

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	15-AFC-01
Project Title:	Puente Power Project
TN #:	215432-2
Document Title:	Exhibit - Transcript on Behalf of Intervenors SC, ECVC, and EDC
Description:	Exhibit - Evidentiary Hearing Transcript dated May 27, 2015
Filer:	Matthew A. Smith
Organization:	Environmental Defense Center
Submitter Role:	Intervenor
Submission Date:	1/18/2017 3:10:37 PM
Docketed Date:	1/18/2017

Exhibit 4001

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE REGINA DEANGELIS, presiding

)	EVIDENTIARY
)	HEARING
)	
)	
)	
Application of Southern California)	
Edison Company (U338E) for Approval)	Application
of the Results of Its 2013 Local)	14-11-016
Capacity Requirements Request for)	
Offers for the Moorpark Sub-Area.)	
)	
)	

REPORTERS' TRANSCRIPT
San Francisco, California
May 27, 2015
Pages 1 - 195
Volume - 1

Reported by: Ana M. Gonzalez, CSR No. 11320
Wendy M. Pun, CSR No. 12891

I N D E X

<u>WITNESSES:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>	
RANBIR SINGH		
Direct Examination By Ms. Reyes	19	
Close		
Cross-Examination By Mr. Chaset	21	
Cross-Examination By Ms. Limón	38	
Cross-Examination By Ms. Sommer	43	
JESSEE BRYSON		
Direct Examination By Ms. Reyes	46	
Close		
Cross-Examination By Ms. Myers	50	
JESSE BRYSON		
Cross-Examination (Resumed.) By	60	
Ms. Myers		
Cross-Examination By Mr. Chaset	74	
Cross-Examination By Ms. Sommer	99	
Cross-Examination By Mr.	132	
Schexnayder		
ROBERT PERRY		
Direct Examination By Mr. Chaset	160	
Cross-Examination By Ms. Cottle	161	
Redirect Examination By Ms.	167	
Reyes Close		
Cross-Examination By Ms. Sommer	172	
Recross-Examination By Ms. Limón	177	
Redirect Examination By Ms.	191	
Reyes Close		
<u>Exhibits:</u>	<u>Iden.</u>	<u>Evid.</u>
EnerNOC-01	12	13
CEJA-01	14	14
SIERRACLUB-01	15	15
SIERRACLUB-01-C	15	15
WBA-01	16	17
WBA-02	16	17
SCE-01	18	19
SCE-01-C	18	19
SCE-02	18	19
SCE-02-C	18	19
SCE-04	18	19
SCE-05	18	19
SCE-03, SCE-07,	45	

1	SCE-07-C		
	ENERNOC-02	48	
2	ENERNOC-03	49	
	ENERNOC-04	49	
3	ENERNOC-02,		50
	ENERNOC-03,		
4	ENERNOC-04		
	CBD-02	100	
5	CO-05	130	
	CO-05-C	130	
6	CO-06	131	
	CO-07	131	
7	CO-08	131	
	CO-09	132	
8	CO-05, CO-05-C,		132
	CO-06, CO-07,		
9	CO-08, CO-09		
	WBA-03	159	160
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1 -- well, let me move on.

2 THE WITNESS: So the testimony here on
3 page 10 really is around incorporating
4 additional language in the contracts.

5 MR. CHASET: Q Okay.

6 A And needing more time to do that.

7 Q This language is merely about
8 needing more time to file the application?

9 A Needing more time --

10 Q To change language in contracts so
11 that you could put that in the application?

12 A It's needing more time to revise
13 the contracts and then to negotiate that
14 additional language with the counterparties,
15 which ultimately led to a delay in the RFO
16 and a later filing date for the application.

17 Q Okay. I understand that. Thank
18 you.

19 Okay. I'm going to move on to page
20 12 now of SCE-01. You were talking about the
21 -- talking about the website. And I think
22 Ms. Myers asked you some questions about this
23 outreach program.

