

From: Redacted  
Sent: 12/22/2011 12:07:44 PM  
To: Redacted  
Cc: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); Douglas, Paul (paul.douglas@cpuc.ca.gov); Schultz, Adam (adam.schultz@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Bcc:  
Subject: 2011 Shortlist

Hi Sandy,

I am following up on our previous conversation (which included Gary, Meredith and Paul) with respect to the 2011 Shortlist report which you expect will be re-submitted to the Commission in January. In the meeting we discussed some suggestions for refining the shortlist. These included:

- 1) Decreasing the shortlist to 2-4x times PG&E's need. Gary mentioned that PG&E has an interest in procuring approximately 800 GWh/y of generation in 2012 to meet portfolio need in the third compliance period. That said, we would expect to see the shortlist reflect the objectives that Gary communicated. Coincidentally, SCE utilized a similar rationale for shortlisting projects while providing some cushion for drop-outs etc.
- 2) Include PAV values for all of the shortlisted projects. This would include reporting all of the values for the sub-components of the PAV plus the final PAV value. Please provide what the range was for the PAV for all of the bids that you evaluated using PG&E's new methodology including the average and the sample size so we have something to compare the projects against.
- 3) Shortlist projects that not only meet need requirements in the third compliance period but meet PG&E's qualitative requirements. This should be reflected in the PAV score and rankings as well as the PVC score.
- 4) This wasn't mentioned, but please update the remainder of the worksheets and commentary section to reflect the revised shortlist and your new methodology.

If you need clarification on anything just shoot me an email or call. I will be gone for the holidays as of today until January 3 so I will get back to you as soon as I get back if you have questions before then.

Thanks Sandy and Happy Holidays

Redacted

Renewable Policy and Procurement

Redacted