

Date: March 30, 2012

To: Colette Kersten  
Advisor to Commissioner Catherine Sandoval

From: Meredith Allen  
Sr. Director, Regulatory Relations  
PG&E

Subject: SVTC Application 10-11-002

Enclosures:

- I DOE Application, "*SVTC Solar: A Photovoltaic Manufacturing Development Facility*", previously filed under seal on November 16, 2011 (CONFIDENTIAL)
- II Term Sheet between PG&E and SVTC Solar, Inc. (CONFIDENTIAL\*) (June 1, 2011)
- III Transcript (March 23, 2011, pages 1 & 68) (CONFIDENTIAL)
- IV SoCalGas – Testimony (August 6, 2010, pages GAW-47 & GAW-48)

\* Please note that the highlighted sections (in yellow) mark confidential information on pages 2, 3, 9 and 14.

SVTC DOE Application (Confidential)

[Previously filed under seal on November 16, 2011]

PG&E/SVTC Solar, Inc. (Confidential)

Term Sheet

For Series B Redeemable Preferred  
Stock Financing of SVTC Solar, Inc.

[Previously filed under seal on March 21, 2012]

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, MARCH 23, 2011

2 10:00 A.M.

3 \* \* \* \* \*

4 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE BEMESDERFER:

5 Let's go on the record.

6 This is the time and place for  
7 the workshop in proceeding A.10-11-002,  
8 the application of Pacific Gas and Electric  
9 Company for authority to increase rates to  
10 cover the cost of investment in a proposed  
11 California-based photovoltaic manufacturing  
12 facilities.

13 I'm Administrative Law Judge Karl  
14 Bemederfer.

15 The assigned commissioner is  
16 Michael Peevey.

17 The purpose of today's workshop is  
18 primarily to discuss the legal and policy  
19 aspects of the application. And in that  
20 regard, I'd like to make a few preliminary  
21 remarks.

22 First, let me introduce my  
23 colleague from the Energy Division, Rachel  
24 Petersen, who's been reviewing the  
25 application and discovery responses in  
26 preparation for this hearing. Rachel's areas  
27 of responsibility at the Commission include  
28 solar facilities and distributed generation,

1 and does not make R&D investments. We  
2 believe the benefits that would come out of  
3 this project are really more equally  
4 distributed amongst ratepayers and customers  
5 than it would be amongst stockholders.

6 Furthermore, we modeled this after,  
7 by having the preferred stock mechanism and  
8 the direct investment, we actually modeled  
9 this after a long-running customer-funded R&D  
10 investment program that Southern California  
11 Gas has had for over ten years now. They now  
12 have seven companies that they have invested  
13 in with customer funds. They added the last  
14 one as recently as January, a fuel cell  
15 company.

16 The concept was originally  
17 authorized in 1997 in the general rate case  
18 and reauthorized in every general rate case  
19 since. The most recent one authorized in  
20 2008 is currently at \$10 million a year. So  
21 there is a precedent for this of R&D  
22 investments being made on behalf of utility  
23 customers in startup and R&D type companies.

24 Moving on to Slide 11, the question  
25 was asked, the risk of losing DOE funds if  
26 this investment is not approved. We think  
27 this was a substantial issue, as Mr.  
28 Empedocles mentioned. The requirement for

Application of Southern California Gas Company  
for authority to update its gas revenue requirement  
and base rates effective on January 1, 2012.  
(U904G)

(NOI for) Application 10-12-\_\_\_\_  
Exhibit No.: (SCG-9)

**PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
GILLIAN A. WRIGHT  
ON BEHALF OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**AUGUST 6, 2010**



