have a good weekend.

Regards,

Jason

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>

-----Original Message-----

From: Lizette.Amaro@sce.com [<mailto:Lizette.Amaro@sce.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2011 4:12 PM

To: Simon, Jason

Cc: JPierce@semprautilities.com; [Redacted], MEAc@pge.com; Laura.Genao@sce.com; Douglas, Paul; Cathy.Karlstad@sce.com

Subject: 2011 Shortlist Workpapers - Please Review by next Thursday

Hi Jason,

We have reviewed the bid workpapers template that you sent around on Friday and for the most part, we do not expect to have difficulty providing the requested data. However, we would like some clarification on a few items as well as the ability to "write over" cells that have been formatted with a drop-down menu, or, in the alternative, have the drop-down menus removed from the spreadsheet.

Given the large number of projects that bid into SCE's solicitation, the drop-downs are problematic because they do not allow our staff to populate the data directly from the bid analysis tool. Using the drop-down menus would require our staff to manually go through each project, line by line, and attempt to select the correct options from the drop-down menus.

In addition to the increase in staff time required to complete this process, doing this manually may result in errors. In order to avoid this issue, and any possible data transfer errors, it would be beneficial to allow us to populate the data automatically from one tool to another.

We would also like clarification on what type of information is being requested in the "bid data" tab. In the Word document that included the instructions, information was requested on "all bids received" rather than all "projects" that were bid into the RPS Solicitation. In the past, SCE has only provided "project" information and not individual "bid"

information for every project. For instance, if a developer bid a 50 MW project into the solicitation in ten different ways, that would result in 500 MWs of bids. In this example, SCE would provide the information for one project and not all ten bids. Further, we also need clarification on the "product bucket" column in the "bid data" tab, since the products have not yet been defined by the Commission.

In addition, recognizing that SCE did not score every project, we also need clarification on which PVC scores are being requested.

Essentially, there are three sets of scores: 1) developer scores for all projects; 2) SCE scores for a percentage of the projects; and 3) Independent Evaluator (IE) scores for a percentage of the projects.