24 My question to you was how vigorous
25 was SCE's outreach campaign with regard to
26 newer modular technologies capable of
27 distributed and decentralized locations?

28 A We did really what we felt was

1 extensive outreach to the market to highlight
2 the RFO and the new products we were
3 soliciting. Not only did we send out an
4 e-mail blast to our 2,000 plus e-mail list,
5 we also did press releases. We sent notices
6 on service lists associated with DSM products
7 as well as LTPP service lists. So we did
8 what we could to highlight to the market that
9 we were looking for all types of resourced in
10 the context of the LCR RFO.

11 Q Including decentralized distributed
12 small scale generation in the LCR areas?

13 A I mean, our -- our outreach was
14 that we were looking for various products,
15 including EE, DR, DG, renewable energy
16 storage, and gas-fired generation. Although
17 we highlighted in our bidders' conference
18 that to the extent there was a product that
19 didn't fit into one of those categories or
20 those forms of contracts, we were willing to
21 negotiate to come up with a form that would
22 work between the parties.

23 Q Thank you.

24 And let me ask you. You did e-mail
25 blasts. You did press releases. Was there
26 any direct personal follow-up by SCE to -- to
27 potential providers of modular distributed
28 generation technologies, or was it just this

1 generic campaign of e-mails and press
2 releases?

3 A I don't -- there were a number of
4 meetings that we held with various
5 counterparties that came to visit us to talk
6 about their technologies, their potential
7 products that they were interested in
8 submitting into the RFO. You know, I don't
9 remember specifically whether any of those
10 meetings fit the description that you have.

11 Q Any of them providers of fuel cell
12 technologies?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Were any of them providers of small
15 scale solar plus storage distributed
16 resources?

17 A I -- I can tell you you've had a
18 number of conversations for those types of
19 products. I don't recall whether that was in
20 the context of the LCR RFO or in other
21 procurement activities that we have ongoing
22 at Edison.

23 Q Thank you.

24 All right. Moving on to pages 14
25 to 15, there were various -- you said for a
26 project to be considered in the RFO, it had
27 to meet certain general qualifications, et
28 cetera. Do you recall the thrust of that

1 testimony? Pages 14 to 15, you were you
2 talking about general qualifications for a
3 project to be considered?

4 A Yes.

5 Q It's fair to say, is it not, that
6 there were not a lot of offers that you got
7 specifically for the Moorpark sub-area as
8 opposed to the Western LA Basin? Is that
9 true?

10 A That's an accurate
11 characterization.

12 Q What's your explanation for why
13 there weren't that many contracts delivered
14 for the Moorpark sub-area?

15 A I think there are a couple of
16 factors. One is the Western LA Basin had --
17 it's a larger procurement, larger
18 opportunity. It also had specific
19 requirements, minimums that had been
20 identified in the LTPP Track 1 and Track 4
21 Decisions. So I think at least my
22 understanding based on conversations is
23 really the market was focusing their effort
24 on the Western LA Basin. I think the climate
25 zone associated with the Moorpark area as
26 well as a smaller number of customers made it
27 a more challenging location for people to
28 develop projects in.

1 Q Okay. And let me ask you to
2 speculate perhaps. Would you judge that the
3 small number of contracts was due to the fact
4 that some of the potential offers couldn't
5 meet your criteria, or was it they just
6 weren't interested?

7 A I'm not aware of the criteria, to
8 use your word, being the barrier, the issue
9 as to why they didn't submit offers.

10 Q Okay. Thank you.

11 Moving on just a little further.
12 Again we're pages -- same area, pages 14 to
13 15 where, you know, you considered various
14 offers for -- well, actually I'm not going to
15 ask that. We already explored that.

16 Let me ask you this. Do you have
17 any reason to understand -- explain why you
18 didn't receive more contracts for renewable
19 energy production, for example solar PV, in
20 -- let's say up-system from Moorpark in the
21 Goleta sub-area for example?

