



Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP
Valentine S. Hoy (Bar No. 121766)
Jeffrey A. Chine (Bar No. 131742)
501 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, California 92101-3541
Attorneys for Intervenor HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
State Energy Resources
Conservation and Development Commission

In the Matter of:) 11-AFC-03
)
QUAIL BRUSH GENERATION) **STATUS REPORT OF INTERVENOR**
PROJECT) **HOMEFED FANITA RANCHO, LLC**
_____)

INTRODUCTION

Intervenor, HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC, ("HomeFed") hereby submits its Status Report pursuant to the November 20, 2012 Notice of Status Conference. In this Status Report, HomeFed will (1) update the Committee on the status of discovery; (2) update the Committee on matters pending before the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC"); and (3) generally update the Committee on HomeFed's ongoing participation as a party opposing the proposed project.

STATUS OF DISCOVERY

On October 31, 2012 HomeFed submitted 84 data requests to the applicant. On November 19, 2012, the applicant docketed initial responses to most of HomeFed's data requests. On November 30, 2012, the applicant docketed responses to the balance of HomeFed's data requests. The responses contained many objections. HomeFed is evaluating the adequacy of the responses; however, a cursory review indicates that the applicant has not sufficiently responded to the requests and a motion to compel may be necessary.

On November 19, 2012, the Committee extended the Discovery Period to December 14, 2012. With the extension to December 14, HomeFed intends to propound follow-up data requests on the applicant in the areas of alternatives, project need and interconnection studies.

On November 21, 2012 HomeFed responded to six data requests propounded by CEC Staff on HomeFed. HomeFed's response included relevant excerpts of the Administrative Record for *Preserve Wild Santee v. City of Santee* (San Diego Superior Court Case No. 37-2008-00075168-CU-TT-CTL).

UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE CPUC PROCEEDING

Relevant to this matter is the CPUC's proceeding concerning the Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E") for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power (Application No. 11-05-023). On November 20, 2012 the CPUC issued both a proposed decision ("PD") from Administrative Law Judge Yacknin, who heard the case, and also an alternate decision ("AD") from Commissioner Ferron, who is in administrative charge of the case. The two potential decisions differ with regard to the 45 Mw Escondido project, but both would deny approval to the Quail Brush (and Pio Pico) contracts. In addition, while both would allow future SDG&E local capacity contracts starting in 2018, the amounts they propose are small enough that they could be met with Pio Pico alone. The PD and AD are attached hereto for the Committee's ease of reference. Both the PD and the AD demonstrate that the public convenience and necessity requirement for a LORS override is not likely to be satisfied in this case.

UPDATE ON HOMEFED'S PARTICIPATION AS A PARTY OPPOSING THE PROPOSED PROJECT

HomeFed was a participant at both the October 3 Staff Workshop and the October 19 Staff Workshop. Should the matter continue, HomeFed intends on commenting on the Preliminary Staff Assessment, participating at future workshops, and will be compiling evidence, developing reports, and designating both percipient and expert witnesses in anticipation of the Commission's evidentiary hearings.


CONCLUSION

HomeFed appreciates the Committee's consideration of its Status Report, and will be attending the December 10 Status Conference.

Dated: December 3, 2012

ALLEN MATKINS LECK GAMBLE
MALLORY & NATSIS LLP

By:



VALENTINE S. HOY
JEFFREY A. CHINE
Attorneys for Real Party in Interest
HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**11-20-12
04:43 PM

November 20, 2012

Agenda ID #11757
and
Alternate Agenda ID #11758
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 11-05-023

Enclosed are the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Hallie Yacknin previously designated as the presiding officer in this proceeding and the alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Mark J. Ferron. The proposed decision and the alternate proposed decision will not appear on the Commission's agenda sooner than 30 days from the date they are mailed.

Pub. Util. Code § 311(e) requires that the alternate item be accompanied by a digest that clearly explains the substantive revisions to the proposed decision. The digest of the alternate proposed decision is attached.

This matter was categorized as ratesetting and is subject to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c). Upon the request of any Commissioner, a Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting (RDM) may be held. If that occurs, the Commission will prepare and publish an agenda for the RDM 10 days beforehand. When an RDM is held, there is a related ex parte communications prohibition period. (See Rule 8.3(c)(4).)

When the Commission acts on these agenda items, it may adopt all or part of the decision as written, amend or modify them, or set them aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision and alternate proposed decision as provided in Pub. Util. Code §§ 311(d) and 311(e) and in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Page 2 of 2

Comments must be filed pursuant to Rule 1.13 either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Yacknin at hsy@cpuc.ca.gov and Commissioner Ferron's advisor Michael Colvin at michael.colvin@cpuc.ca.gov. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ KAREN V. CLOPTON

Karen V. Clopton, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

KVC:rs6

Attachment

**DIGEST OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE YACKNIN'S PROPOSED DECISION
AND THE ALTERNATE PROPOSED DECISION
OF COMMISSIONER FERRON**

ATTACHMENT

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 311(e), this is the digest of the substantive differences between the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Yacknin (mailed on November 20, 2012) and the alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Ferron (also mailed on November 20, 2012) in the matter of Application 11-05-023, the application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) for Authority to enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

The proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Yacknin determines a local capacity requirement need and directs SDG&E to procure up to 343 megawatts of local generation capacity beginning in 2018. It denies authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power. The proposed decision does not reach the issues of contract reasonableness or cost recovery mechanism.

The alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Ferron grants SDG&E authority to enter into a purchase power tolling agreement with Escondido Energy Center, approves the agreement as reasonable and adopts a balancing account to record the associated costs with the project. The alternate decision determines that it is reasonable to approve the Escondido Energy Center, a 45 MW repowered project, since it is relatively small, highly viable and is environmentally beneficial. The alternate proposed decision directs SDG&E to procure up to 298 MW of local generation capacity, beginning in 2018. (The lower amount reflects the approval of the Escondido Energy Center). The alternate proposed decision is otherwise the same as the proposed decision.

(END OF ATTACHMENT)

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ YACKNIN** (Mailed 11/20/2012)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

Application 11-05-023
(Filed May 19, 2011)

**DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND DENYING AUTHORITY TO ENTER
INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE	PAGE
DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY’S LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND DENYING AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS	1
1. Summary	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Local Capacity Requirement.....	4
3.1. Spreadsheet Analyses	4
3.2. OTC Study	6
3.3. LCR Need	13
4. Need for PPTAs	14
5. Contract Reasonableness and Cost Allocation.....	17
6. Comments on Proposed Decision	17
7. Assignment of Proceeding	17
Findings of Fact.....	18
Conclusions of Law	19
ORDER	20

**DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND DENYING AUTHORITY TO ENTER
INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS**

1. Summary

This decision determines a local capacity requirement need and directs San Diego Gas & Electric Company to procure up to 343 megawatts of local generation capacity beginning in 2018. This decision denies San Diego Gas & Electric Company authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center, and Quail Brush Power, without prejudice to a renewed application for their approval, if amended to match the timing of the identified need, or upon a different showing of need. This proceeding is closed.

2. Background

The Commission's biennial procurement review process, established pursuant to Assembly Bill 57 (Stats. 2002, ch. 835), Decision (D.) 04-01-050 and D.04-12-048, requires that investor-owned electric utilities submit long-term procurement plans that serve as the basis for utility procurement activities until refinement during the next biennial planning cycle. Rulemaking (R.) 04-04-003 (the 2004 LTPP) undertook the first of the biennial procurement reviews and reviewed the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2005 to 2014. R.06-02-013 (the 2006 LTPP) undertook the second biennial procurement review and reviewed the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2007 to 2016.

D.07-12-052 (as modified by D.08-11-008), issued in the 2006 LTPP, identified a need for San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to procure up to 530 megawatts (MW) by 2015 to meet its local capacity needs.

Because the 2006 LTPP had just concluded with the issuance of D.07-12-052 immediately before the institution of R.08-02-007 (the 2008 LTPP),

the Commission determined that, rather than requiring the utilities to file new procurement plans, the 2008 LTPP would address a series of policy proposals to refine technical practices used to develop resource and procurement plans, and consider other procedural matters. Order Instituting Rulemaking 10-05-006 (the 2010 LTPP) closed R.08-02-007 and undertook the review of the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2011 to 2020.

Meanwhile, on June 9, 2009, SDG&E issued a Request for Offers (RFO) to meet the local capacity requirement (LCR) that had been identified in the 2006 LTPP. Now, three years later on May 19, 2011, SDG&E brings this application for authority to enter into power purchase tolling agreements with the winning bidders for the Escondido Energy Center (45 MW), Pio Pico Energy Center (305 MW), and Quail Brush Power station (100 MW).

After the prehearing conference (PHC) on July 14, 2011, the assigned Commissioner issued a scoping memo and ruling on July 29, 2011, identifying the issues to be determined by the Commission in resolving the application and setting a schedule for addressing those issues.

