

Dawn Weisz Executive Officer

Damon Connolly Chair City of San Rafael

Kathrin Sears Vice Chair County of Marin

Bob McCaskill City of Belvedere

Alexandra Cock Town of Corte Madera

Larry Bragman Town of Fairfax

Len Rifkind City of Larkspur

Ken Wachtel City of Mill Valley

Denise Athas City of Novato

Tom Butt City of Richmond

Carla Small
Town of Ross

Ford Greene Town of San Anselmo

Ray Withy City of Sausalito

Emmett O'Donnell Town of Tiburon

781 Lincoln Avenue Suite 320 San Rafael, CA 94901

1 (888) 632-3674 marinenergyauthority.com June 17, 2013

CA Public Utilities Commission Energy Division Attention: Tariff Unit 505 Van Ness Avenue, 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

Re: Comments of Marin Energy Authority on Capacity-Only Combined Heat and Power Contracts referenced in Draft Resolution E-4529 (rev. 2), Alternate Draft Resolution E-4529, Draft Resolution E-4569 (rev. 2) and Alternate Draft Resolution E-4529

Dear Energy Division:

Pursuant to Commission Rule 14.5; the Energy Division cover letters accompanying Draft Resolution E-4529 (rev. 2) and Draft Resolution E-4569 (rev. 2) (together, the "ED Draft Resolutions"); and the Energy Division cover letters accompanying Alternate Draft Resolution E-4529 and Alternate Draft Resolution E-4529 (together the "Peevey Draft Resolutions"), Marin Energy Authority ("MEA") provides the following comments.

The Commission Should Minimize the Overall Costs and Procurement via CAM under the CHP Settlement

To the extent that a RA-only CHP contract under the CHP Settlement is the lowest cost option for overall CAM costs and procurement borne by CCAs and their customers, MEA supports using these lowest cost contracts to fill the needs under the CHP Settlement. Minimizing these CAM costs is the prudent use of ratepayer funds since CCA customers – and customers of other load serving entities ("LSEs") – bear the costs of this procurement, but CCAs (and other LSEs) are excluded from reviewing the reasonableness of the CAM costs and the value of the RA to be received by the LSE.

Based on PG&E's most recent Energy Resource Recovery Account filing, PG&E CAM costs on a per kWh basis paid by CCA customers is proposed to <u>triple</u> in 2014. The Commission must be cognizant of the significant impacts these charges have on CCA customers, and the significant procurement impacts CAM has on CCAs.

¹ The ED Draft Resolutions and the Peevey Draft Resolutions (together, the "Draft Resolutions") each relate to certain transactions among Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E"), Southern California Edison Company ("SCE") and Calpine Energy Services, L.P. ("Calpine") for resource adequacy ("RA") only combined heat and power ("CHP") contracts pursuant to the CHP Settlement approved in D.10-12-035. In each case, the contracts would be granted cost allocation mechanism ("CAM") treatment, meaning that community choice aggregators ("CCAs") would receive an allocation of RA, and CCA customers would bear the costs of the contract.

2. MEA Notes That CAM Can Only Be Granted for System and Local Area Reliability Purposes, and the Commission Application of CAM Treatment During the GHG Target Period Would Be Subject to Legal Challenge

MEA reminds the Commission that CAM treatment is authorized only where a specific "system or local area reliability need" exists. (P.U. Code Section 365.1(c)(2).) As a result, any requirements under the CHP Settlement not pursuant to the Megawatt Target would not be recoverable by CAM. If CAM treatment were nevertheless granted, such a Commission Decision would be subject to legal challenge. Greenhouse Gas ("GHG") determinations are not driven by system or local area reliability need, and therefore, imposing CAM treatment during the GHG Target Period of the CHP Settlement would violate P.U. Code Sections 365.1(c)(2), 380(b)(4), and 380(h)(5).

The Commission should not expect CCA customers to bear CHP costs after the Megawatt Target Period. As such, the Commission should take into consideration the "big picture" of the CHP Settlement as it evaluates how the contract options set forth in the Draft Resolutions could impact the Commission's future determinations.

3. A Rulemaking or Other Formal Proceeding Should Be Started to Address CHP Settlement Implementation Issues in a Stakeholder Process.

As MEA has previously noted, the Advice Letter process is not appropriate for the types of implementation decisions being made under the CHP Settlement. MEA continues to recommend that CHP Settlement implementation issues be addressed in a formal stakeholder process, such as through a Commission Rulemaking.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth Kelly Legal Director

Marin Energy Authority

CC:

Service List R.10-05-006

President Michael Peevey

Commissioner Mark Ferron

Commissioner Michel Florio

Commissioner Carla Peterman

Commissioner Catherine Sandoval

Ed Randolph, Energy Division Director, edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov

Karen Clopton, Chief Administrative Law Judge, karen.clopton@cpuc.ca.gov

Frank Lindh, General Counsel, frank.lindh@cpuc.ca.gov

Energy Division Tariff Unit, EDTariffUnit@cpuc.ca.gov

Nicholas Castillo, Nicholas Castillo@cpuc.ca.gov

Brian Stevens, brian.stevens@cpuc.ca.gov

Jennifer Kalafut, jennifer.kalafut@cpuc.ca.gov

Cem Turhal, cem.turhal@cpuc.ca.gov
Damon Franz, damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov
PG&E Tariff Files, pgetariffs@pge.com
Kimberly Chang, kwcc@pge.com
Tom Jarman, taj8@pge.com
SCE Tariff Files, AdviceTariffManager@sce.com
Dahlia Siegel, Dahlia.Siegel@sce.com
Laura Genao, Laura.Genao@sce.com
Amber Wyatt, Amber.Wyatt@sce.com
Akbar Jazayeri, akbar.jazayeri@sce.com
Leslie E. Starck (c/o Karyn Gansecki), karyn.gansecki@sce.com
Marc Ulrich (c/o Katie Sloan), Katie.Sloan@sce.com
Claire Torchia, claire.torchia@sce.com
John Leslie, jleslie@meckennalong.com
Beth Vaughan, CCC, bethevaughan@gmail.com

Evelyn Kahl, EPUC, ek@a-klaw.com