

From: Bichkoff, Lewis
Sent: 4/15/2013 8:43:48 AM
To: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: RE Kansas

Thanks Meredith.

From: Allen, Meredith [mailto:MEAe@pge.com]
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 8:43 AM
To: Bichkoff, Lewis
Subject: RE: RE Kansas

Hi Lewis,

I will check and let you know.

Thanks,

Meredith

From: Bichkoff, Lewis [mailto:Lewis.Bichkoff@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 15, 2013 8:42 AM
To: Allen, Meredith
Subject: RE Kansas

Hi Meredith,

This is Lewis Bichkoff from the RPS team and I had a quick question about the RE Kansas PPA before it gets voted on at this Thursday's meeting:

For the 2011 finalized RPS shortlist, why are the Recurrent bids higher than all the other Solar PV bids?

Anu told me this was due to their later COD, but also because Recurrent had to post a higher collateral for their project development security. Do you know why Recurrent was charged a higher amount for their security than the other developers?

Thanks,

Lewis Bichkoff

California Public Utilities Commission|Energy Division

Renewable Procurement & Market Development

(415) 703-1977|lb5@cpuc.ca.gov

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>