



**FILED**

05-28-10

03:04 PM

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate  
and Refine Procurement Policies and  
Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans.

Rulemaking 10-05-006  
(Filed May 6, 2010)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S INITIAL RULING ON  
PROCUREMENT PLANNING STANDARDS  
AND SETTING SCHEDULE FOR COMMENTS AND WORKSHOPS**

**1. Background**

The Commission initiated the present proceeding to continue its efforts to ensure a reliable and cost-effective electricity supply in California through integration and refinement of a comprehensive set of procurement policies, practices and procedures underlying long-term procurement plans (LTPP).

The Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) issued May 6, 2010 established three tracks in this proceeding. Track I will consider issues related to the overall long-term need for new system and local reliability resources, including adoption of "system" resource plans<sup>1</sup> for the three major electric investor-owned utilities (IOUs) (Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE)).

---

<sup>1</sup> We define "system" as pertaining to the loads and resources in each IOU's service area. "Service area" generally corresponds to the IOUs' respective distribution service territories, inclusive of bundled, direct access, and community choice aggregator loads, but exclusive of embedded publicly-owned utility loads. To distinguish filings related to system reliability needs from bundled Assembly Bill (AB) 57 procurement plans, we will refer to these as "resource plans."

These resource plans will allow the Commission to comprehensively consider the impacts of state energy policies on the need for new resources. Track II will consider adoption of separate “bundled” procurement plans<sup>2</sup> pursuant to AB 57 (Stats. 202, ch. 83, Sec. 3) (codified as Pub. Util. Code § 454.5.)<sup>3</sup> for PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to authorize their procurement activities. Track III will consider a number of rule and policy issues related to resource and procurement plans.

The OIR directed that the assigned Commissioner or Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) would issue a ruling regarding proposed planning standards (which we define herein as Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1), as well as separate rulings regarding renewables portfolio standards (RPS) planning standards (Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 2) and energy efficiency assumptions to be used in this proceeding (Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3).<sup>4</sup> This ruling presents the Planning Standards – Part 1, and sets forth a schedule for the issuance of these other rulings.

In addition, a proposed draft of the Procurement Requirements Summary Document (a.k.a. Rulebook)<sup>5</sup> of Track III will be presented in a separate ruling, and is included in the accompanying schedule.

---

<sup>2</sup> We define “bundled” as pertaining to an investor-owned utility’s (IOU’s) load and resources in its role as a Load Serving Entity (LSE). To distinguish filings related to bundled AB 57 obligations from separate filings related to system reliability needs, we will refer to these as “procurement plans.”

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all references to code sections are to the Public Utilities Code.

<sup>4</sup> OIR at 13.

<sup>5</sup> OIR at 15.

Finally, parties will be given the opportunity to comment upon the proposals, and may be requested to provide comment upon specific questions or issues. Energy Division staff (Staff) will hold workshops on each of these topics to explain their proposals and the questions. All of these actions shall be incorporated into the schedule herein.

## **2. Resource Planning Assumptions (Track I)**

### **2.1. Overview – Responsibility for System Planning Activities**

This proceeding names all CPUC-jurisdictional load-serving entities (LSEs) as defined in Section 380(j) as respondents, because the policies being implemented in this proceeding (e.g., long-term resource adequacy (RA) and RPS) are binding on all LSEs. However, we will require that the three largest IOUs<sup>6</sup> be responsible for the system resource plans, which the Commission will consider for adoption and need determination. Each IOU will be responsible to file system resource plans for their individual service area, pursuant to the Scoping Memo. We encourage the IOUs to coordinate and use common assumptions wherever possible, unless otherwise directed.

We recognize that the IOUs have the most resources, expertise, and knowledge of their service areas, making them well suited to conduct robust analyses. We encourage all other LSEs to actively participate in the proceeding by providing information, if not actual studies, regarding their long-range plans to serve their customers. These other LSEs and any other party to this proceeding will be invited to voluntarily prepare their own independent analyses of system needs, as a complement to the IOUs' analyses.

## **2.2. Initial Guidance on System Resource Plans – Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1**

In Rulemaking (R.) 08-02-007, the Commission considered proposals to standardize the IOUs' resource planning practices, assumptions and analytical techniques (planning standards). The July 1, 2009 Staff Proposal<sup>7</sup> contained specific recommendations related to standardization of system resource plans. In August 2009, workshops were held and parties filed comments in response to the Staff Proposal, as well as alternative party proposals.

