

Docket No.: R.12-03-014

Date: August 24, 2012

**ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS,
DIRECT ACCESS CUSTOMER COALITION, AND
MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY**

TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS

AReM, DACC, MEA Transcript Corrections

Page 543, line 1

My initial questions are going to be to Mr. Martyn because ~~it does~~ they deal with his Questions 13 through 16.

Page 546, line 22

MR. DOUGLASS: Q Mr. Martyn, look at the paragraph in the middle starting with the words "Finally, the ~~joints~~ joint parties."

Page 570, line 1

Q Let me posit a hypothetical to you then. If the CPUC determined there was a local resource need in this proceeding and did not, in Edison's estimation, properly apply the CAM requirements to procurement that was proposed by Edison, would Edison then go and procure some other local resource need just to meet its bundled customer ~~areas~~ needs?

Page 1135, line 20

I don't know whether there are or there aren't. ~~Our~~ Are resource adequacy contracts longer than ~~one~~ 12 months, is that what you asked?

Page 1140, line 10

I think you may be misunderstanding the proposal I've made, and the way I envisioned it, let's take an example. Say, Marin Energy Authority has a propo – wants to build a new ~~filler~~-power plant.

Page 1148, lines 10-11

I was envisioning a customer-based opt-out as more closely related to the load-ratio based opt-out because it would be a fixed megawatt amount.

Page 1174, line 6

Not so much the CAM process, but part of the overall LTPP process, ~~That~~ That part of the LTPP process is that IOUs are obligated to come forward with plans on how to serve their bundled load, which should also include forward projection of load growth and load factor and the characteristics of their load.