By unopposed joint motion filed October 13, 2011, SDG&E and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) requested a delay in the schedule of this application to await the issuance of the decision in the 2010 LTPP which, according to SDG&E and DRA, would address and inform issues of fact that are common to both proceedings. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) granted the motion.

On January 18, 2012, the assigned Commissioners to the 2010 LTPP and this application issued a joint ruling delegating the issue of SDG&E's LCR need from the 2010 LTPP to this application in order to allow the opportunity to consider, in determining that need, the California Independent System

Operator's (CAISO) expected report on its 2011/2012 transmission planning process, without unduly delaying the resolution of the issue to a later phase of the 2010 LTPP. Accordingly, after the conduct of a second PHC on January 31, 2012, to consider the schedule and process for taking the CAISO's report into consideration in this proceeding, the assigned Commissioner issued an amended scoping memo and ruling on March 12, 2012, amending the scope of issues to include the determination of SDG&E's LCR and amending the schedule of the proceeding.

The issues to be determined in the proceeding, as identified in the scoping memo (as amended), can be summarized as follows:

1. How much new generation, if any, does SDG&E require to meet its LCR for the planning horizon 2011 to 2020?
2. Is there a need for the Purchase Power Tolling Agreements (PPTA) to meet the LCR or for other reasons?
3. Are the PPTAs cost-effective and reasonable?
4. What is the appropriate rate treatment for the costs of the PPTAs?

Evidentiary hearings were held on June 19 through June 22, 2012. Parties filed opening briefs on July 13, 2012, and reply briefs on July 27, 2012, upon which the record was submitted.¹

3. Local Capacity Requirement

3.1. Spreadsheet Analyses

SDG&E conducted a spreadsheet analysis to forecast San Diego's LCR. This approach compares local area demand (taking into account forecasted peak

¹ SDG&E's unopposed July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record are granted.

load, transmission capacity to bring in resources from outside the area, and the contingent loss of the single largest transmission line and the single largest generator outage (an “N-1/G-1” contingency)) and comparing it to the available resources to meet it including existing supply resources, resource retirements, and proposed resource additions.

Based on its spreadsheet analysis, SDG&E forecasts an LCR need of 488 MW arising in 2018, increasing to 647 MW in 2020. (Ex. 11, Table 1, RA-5.) This analysis uses the 1-in-10 year peak load forecast from the “mid energy demand scenario” in the California Energy Demand (CED) forecast for 2012-2022,² and assumes, based on its independent assessment, 16 MW of RPS additions, 17 MW of additional demand-side combined heat and power (CHP) generation, 151 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency, 219 MW of demand response, and zero distributed generation by 2020.

DRA recommends against the use of spreadsheet LCR analyses in general because they are unduly simplistic comparisons of forecasted demand and resources as compared to the CAISO’s “Once Through Cooling (OTC) Study” which use power flow and transient stability programs taking into account where supply and demand are located. (DRA opening brief at 13.) SDG&E does not offer an opinion on the relative merits of its spreadsheet analysis and the CAISO’s OTC study, other than to note that its spreadsheet analysis results are

² SDG&E’s prepared testimony relied on California Energy Commission (CEC) staff’s “Revised CED Forecast 2012-2022,” which was released in February 2012. (Ex. 11 at RA-6.) The CEC adopted that forecast as final on June 13, 2012 (except for a change to the forecasted mid-case 1-in-2 year peak load forecast). (SDG&E/Anderson, Tr. 277.)

consistent with the OTC study results with respect to the amount of LCR need and the year in which the need arises. (SDG&E reply brief at 6-7.)

We concur that the OTC study (subject to adjustment as discussed below), is more appropriate to the task at hand of determining local capacity reliability requirements. Accordingly, although DRA presented alternative spreadsheet analyses based on its own assumptions of “low need” and “high need” scenarios³ and the parties challenged many of SDG&E’s input assumptions, we do not reach the relative merits of the input assumptions to the spreadsheet analyses, other than as they inform the merits of the OTC study as discussed below.

3.2. OTC Study

The CAISO presented its forecast of SDG&E’s LCR based on the OTC study that it conducted, as part of its 2011/2012 transmission planning process, to analyze the LCR in the San Diego and San Diego/Imperial Valley areas in view of the recently-adopted State Water Resources Control Board rules that require affected OTC generation units to be retired, repowered, replaced, and/or retrofitted in order to improve coastal and estuarine environmental quality. The OTC study assumes the retirement of the Encina OTC units, and uses power flow and transient stability programs to evaluate mitigation measures (including load, potential transmission measures, potential demand side management and other contracted resources such as combined heat and power) needed to maintain

³ Based on these assumptions, DRA’s “high need” scenario forecasts an LCR surplus that diminishes over the 10-year planning horizon and culminates in a modest LCR need of 47 MW in 2020, while the “low need” scenario forecasts an LCR surplus that grows to 1155 MW in 2020. (Ex. 28.)

zonal and local reliability in the event of the outage of the Imperial Valley-Suncrest portion of the Sunrise transmission line followed by the non-simultaneous loss of the ECO-Miguel portion of the Southwest Powerlink transmission line (an “N-1-1” contingency).

The OTC study evaluated the LCR for 2021 under the four Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) resource additions scenarios that were developed in the 2010 LTPP (2010 LTPP RPS scenarios).⁴ The OTC study does not model any forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response, or incremental CHP. (Ex. 17 at 15-17; CAISO/Sparks, Tr. 566-567.)⁵ On this basis, the OTC study identified a local capacity requirement need in 2021 of 630 MW, 730 MW, 300 MW, and 540 MW, respectively, under the cost-constrained, trajectory, environmentally-constrained, and time-constrained scenarios, assuming the retirement of the Encina power station generating units (absent approval of the three PPTAs at issue in this proceeding). (Ex. 9 and Ex. 10.) Although it did not

⁴ The four RPS scenarios are the cost-constrained scenario, with 909 MW of RPS additions in the SDG&E service territory by 2020 (which the CAISO recommends as its base case); the trajectory scenario, with 508 MW; the environmentally-constrained scenario, with 317 MW; and the time-constrained scenario, with 74 MW. (Assigned Commissioner and ALJ’s Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling, December 3, 2010, R.10-05-006 (2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo), at 25-26, and February 10, 2011, ALJ Ruling, R.10-05-006, *inter alia*, amending the standardized planning assumptions.

⁵ California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) also objects to the OTC study for failing to model any potential future energy storage or transmission upgrades, or load shedding or other non-resource mitigation schemes. (CEJA opening brief at 19 and 24.) We are not persuaded that the LCR requirement should be determined on the basis of such potential eventualities.

analyze LCR needs in prior years, the CAISO maintains that this need will start in early 2018. (CAISO opening brief at 4.)⁶

DRA recommends that we account for the fact that the OTC study models the LCR for 2021, which is outside of the planning horizon for this LTPP, by reducing the OTC study results by the forecasted increase in demand from 2020 to 2021 (76 MW), and for the fact that the OTC study does not take account of forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response by reducing the OTC study results by these amounts. (DRA opening brief at 23-24.)⁷

With respect to the failure to account for forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, the CAISO argues that the OTC study's modeling assumptions are consistent with the statutory requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 345.5 that the CAISO maintain the reliability of the transmission system, most notably by maximizing the efficiency of existing electric generation resources and evaluating cost efficient mitigation solutions to reliability concerns under stressed conditions. (CAISO opening brief at 4-5.) The CAISO explains that, consistent with its statutory responsibility, it did not model uncommitted energy efficiency resources because it is uncertain whether those resources will be achieved and available. Similarly, it did not model incremental demand response because the CAISO does not equate demand response to dispatchable

⁶ It is not clear if the CAISO maintains that all, or only some, of this need will appear in 2018.

⁷ DRA and CEJA recommend additional adjustments to the OTC study results to account for challenges that they make to the CAISO's transmission operation protocols assumptions. (DRA opening brief at 31-35; CEJA reply brief, summary of recommendations.) We are not persuaded to adjust the CAISO's assumed transmission operation protocols, as these matters are within their jurisdiction.

generation in terms of availability when and where needed for a specific megawatt quantity. (Ex. 27 at 2-6.) The CAISO further explains that it does not use “policy-driven” transmission upgrade assumptions for the purpose of assessing its transmission grid reliability and operational needs. (CAISO opening brief at 5.)

While we respect the CAISO’s statutory responsibility and its discretion to model its OTC study modeling based on assumptions that flow from it, the record of the proceeding highlights the limitations of our reliance on the OTC study for purposes of this Commission’s statutory responsibility to ensure just and reasonable rates by, among other things, limiting unnecessary ratepayer costs. For the Commission’s purposes, it is appropriate to take into account reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, as well as incremental demand-side CHP, in determining whether to authorize the procurement of additional generation resources. These resources can reasonably be expected to occur as a result of State and Commission policies, and to reduce LCR needs in the San Diego area.⁸

We recognize that subtracting these resources (or the incremental 2021 demand) from the OTC study results is a crude solution. The power flow study results do not correlate, MW for MW, to resource assumption inputs, as shown by the results under the four RPS scenarios. Nevertheless, in the absence of OTC study results that model reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, it is appropriate to otherwise account for them. In the

⁸ While uncommitted energy efficiency and incremental CHP will reduce demand, the Commission is also taking steps to “place [demand response] on equal footing with generation resources.” (See D.12-04-045 at 16, 76-77.)

absence of any record evidence of an alternative, and consistent with the approach taken in D.06-06-064 to account for demand response with respect to the utilities' local resource adequacy requirements (D.06-06-064 at 53-54), it is reasonable to subtract conservative forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response from the OTC study results for purposes of determining the LCR.