- 1 • Maintaining a balanced RD&D portfolio that emphasizes short to medium-term (1-4  
2 years) technologies that meet the needs of utility operations and customers;
- 3 • Coordinating with other key stakeholders such as CEC, DOE, and the Gas Technology  
4 Institute (“GTI”) in order to optimize use of funds and avoid duplication of efforts  
5 (letters of support from stakeholders are included in **Appendix E** in workpaper  
6 2IN008.001);
- 7 • Collaborating with and obtaining co-funding from, stakeholders in order to maximize  
8 the impact and value of SCG’s RD&D funds. The co-funding ratio for SCG (total  
9 program cost divided by SCG RD&D cost) has been consistently greater than 5:1.  
10 SCG’s co-funding goal for TY 2012 is 6:1;
- 11 • Producing modest financial returns to ratepayers. SCG’s ratepayers received \$2.7  
12 million from 2006 through 2009 from royalties and investment returns;
- 13 • Enhancing commercialization potential by transferring successful RD&D results to  
14 SCG’s Emerging Technologies program for extended field evaluation and product  
15 deployment – and ultimately, the marketplace;
- 16 • Keeping program administration costs low (proposed to be 3.9% of total RD&D  
17 expenditures);
- 18 • Producing benefits that exceed costs. The benefit to cost ratio for the period between  
19 2005 and 2009 is 1.49 (details are provided in **Appendix D** in workpaper 2IN008.001).

#### 20 **Royalty and Equity Investments**

21 SCG carefully screens RD&D investment opportunities and selects projects that offer the best  
22 potential value to SCG and its customers. Project selection criteria include the following:

- 23 1) Value to customers;
- 24 2) Alignment with utility business needs and strategies;
- 25 3) Technology breakthrough and reasonable probability of success;
- 26 4) Favorable fit with overall project portfolio balance (e.g. risk, duration, and customer  
27 targets);
- 28 5) Potential for partnering – obtain co-funding to share risk and leverage assets.

29 For many years, SCG negotiated royalty provisions as part of its RD&D programs and  
30 continues to do so where this makes the most sense from a ratepayer benefits perspective. In D.97-07-  
31 054 (SCG 1997 Performance Based Ratemaking decision) the Commission authorized a 50/50 royalty  
32 sharing mechanism, splitting royalties and other revenues from RD&D investments between

1 ratepayers and shareholders. Subsequently in D.08-07-046 (SCG TY 2008 GRC decision), the  
 2 Commission modified the sharing of royalties and other revenues from RD&D investments to 60/40  
 3 (Ratepayers / Shareholders). SCG proposes to continue this sharing mechanism for the TY 2012 GRC  
 4 period. Table GAW-14 shows financial benefits from 2006 through 2009 from royalties and equity  
 5 investments.

6 **Table GAW-14**  
 7 **Ratepayer Royalties & Investment Income**  
 8 **SCG's RD&D Program**

Year	Customer Royalty Revenue	Customer Equity Investment Revenue	Total
2006	\$223,980	---	\$223,980
2007	\$333,725	\$1,600,000	\$1,933,725
2008	\$276,184	---	\$276,184
2009	\$256,019	---	\$256,019
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,089,908</b>	<b>\$1,600,000</b>	<b>\$2,689,908</b>

9  
 10 SCG is currently managing ten equity investments in emerging technologies. Several of these  
 11 technologies have reached beta testing or early commercialization. These investments are described in  
 12 detail in **Appendix C** in workpaper 2IN008.001.

13 **SCG's RD&D Program Complements CEC PIER RD&D Program**

14 SCG's RD&D program fully complements the gas and electric public purpose RD&D  
 15 programs, otherwise known as Public Interest Energy Research Program ("PIER"), administered by  
 16 the CEC. In general, SCG's regulated RD&D program focuses on developing technologies related to  
 17 utility operations and energy efficiency for customers, while the CEC reaches out to a broader range  
 18 of public energy needs. SCG's program is primarily focused on short to mid-term RD&D, while the  
 19 CEC concentrates on a broader range of energy assessments, strategies, and mid to longer-term  
 20 technology solutions. SCG emphasizes both technology and product development and  
 21 demonstrations, whereas the CEC is inclined toward the research and development end of the RD&D  
 22 spectrum. Furthermore, SCG's RD&D program includes a strong component addressing gas  
 23 transmission and distribution operations, whereas the CEC program does not encompass gas system  
 24 operations.