Based on the record in R.08-02-007, Staff proposes that the IOUs' filing of system resource plans in this track (Track I) should be based on a preliminary set of planning standards or minimum analytical requirements. Staff's proposed preliminary planning standards are attached to this ruling as Attachments 1 through 4.

Our intent is to ensure that for a core set of analyses, to the extent possible, the IOUs' system resource plans are internally consistent, can be easily compared, and results can be aggregated to draw conclusions about system-wide policy choices before the Commission.

It is anticipated that the Scoping Memo for Track I will include finalized planning standards, load and resource tables and full descriptions of required scenarios (including required renewables portfolios).

Therefore, Staff is proposing Standardized Load and Resource Tables for System Resource Plans (Attachment 1) as well as Planning Standards for System

---

<sup>6</sup> Hereinafter, references to IOUs are to PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE.

<sup>7</sup> Energy Division Straw Proposal on LTPP Planning Standards, Attachment 2 to the July 1, 2009 Amended Assigned Commissioner's Ruling (ACR)/Scoping Memo.

Resource Plans (Attachment 2). Parties shall file and serve any additional or alternative proposals by Friday, June 11, 2010.

**2.2.1. Process for Developing Requirements for System Resource Plans**

The decision(s) in Track I will be based on system resource plans prepared by the IOUs with specific guidance from the Commission and/or the assigned Commissioner on required scenarios (including required renewables portfolios), base case assumptions, sensitivity analyses, and evaluation criteria. These plans are not IOU proposals, but the minimum requirements, or planning standards required by the Commission. This shall not preclude the IOUs or any other respondent or party from preparing supplemental analyses for the Commission's consideration based on alternative assumptions, according to the process set forth below.

In the Scoping Memo for this proceeding, the assigned Commissioner shall establish any other planning standards not previously established by the Commission. For planning standards not already established by the Commission, the assigned Commissioner may consider minimum requirements based on initial proposals from Staff, the IOUs, and other respondents or parties, as well as parties' comments on such proposals, and any alternative proposals.

The procedure will be as follows:

- Required renewable portfolios shall be initially proposed by Staff.
- Required non-renewable inputs shall be initially proposed by the IOUs (or any party, in the case of energy efficiency inputs).
- Any party or respondent may comment on any proposal and make any alternative proposal; Staff may, however, establish guiding principles for alternative proposals.

- Following this series of staff, IOU and party proposals, the Scoping Memo shall establish planning standards for the system resource plans conducted by the IOUs, consistent with the direction in the OIR.
- The IOUs shall complete and file system resource plans that fulfill the planning standards set forth in the Scoping Memo.
- In filed testimony, the IOUs or any other party or respondent may submit supplemental analyses based on alternative assumptions.

Other non-renewable system planning inputs (except energy efficiency inputs, which will be considered in Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3) will be initiated by the IOUs, who will create proposals for their service areas. This shall include draft reports documenting draft results, the underlying inputs, assumptions, and methodologies. Parties shall have an opportunity to comment on the draft reports, as well as propose alternatives.

Pursuant to Decision (D.) 08-04-050, the IOUs have been ordered to file demand response (DR) load impact projections through 2020 for use in the LTPP process. The IOUs filed these on April 1, 2010.<sup>8</sup> In addition to the base set of DR programs reflected in the April 1, 2010 filing, we will require the IOUs to estimate the load impacts of additional DR programs, as proposed in attachment 2. The IOUs shall file proposals in this proceeding to reflect the total projected load impacts of DR programs, including the impacts from the April 1, 2010 filing.

---

<sup>8</sup> The load impacts were filed in Rulemaking (R.) 07-01-041.  
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/published/proceedings/R0701041.htm>.

### **2.2.2. Planning for Replacement Infrastructure to Support Once-Through-Cooling Policies**

In D.07-12-052, the Commission authorized the IOUs to procure up to 3,430 megawatts (MW) of new resources by 2015 with the assumption that 11,452 MW of existing resources would retire in the same timeframe.<sup>9</sup> These procurement authorizations were ordered, in part, to encourage the retirement or repowering of older units in support of reducing reliance on once through cooling (OTC) units.<sup>10</sup> Aging plants are mostly located in local reliability areas,<sup>11</sup> which means local RA will become an important issue in this proceeding.