With respect to the mismatch of the OTC study "snapshot" of 2021 and the relevant planning horizon, we note that the 76 MW discrepancy between the 2020 and 2021 forecasted demand is relatively small. Further, the 215 MW discrepancy between the CED 2010-2020 and 2012-2022 demand forecasts of 1-in-10 year peak demand in 2020 would appear to (overly) compensate for the former discrepancy. Further yet, this overcompensation may be mitigated by the potential for undercounting uncommitted energy efficiency by virtue of excluding the impacts in changes to committed energy efficiency between the release of the two CED demand forecasts. On balance, given the uncertainties of these competing discrepancies and the crudity of the adjustment mechanism, it would be unreasonable to undertake additional adjustments to attempt to account for these mismatches.

CEJA argues that the OTC study's reliance on a 2.5% reserve margin is inconsistent with reserve requirements. (CEJA opening brief at 6-7.) Similarly, DRA and CEJA criticize the OTC study for failing to account for proposed future transmission system upgrades for the San Diego area (DRA opening brief at 29-30; CEJA opening brief at 16-17) and for failing to include load drop (DRA opening brief at 31, CEJA opening brief at 19). We are not persuaded that the LCR determination should be based on such potential eventualities.

Accordingly, we adjust the results of the OTC study by the forecast amounts of uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response and incremental demand-side CHP, as follows.

Uncommitted Energy Efficiency:

SDG&E's forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency, which culminates in 151 MW in 2020, is based on the "low savings scenario" of the CEC Preliminary Energy Demand Forecast 2012-2022 Draft Staff Report, dated August 2011.

(Ex. 11 at RA-10.) As SDG&E concedes, its forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is conservative. (SDG&E reply brief at 4; Ex. 24 RA-5 through RA-7.)

DRA and CEJA object to the use of SDG&E's forecast on the basis that it deviates from the "Commission's" standardized planning assumptions in the 2010 LTPP (DRA opening brief at 7-12, CEJA opening brief at 33-34) and because updating those standardized planning assumptions is beyond the scope of this proceeding (DRA reply brief at 3). To the contrary, the Commission has not adopted the standardized planning assumptions set forth in the 2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo (as amended by February 10, 2011, ALJ Ruling). The Commission's decision in the 2010 LTPP, D.12-04-046, merely approved a settlement of related issues and does not serve as precedent for the merits of those assumptions. (*See* Rule 12.5.) Furthermore, the 2010 LTPP issue of SDG&E's LCR was properly delegated to this proceeding by joint ruling of the assigned commissioners to the 2010 LTPP and this proceeding. To the extent that the resolution of this issue requires consideration of the merits of the standardized planning assumptions, it is properly before us now. In the absence of any substantive challenge to the reliability of the August 2011 report, it is reasonable to rely on it for purposes of forecasting uncommitted energy efficiency.

DRA points out that, while SDG&E based its forecast on the August 2011 report's low savings scenario, the mid savings scenario forecasts 288 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency for 2020, which is close to the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumption for uncommitted energy efficiency. (Ex. 15 at 14.) CEJA points out that SDG&E conservatively assumes there will be no savings from the Big Bold Energy Efficiency Strategies. (CEJA opening brief at 33.) While the low savings scenario forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is indisputably conservative, on balance it is appropriate to use this conservative forecast for the purpose of making the crude adjustment to the OTC study results.

Demand response:

SDG&E forecasted demand response consistent with the forecast underlying SDG&E's demand response programs that the Commission recently approved in D.12-04-045. (Ex. 11 at RA-10 through RA-11.)

CEJA objects to this forecast for deviating from the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions and as unduly conservative for failing to account for anticipated increases due to Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and other investments in technology. (CEJA opening brief at 32.) As discussed above with respect to uncommitted energy efficiency, the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions are not controlling, and it is appropriate to assume a conservative forecast of demand response for the purpose of making the crude adjustment to the OTC study results.

Additional Demand Side CHP:

We assume SDG&E's forecast of additional demand-side CHP. This forecast reasonably reflects current expectations of incremental resources. (Ex. 11 at RA-9 through 10; SDG&E/Anderson, Tr. 63-64.)

3.3. LCR Need

The OTC study identifies an LCR need ranging from 300 MW to 730 MW under the four 2010 RPS scenarios in 2021, without accounting for uncommitted energy efficiency or demand response. Imputing this 2021 LCR need to 2020, and accounting for uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response by subtracting their forecasted amounts in 2020 (151 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency and 219 MW of demand response) from the OTC study results for yields an LCR need in 2020 ranging from -87 MW (surplus) to 343 MW,⁹ as follows:

	Environmentally-constrained	Time-constrained	Cost-constrained	Trajectory
OTC study result	300 MW	540 MW	630 MW	730 MW
Uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response and CHP	387 MW	387 MW	387 MW	387 MW
LCR need	[87 MW]	153 MW	243 MW	343 MW

Although the OTC study does not identify the amount of LCR need that might arise prior to 2021, the record demonstrates that LCR need, if any, will begin to emerge in 2018 in the event that the Encina OTC units retire.

⁹ Although the CAISO recommends the results of the cost-constrained scenario as its base case (CAISO opening brief at 3), there is no record evidence for according different weights to the four RPS scenarios or their respective OTC study results.

4. Need for PPTAs

SDG&E procured the three PPTAs pursuant to D.07-12-052, as amended by D.08-11-008, which authorized SDG&E to procure 530 MW in order to meet local and system resource adequacy requirements beginning in 2015. Accordingly, the three PPTAs would add new capacity starting mid-2014.

As discussed above, we no longer find a need for additional resources to meet local and system resource adequacy requirements as soon as 2015. Under all record forecasts, whether as originally presented by the parties or as adjusted in this decision, there is no need for the new capacity represented by the three PPTAs until early 2018. It would be unreasonable to pay for that excess capacity for four of the 20-year and 25-year terms of the PPTAs. Accordingly, we deny approval of the three PPTAs, without prejudice to a renewed application for their approval, if amended to match the timing of the identified need.

Although SDG&E acknowledges that these PPTAs were originally solicited to meet the resource need identified in D.07-12-052, as amended by D.08-11-008, SDG&E asserts that these new generation resources are nevertheless needed to meet the Commission's directive in D.09-01-008 where, according to SDG&E's interpretation of the following sentence, it admonished SDG&E to avoid "just in time" procurement:

[W]e are also admonishing SDG&E to have adequate procedures in place to ensure that they do not again find themselves in a reliability crisis without sufficient time to follow the procurement protocols set forth in D.07-12-052.

(SDG&E opening brief at 3, citing to D.09-01-008 at 18.)

To the contrary and as elucidated by the subsequent sentence, the Commission did not criticize the fact that SDG&E found itself in a reliability crisis; rather, the Commission criticized SDG&E for failing to have procedures in

place to be able to conduct a “fast track” RFO such that it circumvented the competitive solicitation process:

Specifically, SDG&E must institute internal mechanisms that are triggered when projects run into unanticipated delays or cancellations so that the utility can conduct a “fast track” RFO and procure needed reliability resources through the competitive solicitation process.

(*Id.* at 18-19.) This admonition does not stand for the proposition that a utility should intentionally procure excess capacity in order to avoid reliability crises, and we do not endorse that practice now. To the contrary, we expect SDG&E to respond to this LCR need determination and procurement authorization by timely issuing an RFO and bringing an application for approval of its results.

SDG&E and the CAISO assert that it is necessary to approve these PPTAs now, in 2012, in order to ensure that needed capacity will be online in time to meet the need for it. (SDG&E opening brief at 7; CAISO opening brief at 28.) In support of this proposition, SDG&E cites to the Commission in D.07-12-052, wherein we stated:

Recent experience suggests that the time required to develop and carry out competitive long-term RFOs, then finance, permit and construct new generation resources – including a cushion to account for unanticipated delays – requires that these procurement decisions be made up to seven years in advance of when the resources are needed. (D.07-12-052 at 21.)

Paradoxically, the instant application disproves this expectation: Even with SDG&E taking nearly one and a half years to issue an RFO after securing clarification as to its procurement authority, and taking another two years to bring this application, the PPTA projects (if approved) would be operational in only two years -- six years from the time the Commission issued the modified procurement decision, D.08-11-008. Now, pursuant to our admonition in

D.09-01-008, we expect SDG&E to respond to *this* procurement decision in a much more timely fashion, with adequate cushion to enable needed resources to come online within six years.

