From: Sotero, Maria
Sent: 7/8/2014 4:45:43 PM
To: Redacted); Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=EBJ1)
Cc: Franz, Damon A. (damon.franz@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Thanks. I'll be in touch.

And yes- the afternoon works- 1-5pm. Getting my wires crossed!

Maria Sotero | (415) 703-2494

From: Redacted
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 1:15 PM
To: Sotero, Maria; Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)
Cc: Franz, Damon A.
Subject: RE: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Hi Maria,

Here is a list of IOU attendees for the meeting (some may or may not be present):

PG&E:

Redacted

Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) EBJ1@pge.com (for information only, he won't be able to attend)

Redacted

Redacted

Warner, Christopher (Law) <CJW5@PGE.COM>

SCE:

Aaron.Renfro@sce.com

John.Minnicucci@sce.com

joy.weed@sce.com

Douglas.Rhoades@sce.com

Glenn.Haddox@sce.com

Walker.Matthews@sce.com

SDG&E:

Rasool, Hannon J (HRasool@semprautilities.com)

McClelland, Corey P <CMcClelland2@semprautilities.com>

King, Scott <SKing@semprautilities.com>

jcnichols@semprautilities.com

In your previous email, you indicated that the meeting on July 23 would be from 1-5pm. Would that time be possible as it's what I relayed to the team members or is the morning the only available time for the CPUC staff?

Thanks for letting us know who will be in attendance. When you have confirmed the LTPP and RA staff, please let us know.

Thanks,
Redacte

Redacted // Regulatory Affairs

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Redacted

-----Original Message-----
From: Sotero, Maria [mailto:Maria.Sotero@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Redacted Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)
Cc: Franz, Damon A.
Subject: RE: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Thanks Redac. So we are confirmed for 9am-1pm on Wednesday July 23, here at the CPUC?

Could you provide the names and emails of the other IOU attendees, other than Erik and yourself? I'll send a meeting invite.

Damon and I, and a few LTPP/RA staff who I've yet to confirm, will be there; we also invited Chris Myers, Karin Hieta, and Yuliya Shmidt from ORA.

Maria Sotero | (415) 703-2494

-----Original Message-----

From: Redacted

Sent: Tuesday, July 08, 2014 11:45 AM

To: Sotero, Maria; Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)

Cc: Franz, Damon A.

Subject: RE: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Hi Maria,

It appears that the IOUs can meet on July 23rd.

Who from Energy Division and ORA will be in attendance at this meeting?

Thanks,

Redact

Redacted // Regulatory Affairs

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Redacted

-----Original Message-----

From: Sotero, Maria [mailto:Maria.Sotero@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Thursday, July 03, 2014 11:35 AM

To: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)

Cc: Redacted; Franz, Damon A.

Subject: RE: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Erik and Redac -

Sorry to pull the ol' football away, but turns out that neither of the suggested dates work for

ORA. Can you do either the afternoon of the 23rd, the morning of the 24th, or the afternoon of the 25th? (these would be 9a-1p/1p-5p slots) Let me know which of these the IOU group would like, since they all look relatively the same for our schedules.

Happy fourth!

Maria Sotero | (415) 703-2494

-----Original Message-----

From: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) [mailto:EBJ1@pge.com]

Sent: Wednesday, July 02, 2014 6:29 PM

To: Sotero, Maria

Cc: Redacted; Franz, Damon A.

Subject: Re: Session invitation: CES-21 discussion to build consensus

Maria,

Good agenda and questions. We will check with the leads for the two research projects to see if your suggested meeting dates will work on our end. Redact or I will get back to you soon.

Thanks,

Erik

On Jul 2, 2014at 5:41 PM, "Sotero, Maria" <Maria.Sotero@cpuc.ca.gov<mailto:Maria.Sotero@cpuc.ca.gov>> wrote:

Hi Erik and Redac,

We've identified some issues that we want to discuss and hopefully maximize agreement on among the Joint Utilities and ORA. We find some of the protests raised by ORA to be reasonable, but want to move forward as quickly as possible. Can the project managers come in for a half-day meeting with ED staff (including LTPP) and ORA, with the express goal of achieving some consensus on the following issues? Following the meeting, ED staff will be able to move forward with resolving this filing inclusive of specific direction and consensus that result. (Can you also please loop in the appropriate SDG&E and SCE folks? I don't seem to have the correct emails for the right people.)