Planning for generation resources to support implementation of state policies on OTC mitigation is a primary focus of this proceeding. Pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act Section 316(b), on May 4, 2010 the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted a policy to mitigate harm from the use of coastal and estuarine water for OTC in power plants. Staff, in cooperation with the California Energy Commission (CEC) and the California Independent System Operator (CAISO), has proposed a mechanism to phase-out reliance on OTC plants while ensuring system reliability.<sup>12</sup> The proposed mechanism addresses

---

<sup>9</sup> PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E's authorizations were up to 1,200 MW, 1,700 MW, and 530 MW, respectively. Assumed retirements of existing plants by 2015 were 4,400 MW, 6,350 MW, and 702 MW, respectively.

<sup>10</sup> See D.07-12-052 at 89.

<sup>11</sup> Notable exceptions are the Moss Landing and Morro Bay power plants.

<sup>12</sup> Implementation of OTC Mitigation Through Energy Infrastructure Planning and Procurement Changes by the CEC, CPUC, and CAISO, May 19, 2009 (joint energy agency proposal); Appendix C to the SWRCB staff's Draft Substitute Environmental Document for the Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling, July 15, 2009.

*Footnote continued on next page*

the replacement, repowering, or retirement of OTC power plants through a phased, regional approach. According to the joint energy agency proposal, the Commission's need determination and procurement processes would be modified to require the IOUs to assess replacement infrastructure needs and acquire replacement, repowered or otherwise compliant generation capacity.

Analyses in this track will determine the need for generation resources necessary to eliminate reliance on OTC in, at minimum, the Greater Bay Area and San Diego local reliability areas, as well as plants located in northern California but not in local reliability areas. Analyses are also expected to begin the process of phasing out OTC in the Big Creek/Ventura and Los Angeles Basin local reliability areas.

In D.07-12-052, local RA requirements drove the need for new resources in SDG&E's service area, but not the other IOUs' service areas. As was the case for SDG&E's previous authorization, the CAISO's Local Capacity Requirement (LCR)<sup>13</sup> analyses will likely become inputs to the need analyses for the service areas of all three IOUs in this proceeding. The joint energy agency proposal on OTC implementation identifies "enhanced LCR" evaluations,<sup>14</sup> conducted by the CAISO in cooperation with the Commission and the CEC, as a key component of

---

[http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/npdes/docs/cwa316/draft\\_sed.pdf](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/npdes/docs/cwa316/draft_sed.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> The CAISO produces annual LCR studies to determine requirements for local capacity to meet operating reliability standards. These studies also support the Commission's resource adequacy program.

<sup>14</sup> Enhanced" implies conducting an LCR-style analysis of capacity needs, but doing so 10 years forward and identifying the impacts of specific OTC retirements or transmission developments on a local reliability area's LCR projections. See joint energy agency proposal at 3.

generation planning in the Commission's process. A transparent calculator, or "enhanced LCR tool," is expected to emerge from this collaboration and be made publicly available for direct use in this proceeding.

### **2.2.3. Planning for Long-Term Renewables Development – Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 2**

In D.04-12-048, the Commission stated its intent "to fully embed the RPS into long-term planning, placing renewable energy development where it belongs – central to the IOU's resource planning efforts."<sup>15</sup> D.05-07-039 states: "We intend to return long-term RPS planning to the long term procurement planning component of R.04-04-003 or its successor, as contemplated by § 399.14(a)."<sup>16</sup>

In response to the Commission's direction in D.07-12-052,<sup>17</sup> the Energy Division conducted a 33% RPS Implementation Analysis (33% RPS Implementation Analysis) in R.08-02-007,<sup>18</sup> which addressed many implementation issues and market and regulatory barriers associated with achieving 33% RPS. In the July 1, 2009 Staff Proposal,<sup>19</sup> Energy Division referred

---

<sup>15</sup> D.04-12-048 at 3.

<sup>16</sup> D.05-07-039 at 29.

<sup>17</sup> "We direct parties to work with ED staff to refine a methodology for resource planning and analysis that will [...] adequately address the issue of a 33% renewables target by 2020 in subsequent LTPPs." (D.07-12-052 at 256).

<sup>18</sup> Energy Division's 33% *Renewable Portfolio Standard Implementation Analysis: Preliminary Results* report was issued on June 12, 2009, and entered into the R.08-02-007 record in the July 1, 2009 *Amended ACR/Scoping Memo*.