The CAISO asserts that the consequences of failing to bring new generation resources online in time are too great to risk because if the necessary generation resources do not materialize in time, it will be required to use its backstop Capacity Procurement Mechanism (CPM) procedures (if generation is even available), which will increase costs to ratepayers by requiring them to pay both for resource adequacy capacity and CPM capacity. (CAISO opening brief at 28.) On balance, as between the certainty of four years of costs for unneeded capacity and the speculative possibility of a short-term local capacity requirement shortage and resulting CPM capacity costs, it is reasonable to procure resources based on the time of their need.

While it acknowledges that the issue is beyond the scope of the proceeding, SDG&E asserts that a prolonged outage of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) would increase the need for the generation resources represented by the PPTAs. (SDG&E opening brief at 20.) We take judicial notice of the fact that, as of this date, SONGS Units 2 and 3 are out of service.¹⁰ However, and without prejudice to an application for approval of the PPTAs upon such a showing, there is no record evidence in this proceeding of the expected duration of the outage or its implications for SDG&E's system requirements. We cannot, on this record, find that the PPTAs are needed to meet SDG&E's resource requirements as a result of SONGS' permanent retirement.

¹⁰ <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/event-status/reactor-status/ps.html>.

SDG&E asserts that the generation resources represented by the PPTAs are needed to support renewable resources integration. (SDG&E opening brief at 23-25.) To the contrary, the Commission has yet to determine the particular operational characteristics of resources that are needed to support renewable resources integration or to set procurement targets for them. This issue is currently before the Commission in the 2012 LTPP. (*See* R.12-03-014.) We cannot, on this record, find that the PPTAs are needed to support renewable resources integration.

For all these reasons, we direct SDG&E to procure up to 343 MW of local capacity to come on-line beginning in 2018. As discussed previously, SDG&E may seek to meet this need through one or more of the current PPTAs if amended to correspond to the identified need. Otherwise, SDG&E should expeditiously issue an RFO for this need recognizing, as bidders must likewise, that when it brings an application for approval of the RFO results, we will take into consideration material intervening events and circumstances.

5. Contract Reasonableness and Cost Allocation

Because we do not approve the PPTAs, we do not reach the issues of contract reasonableness or cost allocation.

6. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the ALJ in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

7. Assignment of Proceeding

Mark J. Ferron is the assigned Commissioner and Hallie Yacknin is the assigned ALJ and presiding officer in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The three PPTAs would require SDG&E to begin purchasing capacity in 2014, and to continue to purchase capacity over the PPTAs' 20-year and 25-year terms.
2. There is no LCR need until 2018 under any scenario or forecast in the record of this proceeding.
3. The OTC study uses power flow analysis, which allows for a more sophisticated analysis of resource needs than a spreadsheet analysis of resources and need.
4. The CAISO's OTC study did not model forecasted additions of uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response or incremental CHP.
5. SDG&E's forecast of demand response takes account of the Commission's recent decision approving SDG&E's demand response programs in D.12-04-045; the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions do not reflect this.
6. SDG&E's forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is based on the "low savings scenario" of the CEC Preliminary Energy Demand Forecast 2012-2022 Draft Staff Report, dated August 2011, which is a conservative assessment of whether these resources are certain to materialize; this forecast is more current than 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumption for demand response.
7. The OTC study results, adjusted for uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response, and incremental CHP, show an LCR need in 2021 ranging from -87 MW (surplus) to 343 MW.
8. To the extent that there is a forecasted LCR need, it arises in 2018.
9. There is no record evidence of the relative merits of the four RPS scenarios.
10. There is no record evidence of the impact of a prolonged SONGS outage on SDG&E's LCR need.

11. There is no record evidence of the relative merits of various operational characteristics of resources that are needed to support renewable resources integration or procurement targets for such resources.

12. After receiving conditional procurement authority in December 2007, and confirmation of that procurement authority in November 2008, SDG&E issued an RFO in June 2009, and brought this application for approval of its results in May 2011.

13. The three PPTAs would add new capacity beginning in 2014.

Conclusions of Law

1. It is unreasonable for SDG&E to enter into the PPTAs to purchase local capacity beginning in 2014, when there is no need to for incremental local capacity until 2018, four years into the 20- and 25-year terms of the PPTAs.

2. In the absence of a power flow modeling study for the relevant planning horizon, it is reasonable to impute that the OTC study results for 2021 will occur in 2020.

3. In the absence of a power flow modeling study that models these resources, it is reasonable to account for conservative but reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response by subtracting them from the results of the OTC study.

4. The CAISO's modeling assumptions, other than with respect to uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, are reasonable.

5. SDG&E's forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response, and incremental CHP are conservative but reasonable.

6. It is reasonable to authorize SDG&E to procure up to 343 MW of local generation capacity to come on-line beginning in 2018.

7. SDG&E's unopposed July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record should be granted.
8. All other pending motions should be deemed denied.
9. Application 11-05-023 should be closed.
10. This order should be effective immediately.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. San Diego Gas & Electric Company's request for authority to enter into power purchase tolling agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power is denied without prejudice.
2. San Diego Gas & Electric Company is authorized to issue a request for offers to meet a local capacity requirement need of up to 343 MW beginning in 2018.
3. San Diego Gas & Electric Company's July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record are granted.
4. All pending motions that are not otherwise granted in this order are deemed denied.
5. Application 11-05-023 is closed.

This order is effective immediately.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**11-20-12
04:31 PM

November 20, 2012

Agenda ID #11757

and

Alternate Agenda ID #11758

Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 11-05-023

Enclosed are the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Hallie Yacknin previously designated as the presiding officer in this proceeding and the alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Mark J. Ferron. The proposed decision and the alternate proposed decision will not appear on the Commission's agenda sooner than 30 days from the date they are mailed.

Pub. Util. Code § 311(e) requires that the alternate item be accompanied by a digest that clearly explains the substantive revisions to the proposed decision. The digest of the alternate proposed decision is attached.

This matter was categorized as ratesetting and is subject to Pub. Util. Code § 1701.3(c). Upon the request of any Commissioner, a Ratesetting Deliberative Meeting (RDM) may be held. If that occurs, the Commission will prepare and publish an agenda for the RDM 10 days beforehand. When an RDM is held, there is a related ex parte communications prohibition period. (See Rule 8.3(c)(4).)

When the Commission acts on these agenda items, it may adopt all or part of the decision as written, amend or modify them, or set them aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision and alternate proposed decision as provided in Pub. Util. Code §§ 311(d) and 311(e) and in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Page 2 of 2

Comments must be filed pursuant to Rule 1.13 either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Yacknin at hsy@cpuc.ca.gov and Commissioner Ferron's advisor Michael Colvin at michael.colvin@cpuc.ca.gov. The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ KAREN V. CLOPTON
Karen V. Clopton, Chief
Administrative Law Judge

KVC:rs6

Attachment

**DIGEST OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE YACKNIN'S PROPOSED DECISION
AND THE ALTERNATE PROPOSED DECISION
OF COMMISSIONER FERRON**

ATTACHMENT

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 311(e), this is the digest of the substantive differences between the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Yacknin (mailed on November 20, 2012) and the alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Ferron (also mailed on November 20, 2012) in the matter of Application 11-05-023, the application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

The proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Yacknin determines a local capacity requirement need and directs SDG&E to procure up to 343 megawatts of local generation capacity beginning in 2018. It denies authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power. The proposed decision does not reach the issues of contract reasonableness or cost recovery mechanism.

The alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Ferron grants SDG&E authority to enter into a purchase power tolling agreement with Escondido Energy Center, approves the agreement as reasonable and adopts a balancing account to record the associated costs with the project. The alternate proposed decision determines that it is reasonable to approve the Escondido Energy Center, a 45 MW repowered project, since it is relatively small, highly viable and is environmentally beneficial. The alternate proposed decision directs SDG&E to procure up to 298 MW of local generation capacity, beginning in 2018. (The lower amount reflects the approval of the Escondido Energy Center.) The alternate proposed decision is otherwise the same as the proposed decision.