22 You have a lot of sub along the
23 coast there as you get up from the coast. Do
24 you have any reason why you didn't get more
25 solar bids into your RFO from Santa Barbara
26 County?

27 MS. REYES CLOSE: Objection, calls for
28 speculation.

1 ALJ DE ANGELIS: Sustained.

2 MR. CHASET: All right. I'll move on.

3 Q Do you -- do you think that the
4 language of your proposed pro forma agreement
5 was a reason why you didn't get more bids
6 from renewable energy producers?]

7 A Just to be clear, what pro forma
8 agreement are you referring to?

9 Q The pro forma agreement that you
10 used with your counterparties.

11 A For which product? We have several
12 different pro formas.

13 Q For the renewable energy providers.
14 Let's say for solar energy providers. Do you
15 think it was the language in your pro forma
16 was a reason why you didn't get more bids?

17 A I do not. Our pro forma renewable
18 agreement has been used in a number of
19 different programs very successfully this
20 year, last year, the year before. That
21 contract has been in the marketplace for some
22 time. And I'm not aware of any issues
23 associated with it that would prevent
24 counterparties from submitting offers.

25 Q All right. Thank you.

26 Moving onto page 26, you talked
27 about receiving 11,036 offers from a, number
28 redacted, of bidders. This combines the

1 understanding the connection between the
2 overlap RFO concept and the future potential
3 for future contracts.

4 MS. SCHEXNAYDER: Yes, your Honor. It
5 goes to the issue of whether Edison was
6 required to procure all of the -- all of the
7 resources for the Moorpark sub-area initially
8 or whether they could do it incrementally
9 through a number of RFOs. So I think it is
10 relevant to ask what resources would -- or
11 responses they could get from future RFOs for
12 the Moorpark sub-area and LA Basin sub-area.

13 MS. REYES CLOSE: Your Honor?

14 ALJ DE ANGELIS: Ms. Reyes Close.

15 MS. REYES CLOSE: Sure. I mean, your
16 Honor, Edison has put forth contracts that
17 satisfy the minimum procurement in Moorpark.
18 I don't know why we're talking about residual
19 procurement for Moorpark when we've satisfied
20 our requirement. I understand the situation
21 in LA where that is not the case, but for
22 Moorpark it's a very different situation.

23 ALJ DE ANGELIS: Okay. Go ahead and
24 ask the question again.

25 MS. SCHEXNAYDER: Thank you, your
26 Honor.

27 ALJ DE ANGELIS: Thank you.

28 MS. SCHEXNAYDER: Q Mr. Bryson, again,

1 after the LA Basin procurement process is
2 complete, would you expect that selected
3 preferred resources suppliers and energy
4 storage suppliers would be willing to respond
5 to another RFO for those types of resources?

6 A Recognizing this is complete
7 speculation because I don't know what the
8 market is going to respond to and how,
9 typically when we launch an RFO, I'd expect
10 some of the counterparties to put together
11 offers and submit them in the RFO.

12 Q So Mr. Bryson, you have experience
13 putting together RFOs for these types of
14 resources; correct?

15 A These types of resources? Can you
16 help me out there?

17 Q For preferred resources.

18 A I have.

19 Q Okay. And based on that
20 experience, do you have a sense of when
21 you're putting together an RFO whether you
22 expect there to be any responses to the RFO?

23 A We certainly try to structure RFOs
24 so that we will receive responses and try to
25 allow for sufficient time for developers to
26 put together offers and -- and -- having said
27 that, there are times when you do put
28 together an RFO and you think you've got it

1 right and it ends up that it doesn't work.

2 And a great example is the website
3 that -- for the PRP RFO that you just put in
4 front of us initially had a due date of I
5 believe it was April for the offers to be
6 submitted. And that has been revised to June
7 because we didn't think we were going to get
8 enough response.

9 So I put together many RFOs. You
10 have an expectation of what the market can do
11 when you launch it. You're structuring that
12 RFO. And sometimes you have to adjust
13 because it's hard to really predict with
14 perfect accuracy what's going to happen.

