



FILED

06-26-12

02:03 PM

JHE/ms6 6/26/2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) for Approval of Demand Response Programs, Goals and Budgets for 2009- 2011.

Application 08-06-001
(Filed June 2, 2008)

And Related Matters.

Application 08-06-002
Application 08-06-003

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUESTING UPDATED INFORMATION FROM SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

1. Summary

This ruling requests additional information from San Francisco Community Power (SF Power) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) on a Petition for Modification (Petition) of Decision (D.) 09-08-027 filed in January 2011. These parties shall file the data requested below, relevant to the processing of the Petition filed on January 25, 2011, by SF Power. Most of the information requested in this ruling consists of factual data and historic tariff documents. Because of the factual nature of the information requested, I encourage SF Power and PG&E to file their response to this ruling as joint comments. If parties disagree on the substance of the response to any question, the joint filing shall note each party's individual response and explain the rationale for each. These comments from SF Power and PG&E shall be filed and

served not later than July 23, 2012. Parties, if any, wishing to respond to the July 23, 2012, filing shall file and serve their reply not later than July 31, 2012.

2. Background

In August 2009, the Commission adopted D.09-08-027, which established demand response activities and budgets for PG&E, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company for 2009-2011. Among other provisions, that decision allowed SF Power and other entities to act as demand response aggregators. SF Power chose to continue acting as a demand response aggregator through the PG&E Capacity Bidding Program in 2010, after the end of a previous demand response pilot program in which it participated.

As described in its Petition filed on January 25, 2011, and in the PG&E response to that Petition, SF Power did not deliver the amount of demand response it committed to provide through that program, despite its efforts to do so. SF Power provides several factors that may have contributed to this underperformance. In its Petition, SF Power asks the Commission to waive the penalties it incurred by failing to deliver the amount of demand response it estimated throughout 2010. The fines at issue are approximately \$96,000. In its response to this Petition, PG&E argues that SF Power should be required to pay the fines that it incurred, and provides comments on or responses to many of the factors that SF Power asserts may have contributed to its underperformance.

On February 28, 2012, I issued a ruling asking for a status update from parties, to determine whether a Commission decision is still necessary on this Petition or whether it could be resolved informally. I also encouraged, but did not require, parties to prepare a joint response to that ruling. Parties filed separate responses to that ruling on March 9, 2012, and PG&E filed a reply to the SF Power response on March 19, 2012. Filings from both parties agreed that a

Commission decision is needed on this Petition, and that it will not be resolved informally. This ruling requests additional factual information to assist in the preparation of a decision on the Petition.

3. Request for Additional Information

SF Power and PG&E are required to file and serve the following information not later than July 23, 2012. Some of the requested information has already been provided, but this ruling requests more detailed information broken out by year, month, and event. Parties shall ensure that their response to this ruling provides all information in a manner that allows for direct and straightforward comparisons between load nominations, load reductions as measured with the tariffs referenced below, and incentives paid and penalties assessed under those tariffs, as requested below. Parties should provide information in one or more tables or matrices to the extent that doing so will facilitate comparisons, and may also provide narrative explanations in support of those tables or provide additional relevant information, as appropriate or necessary.

1. What amount of load reduction in Kilowatts (kW) did SF Power nominate in each month of 2009?
2. According to information provided previously, SF Power participated in one two-hour test event in 2009.
 - a. Please provide the specifics of that event, including the event date, beginning and ending time, advance notice of the event received by SF Power, amount of load nominated for that event, and any other relevant information.
 - b. Please also provide a copy of the tariff under which SF Power was operating its load reduction program during 2009.

- c. What amount of load reduction (in kW) did SF Power deliver during that event, calculated using the baseline in place at the time?
 - d. If possible, please estimate the load reduction (in kW) SF Power would have been credited with delivering if the 2010 baseline had been in place during that test event.
3. What amount of load reduction (in kW) did SF Power nominate in each month of 2010?
4. What amount of load reduction (in kW) did SF Power deliver in each month of 2010, under the baseline in place at that time?
5. According to information provided previously, SF Power participated in nine actual events under the Capacity Bidding Program (CBP) in 2010.
 - a. Please provide the specifics of each event, including the event date, beginning and ending time, advance notice of the event received by SF Power, amount of load nominated for that event, and any other relevant information.
 - b. Please also provide a copy of the tariff under which SF Power was operating its load reduction program during 2010 (E-CBP, and any other that may be applicable).
 - c. What amount of load reduction did SF Power deliver during each event in 2010, calculated using the baseline in place at the time?
 - d. If possible, please estimate the load reduction (in kW) SF Power would have been credited with delivering if the 2009 baseline had been in place during that event.
6. Did SF Power receive any capacity payments or other incentives during 2010? If so, what is the dollar amount of incentive or other funding SF Power earned, and received (if different), in 2010 through to its participation in the

- CBP? Please separately provide the same information for SF Power for 2009.
- a. Total;
 - b. In each month; and
 - c. For each event.
7. What dollar amount of penalties did SF Power incur in 2010? Please separately provide the same information for SF Power for 2009.
- a. Total;
 - b. In each month; and
 - c. For each event.
8. What is the maximum load reduction that SF Power achieved in any event in 2009 or 2010 during an event, under each baseline?

As may be evident from these questions, I want parties' joint response to provide a detailed description of SF Power's participation in load reduction programs in 2009 and 2010. In addition to the required information listed in the questions in this ruling, parties may also provide additional information not already provided in their earlier filings that they believe may be helpful in interpreting or understanding this data.

IT IS RULED that:

1. San Francisco Community Power (SF Power) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) shall prepare joint comments that contain all information requested in this ruling. SF Power and PG&E shall file and serve the joint comments responsive to this ruling, as described in this ruling, not later than July 23, 2012.

2. Any parties wishing to comment on the July 23, 2012 filing may file and serve replies not later than July 31, 2012.

Dated June 26, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

 /s/ JESSICA T. HECHT
 Jessica T. Hecht
 Administrative Law Judge