(END OF ATTACHMENT)

COM/FER/jt2

ALTERNATE DRAFT

Agenda ID #11758
Alternate to Agenda ID #11757
Ratesetting

Decision ALTERNATE PROPOSED DECISION OF
COMMISSIONER FERRON (Mailed 11/20/2012)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric
Company (U902E) for Authority to Enter
into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements
with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico
Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

Application 11-05-023
(Filed May 19, 2011)

**DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S
LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND GRANTING PARTIAL AUTHORITY
TO ENTER INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY’S LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND GRANTING PARTIAL AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS	1
1. Summary	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Local Capacity Requirement.....	5
3.1. Spreadsheet Analyses	5
3.2. OTC Study	6
3.3. LCR Need	13
4. Need.....	14
4.1 Need for the PPTAs to meet the LCR.....	14
4.2 Need for the Escondido Energy Center PPTA for other reasons	18
5. Contract Reasonableness and Cost Allocation.....	19
6. Comments on Alternate Proposed Decision	21
7. Assignment of Proceeding	21
Findings of Fact.....	21
Conclusions of Law	24
ORDER	25

DECISION DETERMINING SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY'S LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENT AND GRANTING PARTIAL AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO PURCHASE POWER TOLLING AGREEMENTS**1. Summary**

This decision determines a local capacity requirement need and directs San Diego Gas & Electric Company to procure up to 298 megawatts of local generation capacity beginning in 2018. This decision grants San Diego Gas & Electric Company authority to enter into a purchase power tolling agreement with Escondido Energy Center. This decision denies authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power, without prejudice to a renewed application for their approval, if amended to match the timing of the identified need, or upon a different showing of need. This proceeding is closed.

2. Background

The Commission's biennial procurement review process, established pursuant to Assembly Bill 57 (Stats. 2002, ch. 835), Decision (D.) 04-01-050 and D.04-12-048, requires that investor-owned electric utilities submit long-term procurement plans that serve as the basis for utility procurement activities until refinement during the next biennial planning cycle. Rulemaking (R.) 04-04-003 (the 2004 long-term procurement plan (LTPP)) undertook the first of the biennial procurement reviews and reviewed the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2005 to 2014. R.06-02-013 (the 2006 LTPP) undertook the second biennial procurement review and reviewed the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2007 to 2016.

D.07-12-052 (as modified by D.08-11-008), issued in the 2006 LTPP, identified a need for San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) to procure up to 530 megawatts (MW) by 2015 to meet its local capacity needs.

Because the 2006 LTPP had just concluded with the issuance of D.07-12-052 immediately before the institution of R.08-02-007 (the 2008 LTPP), the Commission determined that, rather than requiring the utilities to file new procurement plans, the 2008 LTPP would address a series of policy proposals to refine technical practices used to develop resource and procurement plans, and consider other procedural matters. Order Instituting Rulemaking 10-05-006 (the 2010 LTPP) closed R.08-02-007 and undertook the review of the utilities' long-term procurement plans for 2011 to 2020.

Meanwhile, on June 9, 2009, SDG&E issued a Request for Offers (RFO) to meet the local capacity requirement (LCR) that had been identified in the 2006 LTPP. Almost three years later on May 19, 2011, SDG&E brings this application for authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with the winning bidders for the Escondido Energy Center (45 MW), Pio Pico Energy Center (305 MW), and Quail Brush Power station (100 MW). The Escondido Energy Center is a repowering of an existing facility with a contract term of 25 years, while both Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Energy Project are new facilities with contract terms of 20 years.

After the prehearing conference (PHC) on July 14, 2011, the assigned Commissioner issued a scoping memo and ruling on July 29, 2011, identifying the issues to be determined by the Commission in resolving the application and setting a schedule for addressing those issues.

By unopposed joint motion filed October 13, 2011, SDG&E and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) requested a delay in the schedule of this application to await the issuance of the decision in the 2010 LTPP which, according to SDG&E and DRA, would address and inform issues of fact that are

common to both proceedings. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) granted the motion.

On January 18, 2012, the assigned Commissioners to the 2010 LTPP and this application issued a joint ruling delegating the issue of SDG&E's LCR need from the 2010 LTPP to this application in order to allow the opportunity to consider, in determining that need, the California Independent System Operator's (CAISO) expected report on its 2011/2012 transmission planning process, without unduly delaying the resolution of the issue to a later phase of the 2010 LTPP. Accordingly, after the conduct of a second PHC on January 31, 2012, to consider the schedule and process for taking the CAISO's report into consideration in this proceeding, the assigned Commissioner issued an amended scoping memo and ruling on March 12, 2012, amending the scope of issues to include the determination of SDG&E's LCR and amending the schedule of the proceeding.

The issues to be determined in the proceeding, as identified in the scoping memo (as amended), can be summarized as follows:

1. How much new generation, if any, does SDG&E require to meet its LCR for the planning horizon 2011 to 2020?
2. Is there a need for the Purchase Power Tolling Agreements (PPTA) to meet the LCR or for other reasons?
3. Are the PPTAs cost-effective and reasonable?
4. What is the appropriate rate treatment for the costs of the PPTAs?

Evidentiary hearings were held on June 19 through June 22, 2012. Parties filed opening briefs on July 13, 2012, and reply briefs on July 27, 2012, upon which the record was submitted.¹

3. Local Capacity Requirement

3.1. Spreadsheet Analyses

SDG&E conducted a spreadsheet analysis to forecast San Diego's LCR. This approach compares local area demand (taking into account forecasted peak load, transmission capacity to bring in resources from outside the area, and the contingent loss of the single largest transmission line and the single largest generator outage (an "N-1/G-1" contingency)) and comparing it to the available resources to meet it including existing supply resources, resource retirements, and proposed resource additions.

Based on its spreadsheet analysis, SDG&E forecasts an LCR need of 488 MW arising in 2018, increasing to 647 MW in 2020. (Ex. 11, Table 1, RA-5.) This analysis uses the 1-in-10 year peak load forecast from the "mid energy demand scenario" in the California Energy Demand (CED) forecast for 2012-2022,² and assumes, based on its independent assessment, 16 MW of RPS additions, 17 MW of additional demand-side combined heat and power (CHP) generation, 151 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency, 219 MW of demand response, and zero distributed generation by 2020.

¹ SDG&E's unopposed July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record are granted.

² SDG&E's prepared testimony relied on California Energy Commission (CEC) staff's "Revised CED Forecast 2012-2022," which was released in February 2012. (Ex. 11 at RA-6.) The CEC adopted that forecast as final on June 13, 2012 (except for a change to the forecasted mid-case 1-in-2 year peak load forecast). (SDG&E/Anderson, Tr. 277.)

DRA recommends against the use of spreadsheet LCR analyses in general because they are unduly simplistic comparisons of forecasted demand and resources as compared to the CAISO's "Once Through Cooling (OTC) Study" which use power flow and transient stability programs taking into account where supply and demand are located. (DRA opening brief at 13.) SDG&E does not offer an opinion on the relative merits of its spreadsheet analysis and the CAISO's OTC study, other than to note that its spreadsheet analysis results are consistent with the OTC study results with respect to the amount of LCR need and the year in which the need arises. (SDG&E reply brief at 6-7.)

We concur that the OTC study (subject to adjustment as discussed below), is more appropriate to the task at hand of determining local capacity reliability requirements. Accordingly, although DRA presented alternative spreadsheet analyses based on its own assumptions of "low need" and "high need" scenarios³ and the parties challenged many of SDG&E's input assumptions, we do not reach the relative merits of the input assumptions to the spreadsheet analyses, other than as they inform the merits of the OTC study as discussed below.

3.2. OTC Study

The CAISO presented its forecast of SDG&E's LCR based on the OTC study that it conducted, as part of its 2011/2012 transmission planning process, to analyze the LCR in the San Diego and San Diego/Imperial Valley areas in

³ Based on these assumptions, DRA's "high need" scenario forecasts an LCR surplus that diminishes over the 10-year planning horizon and culminates in a modest LCR need of 47 MW in 2020, while the "low need" scenario forecasts an LCR surplus that grows to 1155 MW in 2020. (Ex. 28.)

view of the recently-adopted State Water Resources Control Board rules that require affected OTC generation units to be retired, repowered, replaced, and/or retrofitted in order to improve coastal and estuarine environmental quality. The OTC study assumes the retirement of the Encina OTC units, and uses power flow and transient stability programs to evaluate mitigation measures (including load, potential transmission measures, potential demand side management and other contracted resources such as combined heat and power) needed to maintain zonal and local reliability in the event of the outage of the Imperial Valley-Suncrest portion of the Sunrise transmission line followed by the non-simultaneous loss of the ECO-Miguel portion of the Southwest Powerlink transmission line (an “N-1-1” contingency).

The OTC study evaluated the LCR for 2021 under the four Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) resource additions scenarios that were developed in the 2010 LTPP (2010 LTPP RPS scenarios).⁴ The OTC study does not model any forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response, or incremental CHP. (Ex. 17 at 15-17; CAISO/Sparks, Tr. 566-567.)⁵ On this basis, the OTC

⁴ The four RPS scenarios are the cost-constrained scenario, with 909 MW of RPS additions in the SDG&E service territory by 2020 (which the CAISO recommends as its base case); the trajectory scenario, with 508 MW; the environmentally-constrained scenario, with 317 MW; and the time-constrained scenario, with 74 MW. (Assigned Commissioner and ALJ’s Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling, December 3, 2010, R.10-05-006 (2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo), at 25-26, and February 10, 2011, ALJ Ruling, R.10-05-006, *inter alia*, amending the standardized planning assumptions.