<sup>19</sup> Energy Division Straw Proposal on LTPP Planning Standards, Attachment 2 to the July 1, 2009 *Amended ACR/Scoping Memo*, R.08-02-007.

to the 33% RPS Implementation Analysis as an example of the type of long-term renewables analysis that the Commission should expect in system resource plans.

A system-wide “Renewables and Transmission Study,” as described in the July 1, 2009 Staff Proposal and as exemplified by the 33% RPS Implementation Analysis, is valuable for the LTPP process. Having detailed information about plausible renewable generation portfolios and associated transmission infrastructure requirements is desirable for identifying the need for new system or local resources, as well as any operational needs to integrate intermittent renewables. It is recognized that renewable development strategies may vary in terms of cost, time to implement, and development risk,<sup>20</sup> and that the regulatory framework for renewables is under regular administrative and legislative review.<sup>21</sup> Thus, the long-term renewables analyses performed in this proceeding need to provide sufficient information to support Commission determinations of preferred RPS implementation strategies under a variety of potential scenarios.

In order to avoid duplicating the substantial effort that went into developing and vetting the methodology used in the 33% RPS Implementation Analysis, and encourage continued coordination by Staff of a single, statewide study, Staff shall update the relevant outputs from the 33% RPS Implementation Analysis using updated assumptions and methodologies consistent with the emerging renewables and transmission environment. Parties shall be given an

---

<sup>20</sup> The 33% RPS Implementation Analysis provided a preliminary analysis of distinct RPS portfolios and their expected performance in terms of cost, risk and time.

<sup>21</sup> For example, the California Air Resources Board was directed in Executive Order S-21-09 to utilize its authority under AB 32 to develop regulations to implement a 33% renewables target. These regulations have not yet been adopted.

opportunity to provide input into this process. As a first step, workshops were noticed in R.08-02-007 and held on December 10-11, 2009 to discuss staff's proposed approach to an update of the 33% RPS Implementation Analysis.

It is expected that renewable resource portfolios generated from an updated renewables study will be among several required inputs to system resource plans in this proceeding. The June 2009 33% RPS Implementation Analysis produced a number of renewable portfolios, including a reference case which gave great weight to commercially active projects in the IOUs' RPS solicitations; a high distributed generation case; and a high out-of-state generation case (among others). It is anticipated that the Energy Division's updated study will produce similar portfolios based on an updated methodology to optimize these portfolios in terms of cost, time to implement, development risk, or other factors.

The assigned Commissioner or ALJ will present the Staff's proposed Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 2, focused on renewable planning assumptions, subsequent to this ruling, along with any requested questions for party comment.

**2.2.4. Assumptions for Energy Efficiency  
for LTPP Purposes – Resource Planning  
Assumptions – Part 3**

The OIR noted that the ALJ would "issue a separate ruling requesting parties to comment upon an appropriate range of energy efficiency assumptions to be used in this proceeding."<sup>22</sup> Staff's proposed assumptions will be presented

---

<sup>22</sup> OIR at 13.

as Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3, subsequent to this ruling, along with any requested questions for party comment.

### **3. Procurement Planning Assumptions for Bundled Procurement Plans (Track II)**

Based on the record in R.08-02-007, it is reasonable to direct the IOUs' filing of bundled LTPPs be based on a limited set of planning standards. The intent is to ensure that the IOUs' plans can be more easily compared to each other and to maintain consistency, where appropriate, with Commission policy in other procurement-related proceedings. More broadly, the scope of the requirements is guided by the Commission's mandate to ensure that the IOUs' bundled plans "enable [each IOU] to fulfill its obligation to serve its customers at just and reasonable rates."<sup>23</sup>

Staff is proposing Procurement Planning Assumptions of Standardized Load and Resource Tables for Bundled Procurement Plans (Attachment 3) as well as Planning Standards for Bundled Procurement Plans (Attachment 4). These roughly correspond to the Resource Planning Assumptions used for the system plan process. Parties shall file and serve any additional or alternative proposals by Friday, June 11, 2010.