15 Q Okay. And my question is just
16 based on your experience and your expectation
17 of how the market would respond. So based on
18 that experience, would you have a reason to
19 expect that preferred resources suppliers who
20 are successful in the LA Basin proceeding
21 would respond to another -- another RFO for
22 additional preferred resources?

23 A If we were to launch another RFO
24 for preferred resources, I would expect to
25 receive offers, yes.

26 Q Thank you. But am I correct to
27 understand your testimony that Edison is not
28 considering another RFO for preferred

1 resources in the Moorpark sub-area at this
2 time?

3 A That's correct at this time. We
4 have satisfied the Commission authorization
5 for the identified need in the Moorpark area.

6 Q Okay. If you did pursue an
7 additional RFO for preferred resources and
8 energy storage in the Moorpark sub-area,
9 would you expect to see responses -- based on
10 your experience, would you expect to see
11 responses that are more in line with the
12 responses you saw in the LA Basin RFO?

13 A Once again, hypothetical. To the
14 extent that we were preparing an RFO for
15 additional preferred resources and storage in
16 the Moorpark area, I think we'd want to do
17 additional outreach to see what we could do
18 differently to get a different level of
19 competition, a different level of
20 participation in the RFO compared to what we
21 saw in the LCR RFO. So I wouldn't
22 necessarily want to use the same timeline
23 that we had used out of concern that, you
24 know, maybe we get the same sort of result.

25 Q Thank you.

26 So just to clarify, a different --
27 to get a different response, do you mean to
28 get a greater response?

1 A To get a more robust response for
2 preferred resources.

3 MS. SCHEXNAYDER: Great. Thank you.

4 If I can have one moment, your
5 Honor? I believe those are all the questions
6 I have for Mr. Bryson.

7 ALJ DE ANGELIS: Thank you.

8 Any additional?

9 Ms. Limón.

10 MS. LIMÓN: Yes, your Honor. Thank
11 you. Good afternoon, Mr. Bryson. I'm Gladys
12 Limón. I'm an attorney for California
13 Environmental Justice Alliance.

14 Did you personally oversee the 2013
15 RFO process for the Moorpark sub-area?

16 A I did oversee the LCR RFO for both
17 Moorpark and LA Basin, yes.

18 Q You testified regarding the
19 selection of the independent evaluators
20 Sedway Consulting; correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q You cite to a copy of Sedway's
23 report in Appendix D; correct?

24 A Correct.

25 Q Have you read that report?

26 A I have.

27 Q So you're familiar with its
28 contents?

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)	
)	
)	
Application of Southern California)	
Edison Company (U338E) for Approval)	Application
of the Results of Its 2013 Local)	14-11-016
Capacity Requirements Request for)	
Offers for the Moorpark Sub-Area.)	
)	
)	

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING

I, Ana M. Gonzalez, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 11320, in and for the State of California do hereby certify that the pages of this transcript prepared by me comprise a full, true and correct transcript of the testimony and proceedings held in the above-captioned matter on May 27, 2015.

I further certify that I have no interest in the events of the matter or the outcome of the proceeding.

EXECUTED this 27th day of May, 2015.

Ana M. Gonzalez
CSR No. 11320

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

)	
)	
)	
Application of Southern California)	
Edison Company (U338E) for Approval)	Application
of the Results of Its 2013 Local)	14-11-016
Capacity Requirements Request for)	
Offers for the Moorpark Sub-Area.)	
)	
)	

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING

I, Wendy M. Pun, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 12891, in and for the State of California do hereby certify that the pages of this transcript prepared by me comprise a full, true and correct transcript of the testimony and proceedings held in the above-captioned matter on May 27, 2015.

I further certify that I have no interest in the events of the matter or the outcome of the proceeding.

EXECUTED this 27th day of May, 2015.

Wendy M. Pun
CSR No. 12891