⁵ California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) also objects to the OTC study for failing to model any potential future energy storage or transmission upgrades, or load shedding or other non-resource mitigation schemes. (CEJA opening brief at 19 and 24.) We are not persuaded that the LCR requirement should be determined on the basis of such potential eventualities.

study identified a local capacity requirement need in 2021 of 630 MW, 730 MW, 300 MW, and 540 MW, respectively, under the cost-constrained, trajectory, environmentally-constrained, and time-constrained scenarios, assuming the retirement of the Encina power station generating units (absent approval of the three PPTAs at issue in this proceeding). (Ex. 9 and Ex. 10.) Although it did not analyze LCR needs in prior years, the CAISO maintains that this need will start in early 2018. (CAISO opening brief at 4.)⁶

DRA recommends that we account for the fact that the OTC study models the LCR for 2021, which is outside of the planning horizon for this LTPP, by reducing the OTC study results by the forecasted increase in demand from 2020 to 2021 (76 MW), and for the fact that the OTC study does not take account of forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response by reducing the OTC study results by these amounts. (DRA opening brief at 23-24.)⁷

With respect to the failure to account for forecasted uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, the CAISO argues that the OTC study's modeling assumptions are consistent with the statutory requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 345.5 that the CAISO maintain the reliability of the transmission system, most notably by maximizing the efficiency of existing electric generation resources and evaluating cost efficient mitigation solutions to

⁶ It is not clear if the CAISO maintains that all, or only some, of this need will appear in 2018.

⁷ DRA and CEJA recommend additional adjustments to the OTC study results to account for challenges that they make to the CAISO's transmission operation protocols assumptions. (DRA opening brief at 31-35; CEJA reply brief, summary of recommendations.) We are not persuaded to adjust the CAISO's assumed transmission operation protocols, as these matters are within their jurisdiction.

reliability concerns under stressed conditions. (CAISO opening brief at 4-5.) The CAISO explains that, consistent with its statutory responsibility, it did not model uncommitted energy efficiency resources because it is uncertain whether those resources will be achieved and available. Similarly, it did not model incremental demand response because the CAISO does not equate demand response to dispatchable generation in terms of availability when and where needed for a specific megawatt quantity. (Ex. 27 at 2-6.) The CAISO further explains that it does not use “policy-driven” transmission upgrade assumptions for the purpose of assessing its transmission grid reliability and operational needs. (CAISO opening brief at 5.)

While we respect the CAISO’s statutory responsibility and its discretion to model its OTC study modeling based on assumptions that flow from it, the record of the proceeding highlights the limitations of our reliance on the OTC study for purposes of this Commission’s statutory responsibility to ensure just and reasonable rates by, among other things, limiting unnecessary ratepayer costs. For the Commission’s purposes, it is appropriate to take into account reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, as well as incremental demand-side CHP, in determining whether to authorize the procurement of additional generation resources. Such action is consistent with the California Energy Action Plan, which established the “loading order” for how new resources are prioritized.⁸ These resources can reasonably be expected

⁸ California’s principal energy agencies, including the Commission, joined to create the Energy Action Plan in 2003. This plan identifies specific goals and actions to ensure that adequate, reliable and reasonably-priced electrical power and natural gas supplies are achieved and provided through cost-effective and environmentally sound strategies.

to occur as a result of State and Commission policies, and to reduce LCR needs in the San Diego area.⁹

We recognize that subtracting these resources (or the incremental 2021 demand) from the OTC study results is a crude solution. The power flow study results do not correlate, MW for MW, to resource assumption inputs, as shown by the results under the four RPS scenarios. Nevertheless, in the absence of OTC study results that model reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, it is appropriate to otherwise account for them. In the absence of any record evidence of an alternative, and consistent with the approach taken in D.06-06-064 to account for demand response with respect to the utilities' local resource adequacy requirements (D.06-06-064 at 53-54), it is reasonable to subtract conservative forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response from the OTC study results for purposes of determining the LCR.

With respect to the mismatch of the OTC study "snapshot" of 2021 and the relevant planning horizon, we note that the 76 MW discrepancy between the 2020 and 2021 forecasted demand is relatively small. Further, the 149 MW discrepancy between the CED 2010-2020 and 2012-2022 demand forecasts of 1-in-10 year peak demand in 2020 would appear to (overly) compensate for the former discrepancy.¹⁰ Further yet, this overcompensation may be mitigated by the potential for undercounting uncommitted energy efficiency by virtue of

⁹ While uncommitted energy efficiency and incremental CHP will reduce demand, the Commission is also taking steps to "place [demand response] on equal footing with generation resources." (See D.12-04-045 at 16, 76-77.)

¹⁰ See Ex. 15, Attachment H.

excluding the impacts in changes to committed energy efficiency between the release of the two CED demand forecasts. On balance, given the uncertainties of these competing discrepancies and the crudity of the adjustment mechanism, it would be unreasonable to undertake additional adjustments to attempt to account for these mismatches.

CEJA argues that the OTC study's reliance on a 2.5% reserve margin is inconsistent with reserve requirements. (CEJA opening brief at 6-7.) Similarly, DRA and CEJA criticize the OTC study for failing to account for proposed future transmission system upgrades for the San Diego area (DRA opening brief at 29-30; CEJA opening brief at 16-17) and for failing to include load drop (DRA opening brief at 31, CEJA opening brief at 19). We are not persuaded that the LCR determination should be based on such potential eventualities.

Accordingly, we adjust the results of the OTC study by the forecast amounts of uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response and incremental demand-side CHP, as follows.

Uncommitted Energy Efficiency:

SDG&E's forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency, which culminates in 151 MW in 2020, is based on the "low savings scenario" of the CEC Preliminary Energy Demand Forecast 2012-2022 Draft Staff Report, dated August 2011. (Ex. 11 at RA-10.) As SDG&E concedes, its forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is conservative. (SDG&E reply brief at 4; Ex. 24 RA-5 through RA-7.)

DRA and CEJA object to the use of SDG&E's forecast on the basis that it deviates from the "Commission's" standardized planning assumptions in the 2010 LTPP (DRA opening brief at 7-12, CEJA opening brief at 33-34) and because updating those standardized planning assumptions is beyond the scope of this proceeding (DRA reply brief at 3). To the contrary, the Commission has not

adopted the standardized planning assumptions set forth in the 2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo (as amended by February 10, 2011, ALJ Ruling). The Commission's decision in the 2010 LTPP, D.12-04-046, merely approved a settlement of related issues and does not serve as precedent for the merits of those assumptions. (*See* Rule 12.5.) Furthermore, the 2010 LTPP issue of SDG&E's LCR was properly delegated to this proceeding by joint ruling of the assigned commissioners to the 2010 LTPP and this proceeding. To the extent that the resolution of this issue requires consideration of the merits of the standardized planning assumptions, it is properly before us now. In the absence of any substantive challenge to the reliability of the August 2011 report, it is reasonable to rely on it for purposes of forecasting uncommitted energy efficiency.

DRA points out that, while SDG&E based its forecast on the August 2011 report's low savings scenario, the mid savings scenario forecasts 288 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency for 2020, which is close to the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumption for uncommitted energy efficiency. (Ex. 15 at 14.) CEJA points out that SDG&E conservatively assumes there will be no savings from the Big Bold Energy Efficiency Strategies. (CEJA opening brief at 33.) While the low savings scenario forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is indisputably conservative, on balance it is appropriate to use this conservative forecast for the purpose of making the crude adjustment to the OTC study results.

Demand response:

SDG&E forecasted demand response consistent with the forecast underlying SDG&E's demand response programs that the Commission recently approved in D.12-04-045. (Ex. 11 at RA-10 through RA-11.)

CEJA objects to this forecast for deviating from the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions and as unduly conservative for failing to account for anticipated increases due to Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and other investments in technology. (CEJA opening brief at 32.) As discussed above with respect to uncommitted energy efficiency, the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions are not controlling, and it is appropriate to assume a conservative forecast of demand response for the purpose of making the crude adjustment to the OTC study results.

Additional Demand Side CHP:

We assume SDG&E's forecast of additional demand-side CHP. This forecast reasonably reflects current expectations of incremental resources. (Ex. 11 at RA-9 through 10; SDG&E/Anderson, Tr. 63-64.)

3.3. LCR Need

The OTC study identifies an LCR need ranging from 300 MW to 730 MW under the four 2010 RPS scenarios in 2021, without accounting for uncommitted energy efficiency or demand response. Imputing this 2021 LCR need to 2020, and accounting for uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response and combined heat and power by subtracting their forecasted amounts in 2020 (151 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency, 219 MW of demand response and 17 MW of additional demand-side combined heat and power) from the OTC study results for yields an LCR need in 2020 ranging from -87 MW (surplus) to 343 MW,¹¹ as follows:

¹¹ Although the CAISO recommends the results of the cost-constrained scenario as its base case (CAISO opening brief at 3), there is no record evidence for according different weights to the four RPS scenarios or their respective OTC study results.