#### **3.1. Greenhouse Gas Emission Adder**

D.04-12-048 directed the IOUs to use a value to account for the financial risk associated with greenhouse gas (GHG) emission (GHG adder) when analyzing request for offer (RFO) bids and when modeling alternative resource

---

<sup>23</sup> Section 454.5(d)(1).

portfolios and selecting a preferred portfolio.<sup>24</sup> The IOUs were directed to use the same value as adopted in the Avoided Cost R.04-04-025). In D.05-04-024, the Commission adopted an escalating \$12.50/ton (2008\$) GHG adder for purposes of energy efficiency program planning, and also applied the adder to utilities' long-term planning and procurement, as mandated in D.04-12-048.<sup>25</sup>

Since 2005, the Commission's GHG policies have evolved considerably in response to rapidly changing state and federal policies. Recognizing a need to keep abreast of these changes, the Commission directed in D.08-10-026 that GHG compliance costs be included as a permanent feature of the market price referent (MPR),<sup>26</sup> and adopted a methodology for calculating them as part of the overall MPR methodology. Annual resolutions adopting the MPR, such as Resolution E-4298, which adopted the 2009 RPS MPR, apply this methodology.<sup>27</sup>

Notably, the Staff Proposal recommended that the IOUs' LTPP modeling use assumed GHG compliance costs from the most recent MPR for the "base case" CO<sub>2</sub> price forecasts, rather than values directed in D.04-12-048 and

---

<sup>24</sup> D.04-12-048, Ordering Paragraph 17.

<sup>25</sup> D.05-04-024, Conclusion of Law 7; see also Finding of Fact 5; and at 29.

<sup>26</sup> Established in § 399.1.5(c), the MPR represents the market price of electricity. It is used as a benchmark to assess the above-market costs of RPS contracts, and can serve to contain the total cost of the RPS program.

<sup>27</sup> Specifically, the Commission adopted "mid-case" values from a Synapse Energy Economics report's analysis of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) pricing, "which assumes CO<sub>2</sub> prices of \$15 in 2013, increasing to \$30.80 in 2020 and \$53.40 in 2030, which results in a levelized price of \$30/CO<sub>2</sub> ton in 2007\$." (December 17, 2009, Resolution E-4298 at 9.) The methodology assumes a nominal 2.5% inflation rate.

D.05-04-024.<sup>28</sup> The rationale was to achieve consistency across Commission proceedings and use the most updated information. Parties generally responded favorably in comments on staff's recommendation<sup>29</sup>.

So long as the MPR is calculated annually, it is reasonable to direct the IOUs to use the GHG compliance cost that is calculated in the most recent MPR for a given year when analyzing RFO bids and when modeling alternative resource portfolios. However, the GHG compliance cost used for the MPR should be employed as the base case assumption, but not necessarily as the basis for selecting a preferred portfolio. The preferred portfolio in the IOUs' bundled LTPPs must show the impact of GHG compliance costs using a standardized set of base case assumptions.

#### **4. Procurement Requirements Summary Document (a.k.a. Rulebook) (Track III)**

As noted above, Staff expect to issue a proposed draft Rulebook shortly. Parties will be offered an opportunity to make initial comments and reply comments. Due to the complexity of the document and the short timeline for responses, there will be additional opportunities for comment further in the course of Track III.

---

<sup>28</sup> Staff Proposal at 104-105.

<sup>29</sup> SCE, in comments to the Staff Straw Proposal at 17, stated that "GHG emission statistics are not particularly meaningful for SCE's bundled portfolio, because policies that monitor or internalize the cost of GHG procurement are best addressed in the context of a Statewide or system-level IRP analysis, with any resulting policies applied to all LSEs."

## **5. Workshops**

Staff has scheduled four workshops on three successive Fridays at the Commission's San Francisco headquarters in June to allow Staff and parties to discuss Staff proposals and to clarify on any questions presented in subsequent rulings.

A workshop is set for **Friday, June 11, 2010 at 9:00 a. m.**, in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, to discuss the Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1 (Attachments 1 and 2) and for the Procurement Planning Assumptions (Attachments 3 and 4).

A workshop is set for **Friday, June 11, 2010 at 1:00 p. m.**, in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, to discuss the Procurement Requirements Summary Document (a.k.a. Rulebook) (Proposal forthcoming by separate ruling).

A workshop is set for **Friday, June 18, 2010 at 9:00 a. m.**, in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, to discuss the Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 2 (RPS Planning Standards) (Proposal forthcoming by separate ruling).

A workshop is set for **Friday, June 25, 2010 at 9:00 a. m.**, in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, to discuss the Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3 (Energy Efficiency Assumptions) (Proposal forthcoming by separate ruling).