Let me know if you have any questions about this agenda. We could talk next week. I highlighted in red the 3 areas where it seems the IOUs should "lead" the discussion; otherwise I'll steer things/present overview.

Discussion objectives:

Part 1: Flexibility Metrics and Standards Project Objective 1: From a technical and policy standpoint, identify the specific differences between current flexibility modeling efforts and those proposed for CES-21. ED staff views this objective as critical.

Points of discussion and key questions:

a. Technical overview of Flexibility Metrics project. This portion of the discussion should cover the technical aspects of the project so that policy analysts understand what the project seeks to do, what it is, and what it isn't. This portion of the discussion should be led by the Joint Utilities with a focus on explaining the project proposal and plan. Analysts will have the opportunity to ask clarifying questions of the project team.

b. Selected issues raised by parties. Other issues raised by ORA, such as whether the project addresses an identified problem, may be addressed above, but time will be allotted to discuss any outstanding concerns. If there is another discussion of existing planning models, other than the document above, the Joint Utilities are encouraged to bring this to the table.

c. Agreement on follow-up action

Possible follow-up action to achieve Objective 1:

After this discussion, the Joint Utilities could provide a matrix that captures the above detail/relevant aspects of the Collaborative Review of Planning Models document and shows how the proposed project fits with existing work. In the response to ORA's protest, there was a very clear and extremely helpful discussion of how the Flexibility Metrics project is distinct from CEC's work; we'd like to discuss how this could be demonstrated more broadly. A similar matrix is being filed related to the EPIC proceeding.

Objective 2: The Joint Utilities state that the LTPP and RA proceedings are "the most likely venues where the benefits of this project can be realized;" Objective 2 is to identify specific processes for incorporating results into Commission proceedings that can be built into the CES-21 project management process.

Points of discussion and key questions:

a. Process. LTPP staff can provide input regarding how results might be incorporated, as can the utilities from a project management/results timeline perspective.

b. Agreement on follow-up action

Part 2: Cybersecurity and Benefits

Objective 3: Identify additional project implementation details that would benefit the MMATR cybersecurity project.

Points of discussion and key questions:

a. Project plan overview. The Joint Utilities should lead this portion of the discussion by presenting their implementation plan for this project.

b. Discussion of additional potential detail on deliverables and/or milestones that are reasonable in light of prior submissions as well as structured oversight of the project.

Discussion of process for using/reporting on those deliverables.

c. Agreement on follow-up action

Objective 4: Identify strategies to address barriers to including net present value and quantitative benefits of projects.

Points of discussion and key questions:

a. Decision 14-03-029, OP 15c states "The business case for each new research project should: i) demonstrate quantifiable customer benefits, including a demonstration that safety and environmental benefits exceed costs on a net present value basis, using a Commission approved methodology, such as that used in calculating a Market Price Referent." The Joint Utilities should present the methods they propose for assessing benefits and NPV, and barriers therein.

b. Discussion of available resources and strategies for assessing benefits/NPV

c. Agreement on follow-up action

Possible follow-up action: The Joint Utilities could consult with the benefits assessment team in the CEC's R&D division, which works on exactly these issues, as it assesses benefits for CES-21.

Dates: (Always tricky for a big group in Mid-July!) Can key folks can come here on Thursday July 17 from 9am to 1pm? (I am expecting this session may take 4 hours, split into two parts; of course, it could be less!)

A less-good but still potential day would be Monday the 21st, 9-1.

Maria Sotero

Regulatory Analyst, Emerging Procurement Strategies Energy Division, CPUC

(415) 703-2494 | maria.sotero@cpuc.ca.gov<mailto:maria.sotero@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/

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