	Environmentally-constrained	Time-constrained	Cost-constrained	Trajectory
OTC study result	300 MW	540 MW	630 MW	730 MW
Uncommitted energy efficiency, demand response and combined heat and power	387 MW	387 MW	387 MW	387 MW
LCR need	[87 MW]	153 MW	243 MW	343 MW

Although the OTC study does not identify the amount of LCR need that might arise prior to 2021, the record demonstrates that LCR need, if any, will begin to emerge in 2018 in the event that the Encina OTC units retire.

4. Need

4.1. Need for the PPTAs to meet the LCR

SDG&E procured the three PPTAs pursuant to D.07-12-052, as amended by D.08-11-008, which authorized SDG&E to procure 530 MW in order to meet local and system resource adequacy requirements beginning in 2015. Accordingly, the three PPTAs would add new capacity starting mid-2014.

As discussed above, we no longer find a need for additional resources to meet local and system resource adequacy requirements as soon as 2015. Under all record forecasts, whether as originally presented by the parties or as adjusted in this decision, there is no need for the new capacity represented by the PPTAs until early 2018, and then only under the assumption that the Encina OTC units retire. It would not be reasonable to pay for that excess capacity for four of the 20-year terms of the PPTAs associated with Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Energy Project. Accordingly, we deny approval of the Pio Pico Energy

Center and Quail Brush Energy Project PPTAs, without prejudice to a renewed application for their approval, if amended to match the timing of the identified need. For separate reasons discussed below, we approve the Escondido Energy Center.

Although SDG&E acknowledges that these PPTAs were originally solicited to meet the resource need identified in D.07-12-052, as amended by D.08-11-008, SDG&E asserts that these new generation resources are nevertheless needed to meet the Commission's directive in D.09-01-008 where, according to SDG&E's interpretation of the following sentence, it admonished SDG&E to avoid "just in time" procurement:

[W]e are also admonishing SDG&E to have adequate procedures in place to ensure that they do not again find themselves in a reliability crisis without sufficient time to follow the procurement protocols set forth in D.07-12-052.

(SDG&E opening brief at 3, citing to D.09-01-008 at 18.)

To the contrary and as elucidated by the subsequent sentence, the Commission did not criticize the fact that SDG&E found itself in a reliability crisis; rather, the Commission criticized SDG&E for failing to have procedures in place to be able to conduct a "fast track" RFO such that it circumvented the competitive solicitation process:

Specifically, SDG&E must institute internal mechanisms that are triggered when projects run into unanticipated delays or cancellations so that the utility can conduct a "fast track" RFO and procure needed reliability resources through the competitive solicitation process.

(*Id.* at 18-19.) This admonition does not stand for the proposition that a utility should intentionally procure excess capacity in order to avoid reliability crises, and we do not endorse that practice now. To the contrary, we expect SDG&E to

respond to this LCR need determination and procurement authorization by timely issuing an RFO and bringing an application for approval of its results.

SDG&E and the CAISO assert that it is necessary to approve these PPTAs now, in 2012, in order to ensure that needed capacity will be online in time to meet the need for it. (SDG&E opening brief at 7; CAISO opening brief at 28.) In support of this proposition, SDG&E cites to the Commission in D.07-12-052, wherein we stated:

Recent experience suggests that the time required to develop and carry out competitive long-term RFOs, then finance, permit and construct new generation resources – including a cushion to account for unanticipated delays – requires that these procurement decisions be made up to seven years in advance of when the resources are needed. (D.07-12-052 at 21.)

Paradoxically, the instant application disproves this expectation: Even with SDG&E taking nearly one and a half years to issue an RFO after securing clarification as to its procurement authority, and taking another two years to bring this application, the PPTA projects (if approved) would be operational in only two years -- six years from the time the Commission issued the modified procurement decision, D.08-11-008. Now, pursuant to our admonition in D.09-01-008, we expect SDG&E to respond to *this* procurement decision in a much more timely fashion, with adequate cushion to enable needed resources to come online within six years.

The CAISO asserts that the consequences of failing to bring new generation resources online in time are too great to risk because if the necessary generation resources do not materialize in time, it will be required to use its backstop Capacity Procurement Mechanism (CPM) procedures (if generation is even available), which will increase costs to ratepayers by requiring them to pay

both for resource adequacy capacity and CPM capacity. (CAISO opening brief at 28.) On balance, as between the certainty of four years of costs for unneeded capacity and the speculative possibility of a short-term local capacity requirement shortage and resulting CPM capacity costs, it is reasonable to procure resources based on the time of their need.

While it acknowledges that the issue is beyond the scope of the proceeding, SDG&E asserts that a prolonged outage of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) would increase the need for the generation resources represented by the PPTAs. (SDG&E opening brief at 20.) We take judicial notice of the fact that, as of this date, SONGS Units 2 and 3 are out of service.¹² In fact, the Commission recently opened Investigation (I.) 12-10-013 in this matter. However, and without prejudice to an application for approval of the PPTAs upon such a showing, there is no record evidence in this proceeding of the expected duration of the outage or its implications for SDG&E's system requirements. As stated above, the LCR determination we authorize is based on the assumption that the Encinca OTC units retire in 2018; with the outage at SONGS, this assumption may no longer be appropriate. We cannot, on this record, find that the PPTAs are needed to meet SDG&E's resource requirements as a result of SONGS' outage.

SDG&E asserts that the generation resources represented by the PPTAs are needed to support renewable resources integration. (SDG&E opening brief at 23-25.) To the contrary, the Commission has yet to determine the particular

¹² <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/event-status/reactor-status/ps.html>.

operational characteristics of resources that are needed to support renewable resources integration or to set procurement targets for them. This issue is currently before the Commission in the 2012 LTPP. (See R.12-03-014.) We cannot, on this record, find that the PPTAs are needed to support renewable resources integration.

For all these reasons, we direct SDG&E to procure up to 298 MW of local capacity to come on-line beginning in 2018. This authorization is the equivalent of the high end of the range presented by the four scenarios (343 MW), less the 45 MW associated with Escondido Energy Center. As discussed previously, SDG&E may seek to meet this need using either the Quail Brush Energy Project or the Pio Pico Energy Center, if the proposed PPTAs are amended to correspond to the identified need. Otherwise, SDG&E should expeditiously issue an RFO for this need recognizing, as bidders must likewise, that when it brings an application for approval of the RFO results, we will take into consideration material intervening events and circumstances. The timing of the RFO should coordinate with the anticipated retirement of Encina and other changing conditions in SDG&E's service territory, as appropriate.

4.2. Need for the Escondido Energy Center PPTA for Other Reasons

In the above section, we deny without prejudice the requested authority to enter into PPTAs for Quail Brush Energy Project and Pio Pico Energy Center. We now turn our attention to the Escondido Energy Center. This project is a 45 MW repower of an existing facility. In its initial application, SDG&E contends that there are no incremental transmission impacts associated with the power delivered under this PPTA and that there are negligible environmental impacts due to its co-location with an existing facility.

Unlike the other two projects, this project is a repowering of an existing facility. The Commission has a history of encouraging the increased efficiency and repowering of existing facilities.¹³ The repowered facility can take advantage of existing natural gas connections and will have relatively lower emissions associated with the energy. In addition, the Escondido Energy Center PPTA can come online relatively soon, since the facility has already received its “authority to construct” and thus has very high viability, since previous owners had begun the process to repower the site.¹⁴ The PPTA has a longer contractual term (25 years) than the other two PPTAs. Given the differences in the time horizons, ratepayers can more fully benefit from the project. In its opening brief, DRA is mostly supportive of the Escondido Energy Center, indicating that the Commission should approve it if the Commission were to approve any of the PPTAs. Overall, we agree with DRA. On balance, we think that it is reasonable to approve the Escondido Energy Center PPTA given the project’s relatively small size, high viability, long contractual term and environmental benefits associated with repowering existing facilities.

5. Contract Reasonableness and Cost Allocation

We now turn our attention to contract reasonableness and associated cost allocation for the Escondido Energy Center PPTA. In its opening brief, SDG&E represents that it fully complied with the Commission’s policies in the execution of the PPTA. We agree that the PPTA was executed as a result of a competitive solicitation and utilized the Procurement Review Group and the Independent

¹³ See D.07-012-052.

¹⁴ See Anderson Testimony at 45.

Evaluator, as appropriate. SDG&E further contends that “no party has questioned SDG&E’s selection of the winners of the competitive RFO process.” (See SDG&E’s Opening Brief, at 26.) Overall, we agree that the costs associated with the Escondido Energy Center PPTA are just and reasonable.

SDG&E seeks to establish a Local Generation Balancing Account in order to record the costs associated with this PPTA. SDG&E requests that disposition of the Local Generation Balancing Account balance take place in its Energy Resource Recovery Account proceeding. No party objects to the creation of this balancing account, and therefore we grant the request.