## **6. Comments**

The comment schedule will be very aggressive, in order to meet the proceeding timeline of issuance of one or more scoping memos by the end of July, 2010. Parties are given seven to fourteen days after each workshop for

comment, and seven days for reply comments. Comment dates were chosen to avoid parties filing comments on the same day as other workshops. Please note that parties will be in receipt of the Staff proposals in advance of the workshops, and hence the time for review is in excess of seven days.

**7. Schedule**

**Comprehensive Preliminary Schedule**

<b>Proceeding Milestone</b>	<b>Date</b>
Comments due on Preliminary Scoping Memo	Friday, June 4, 2010 <sup>30</sup>
Proposals / Alternative Proposals on Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1 and Procurement Planning Assumptions	Friday, June 11, 2010
Workshop on Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1 and Procurement Planning Assumptions; Workshop on Rulebook	Friday, June 11, 2010, at 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.
Prehearing Conference Commission Courtroom State Office Building 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, California	Monday, June 14, 2010, at 10:00 a.m.

---

<sup>30</sup> Due to an error in the text of the OIR, there is some confusion about this deadline. The OIR states at 19 that comments are due after thirty days. This is an error. Ordering Paragraph 6 correctly identifies the comment due date as June 4, 2010. When unclear or inconsistent, the Ordering Paragraph governs.

Proceeding Milestone	Date
Workshop on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 2 (RPS Planning Standards)	Friday, June 18, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.
Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 1, Procurement Planning Assumptions, and Rulebook	Monday, June 21, 2010
Workshop on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 3 (Energy Efficiency Assumptions)	Friday, June 25, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.
Reply Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 1, Procurement Planning Assumptions, and Rulebook	Monday, June 28, 2010
Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 2 (RPS Planning Standards); Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 3 (Energy Efficiency Assumptions)	Friday, July 2, 2010
Reply Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 2 (RPS Planning Standards); Reply Comments on Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 3 (Energy Efficiency Assumptions)	Friday, July 9, 2010

**8. Attachments**

The following attachments comprise the Resource Planning Assumptions - Part 1:

- Attachment 1: Staff Proposal - Standardized Load and Resource Tables for System Resource Plans.
- Attachment 2: Staff Proposal - Planning Standards for System Resource Plans.

The following attachments comprise the Procurement Planning Assumptions:

- Attachment 3: Staff Proposal - Standardized Load and Resource Tables for Bundled Procurement Plans.

- Attachment 4: Staff Proposal – Planning Standards for Bundled Procurement Plans.

Therefore, **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Resource Planning Standards – Part 2, Resource Planning Standards – Part 3, and the Procurement Requirements Summary Document (a.k.a. Rulebook) will be distributed by separate rulings.
2. A workshop is scheduled for Friday, June 11, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. , in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1 (Attachments 1 and 2) and Procurement Planning Assumptions (Attachments 3 and 4).
3. A workshop is scheduled for Friday, June 11, 2010 at 1:00 p.m., in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, regarding the Procurement Requirements Summary Document (a.k.a. Rulebook).
4. A workshop is scheduled for Friday, June 18, 2010 at 9:00 a.m., in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 2.
5. A workshop is scheduled for Friday, June 25, 2010 at 9:00 a.m., in the Commission Auditorium, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3.
6. Parties shall file any additional or alternative proposals regarding the matters considered in the Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1 and Procurement Planning Assumptions by Friday, June 11, 2010.

7. Comments regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 1, Procurement Planning Assumptions, and the Rulebook are due on Monday, June 21, 2010; Reply Comments are due on Monday, June 28, 2010.

8. Comments regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 2 are due on Friday, July 2, 2010; Reply Comments are due on Friday, July 9, 2010.

9. Comments regarding Resource Planning Assumptions – Part 3 are due on Friday, July 2, 2010; Reply Comments are due on Friday, July 9, 2010.

Dated May 28, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ VICTORIA S. KOLAKOWSKI

Victoria S. Kolakowski  
Administrative Law Judge

**INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE**

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding as well as the service lists to R.08-02-007, R.08-08-009, R.05-12-013, R.09-10-032, R.08-07-011, R.07-01-041, R.08-03-008, I. 08-03-010, and R.08-03-009 by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated May 28, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ LILLIAN LI  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lillian Li

**N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to ensure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074 or TDD# (415) 703-2032 five working days in advance of the event.