

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



FILED
6-21-16
04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue Implementation and Administration, and Consider Further Development, of California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program.

Rulemaking 15-02-020
(Filed February 26, 2015)

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S (U 39-E),
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E), AND
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E)
RESPONSE TO LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATIONS'
MOTION TO AMEND THE 2016 RPS PLAN RULING**

JANET S. COMBS
CAROL SCHMID-FRAZEE

Southern California Edison Company
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, CA 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-1337
Facsimile: (626) 302-1935
E-mail: Carol.SchmidFrazee@sce.com

Attorneys for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF
GRADY MATHAI-JACKSON

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, B30A
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 973-6971
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520
E-mail: CRMd@pge.com

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PAUL A. SZYMANSKI
SENIOR COUNSEL

San Diego Gas & Electric Company
8330 Century Park Ct., CP32D
San Diego, CA 92123
Telephone: (858) 654-1732
Facsimile: (619) 699-5027
E-mail: Pszymanski@Semprautilities.com

Attorney for
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: June 21, 2016

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue Implementation and Administration, and Consider Further Development, of California Renewables Portfolio Standard Program.

Rulemaking 15-02-020
(Filed February 26, 2015)

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY’S (U 39-E),
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E), AND
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E)
RESPONSE TO LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATIONS’
MOTION TO AMEND THE 2016 RPS PLAN RULING**

Pursuant to Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 11.1(e), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”), Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (“SDG&E”) (the “Joint Utilities”) respectfully submit this response to the *Motion of the Large-Scale Solar Association to Amend the 2016 RPS Plan Ruling* (“Motion”).

The Large-Scale Solar Association’s (“LSA”) Motion is the second motion that has been filed in this proceeding seeking to substantially expand the scope of issues covered in the Renewable Portfolio Standard (“RPS”) Plans submitted by the Joint Utilities.¹ LSA requests that the Joint Utilities include in their respective RPS Plans extensive information as to how they schedule and bid RPS-eligible resources and specifically resources with curtailment provisions, how the Joint Utilities manage curtailment provisions in their respective contracts, constraints on the ability to submit economic bids, and utility practice with regard to California Independent System Operator (“CAISO”) operational instructions.² LSA’s Motion is flawed for a number of reasons and thus should be denied.

¹ A motion seeking to expand the scope of issues in the 2016 RPS Plans was also filed by the California Biomass Energy Alliance, California Wind Energy Association, Calpine Corporation, Geothermal Energy Association, and Ormat Nevada, Inc. on June 1, 2016 in this proceeding. The Joint Utilities filed a response to that motion on June 16, 2016.

² See Motion at p. 4.

First, the Motion would substantially expand the scope of the RPS Plans. California Public Utilities Code section 399.13(a)(1) requires the Joint Utilities, Community Choice Aggregators (“CCAs”), and Direct Access (“DA”) providers to file annual RPS Procurement Plans. The specific RPS Procurement Plan elements are included in Section 399.13(a)(5), focusing primarily on the need for additional resources, compliance positions, bid documents, and the status and risks associated with new or proposed facilities. LSA now asks that the Joint Utilities be directed to include in their respective RPS Plans detailed information concerning bidding and scheduling practices, as well as contract administration issues. This is well beyond the statutory requirements.

Second, the issues proposed by LSA are already being addressed in other venues. Least-cost dispatch and contract administration issues are addressed annually in each of the Joint Utilities’ Energy Resource Recovery Account (“ERRA”) Compliance proceedings. In Decision (“D.”) 02-12-074, the Commission adopted Standard of Conduct 4 (“SOC 4”) which addresses the issue of contract administration.³ In D.05-01-054, the Commission confirmed that in conducting the daily economic dispatch of energy, utilities must comply with SOC 4, which states that “[t]he utilities shall prudently administer all contracts and generation resources and dispatch the energy in a least-cost manner....”⁴ Dispatch and contract administration issues included in SOC 4 are addressed in ERRA Compliance proceedings. Therefore, no additional review is required through the RPS Procurement Plans. Moreover, PG&E notes that it provided substantial scheduling, bidding, and operational information regarding economic curtailment and overgeneration in its 2014 Bundled Procurement Plan (“BPP”), which was approved by the Commission in October 2015 in D.15-10-031. PG&E’s BPP addresses how PG&E schedules

³ D.02-12-074 at p. 54.

⁴ D.05-01-054 at p. 4.

and bids resources, including the use of economic curtailment rights, and addresses overgeneration. Again, there is no reason to address in the RPS Plans issues that have been addressed in other venues.

Third, some of the information which LSA requests that the Joint Utilities provide in the RPS Plans “to provide greater transparency”⁵ is confidential in nature and will not be available to market participants. For example, LSA asks that the Joint Utilities provide information on how they are “bidding contracts with limited or no curtailment flexibility? Are they self-scheduled or bid economically?”⁶ This information is market-sensitive and proprietary information with respect to the Joint Utilities’ respective strategy frameworks for bidding in the CAISO markets. Market participants with knowledge of the Joint Utilities’ respective bidding strategies could develop responses to these strategies that negatively impact market prices available to the Joint Utilities, potentially resulting in increased costs for their customers. As such, this information should be confidential under Public Utilities Code Section 454.5(g). While the confidential nature of the information would not preclude the Commission from ordering the Joint Utilities to provide it in the Confidential version of their RPS plans, the provision of this information to the Commission will not provide “greater transparency of this information” to market participants, like LSA’s members.

Fourth, LSA’s Motion could further delay submission of the RPS Plans in this proceeding. Initially, parties were required to submit 2016 RPS Plans by July 1, 2016. The Joint Utilities requested an extension of this deadline to August 15, 2016, which was unopposed. On June 8, 2016, Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) Mason granted an extension of the July 1, 2016 deadline to August 8, 2016. There will likely be little more than a month between a ruling on the

⁵ Motion at p.3.

⁶ Motion at p.4.

Joint Motion and the due date for 2016 RPS Plans. There appears to be insufficient time to develop the detailed information requested in LSA's Motion. If the Motion is granted, an additional extension to file the 2016 RPS Plans may be required.

LSA's Motion should be denied because it unnecessarily expands the scope of the RPS Plans, seeks information that is addressed and other proceedings, and could delay submission of the RPS Plans.

SCE and SDG&E have authorized PG&E to sign this pleading on their behalf.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the
Joint Utilities,

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF
GRADY MATHAI-JACKSON

By: /s/ Charles R. Middlekauff
CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, B30A
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 973-6971
Facsimile: (415) 973-5520
E-Mail: CRMd@pge.com

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

June 21, 2016

VERIFICATION

I, Brendan Lucker, am an employee of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a corporation, and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. I have read the foregoing:

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S (U 39-E),
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U 338-E), AND
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (U 902-E)
RESPONSE TO LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATIONS'
MOTION TO AMEND THE 2016 RPS PLAN RULING**

The statements in the foregoing document are true to my own knowledge, except as to matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on this 20th day of June, 2016 at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Brendan Lucker

BRENDAN LUCKER

Manager, Renewable Energy Strategy
Pacific Gas and Electric Company