SDG&E also seeks to create a Local Generation Charge as an on-bill charge, on a non-bypassable basis, for the costs associated with this PPTA among all utility and non-utility customers in its service territory. SDG&E requests that the Local Generation Charge be created for recovery of new generation, consistent with the Cost Allocation Mechanism (CAM), as recently updated in D.11-05-005. SDG&E requests the Local Generation Charge to fund the Local Generation Balancing Account; SDG&E contends that the Local Generation Charge is necessary because the Energy Resource Recovery Account is limited to bundled customers. SDG&E does note that D.11-05-005 identified a number of issues regarding the full implementation of the CAM which will be resolved in a separate proceeding and does not seek to resolve those matters in this Application. In their opening briefs, Western Power Trading Forum, Direct Access Customer Coalition and Alliance for Retail Energy Markets jointly object to the creation of the Local Generation Charge until further Commission action is taken. After considering parties’ positions, on balance, we find that further Commission action is necessary before we decide whether to create the requested Local Generation Charge. We therefore defer consideration of the Local

Generation Charge. After the Commission has taken appropriate further action, SDG&E may come back to the Commission for any additional direction needed to obtain final determinations regarding allocation of cost recovery for the PPTA. Unless modified by further Commission action, recovery of the costs recorded in the Local Generation Balancing Account will be limited to bundled customers in SDG&E's distribution service area, on an equal per kilowatt-hour basis by customer class, and therefore can be appropriately addressed in the Energy Resource Recovery Account proceeding.

Last, SDG&E seeks cost recovery associated with Financial Accounting Standards Board Interpretation No. 46(R) consolidation and debt equivalence issues in its next cost of capital proceeding. We note that in SDG&E's current cost of capital proceeding, Application 12-06-016, the Commission is considering this request. Therefore, we do not prejudge the outcome here in this decision.

6. Comments on Alternate Proposed Decision

The alternate proposed decision of Commissioner Ferron in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on _____, and reply comments were filed on _____ by _____.

7. Assignment of Proceeding

Mark J. Ferron is the assigned Commissioner and Hallie Yacknin is the assigned ALJ and presiding officer in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The Quail Brush Energy Project and the Pio Pico Energy Center PPTAs would require SDG&E to begin purchasing capacity in 2014, and to continue to purchase capacity over the PPTAs' 20-year terms.

2. The Escondido Energy Center PPTA is a 45 MW repower at an existing facility, which has a contract term of 25 years.
3. There is no LCR need until 2018 under any scenario or forecast in the record of this proceeding, and then only if the Encina OTC units retire.
4. The OTC study uses power flow analysis, which allows for a more sophisticated analysis of resource needs than a spreadsheet analysis of resources and need.
5. The CAISO's OTC study did not model forecasted additions of uncommitted energy efficiency or demand response, or incremental CHP.
6. SDG&E's forecast of demand response takes account of the Commission's recent decision approving SDG&E's demand response programs in D.12-04-045; the 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumptions do not reflect this.
7. SDG&E's forecast of uncommitted energy efficiency is based on the "low savings scenario" of the CEC Preliminary Energy Demand Forecast 2012-2022 Draft Staff Report, dated August 2011, which is a conservative assessment of whether these resources are certain to materialize; this forecast is more current than 2010 LTPP standardized planning assumption for demand response.
8. SDG&E forecast 17 MW of incremental demand-side CHP, based on its independent assessment.
9. The California Energy Action Plan established the "loading order" for how new resources are prioritized.
10. The OTC study results, adjusted for uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response and for incremental CHP, show an LCR need in 2021 ranging from -87 MW (surplus) to 343 MW.
11. To the extent that there is a forecasted LCR need, it arises in 2018.
12. There is no record evidence of the relative merits of the four RPS scenarios.

13. There is no record evidence of the impact of a prolonged SONGS outage on SDG&E's LCR need.

14. There is no record evidence of the relative merits of various operational characteristics of resources that are needed to support renewable resources integration or procurement targets for such resources.

15. After receiving conditional procurement authority in December 2007, and confirmation of that procurement authority in November 2008, SDG&E issued an RFO in June 2009, and brought this application for approval of its results in May 2011.

16. The Quail Brush Energy Project and the Pio Pico Energy Center PPTAs would add new capacity beginning in 2014.

17. The Commission has a history of encouraging the increased efficiency and repowering of existing facilities.

18. The Escondido Energy Center PPTA can utilize existing natural gas connections, and after repowering, will result in environmental benefits, including lower emissions associated with the energy.

19. The Escondido Energy Center PPTA was executed as a result of a competitive solicitation.

20. SDG&E fully complied with the Commission's procurement policies, including use of the Procurement Review Group and the Independent Evaluator, when executing the Escondido Energy Center PPTA.

21. The costs associated with the Escondido Energy Center PPTA are just and reasonable.

22. Further Commission action on refining the Cost Allocation Mechanism is necessary before creating the Local Generation Charge can be considered.

23. It is reasonable to have the Local Generation Balancing Account be limited to bundled customers until the Commission takes further action refining the CAM and considers the creation of the Local Generation Charge.

Conclusions of Law

1. It is not reasonable to authorize the Quail Brush Energy Project and the Pio Pico Energy Center PPTAs to purchase local capacity beginning in 2014, when there is no need to for incremental local capacity until 2018, four years into the 20-year terms of the PPTAs.

2. It is reasonable to authorize the Escondido Energy Center PPTA for 25 years given the project's relative small size, high viability and environmental benefits resulting from its repower.

3. In the absence of a power flow modeling study for the relevant planning horizon, it is reasonable to impute that the OTC study results for 2021 will occur in 2020.

4. In the absence of a power flow modeling study that models these resources, it is reasonable to account for conservative but reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response and for incremental CHP by subtracting them from the results of the OTC study.

5. The CAISO's modeling assumptions, other than with respect to uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response and incremental CHP, are reasonable.

6. SDG&E's forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response are conservative but reasonable.

7. SDG&E's forecast of incremental CHP is reasonable.

8. It is reasonable to authorize SDG&E to procure up to 298 MW of local generation capacity to come on-line beginning in 2018, as coordinated with the

anticipated retirement of Encina or other changing conditions in its service territory.

9. SDG&E's unopposed July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record should be granted.

10. It is reasonable for SDG&E to create and utilize a Local Generation Balancing Account to record the costs of the Escondido Energy Center PPTA.

11. The Local Generation Balancing Account should be applied to all bundled customers in SDG&E's service area, on an equal per kilowatt-hour basis by customer class.

12. All other pending motions should be deemed denied.

13. Application 11-05-023 should be closed.

14. This order should be effective immediately.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. San Diego Gas & Electric Company's request for authority to enter into a purchase power tolling agreement with Escondido Energy Center is approved.

2. San Diego Gas & Electric Company's request for authority to enter into purchase power tolling agreements with Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Energy Project is denied without prejudice.

3. San Diego Gas & Electric Company is authorized to issue a request for offers to meet a local capacity requirement need of up to 298 MW beginning in 2018. San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall adjust the timing of the request for offers, as appropriate, to coordinate with the anticipated retirement of Encina and other changing conditions in its service territory.

4. San Diego Gas & Electric Company's July 9, 2012, and August 15, 2012, motions to supplement the evidentiary record are granted.

5. San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall create a Local Generation Balancing Account for the Escondido Energy Center. The Local Generation Balancing Account shall be applied to bundled customers in San Diego Gas & Electric Company's service area, on an equal per kilowatt-hour basis by customer class.

6. All pending motions that are not otherwise granted in this order are deemed denied.

7. Application 11-05-023 is closed.

This order is effective immediately.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.



**BEFORE THE ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
1516 NINTH STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
1-800-822-6228 – WWW.ENERGY.CA.GOV**

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR THE
QUAIL BRUSH GENERATION PROJECT**

**DOCKET NO. 11-AFC-03
PROOF OF SERVICE
(Revised 11/19/2012)**

APPLICANT

Cogentrix Energy, LLC
C. Richard "Rick" Neff, Vice President
Environmental, Health & Safety
9405 Arrowpoint Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28273
rickneff@kogentrix.com

Cogentrix Energy, LLC
John Collins, VP Development
Lori Ziebart, Project Manager
Quail Brush Generation Project
9405 Arrowpoint Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28273
johncollins@kogentrix.com
loriziebart@kogentrix.com

APPLICANT'S CONSULTANTS

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Connie Farmer
Sr. Environmental Project Manager
143 Union Boulevard, Suite 1010
Lakewood, CO 80228
connie.farmer@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Barry McDonald
VP Solar Energy Development
17885 Von Karmen Avenue, Ste. 500
Irvine, CA 92614-6213
barry.mcdonald@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech EC, Inc.
Sarah McCall
Sr. Environmental Planner
143 Union Boulevard, Suite 1010
Lakewood, CO 80228
sarah.mccall@tetrattech.com

COUNSEL FOR APPLICANT

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Ella Foley Gannon
Camarin Madigan
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
ella.gannon@bingham.com
camarin.madigan@bingham.com

INTERVENORS

Roslind Varghese
9360 Leticia Drive
Santee, CA 92071
roslindv@gmail.com

Rudy Reyes
8655 Graves Avenue, #117
Santee, CA 92071
reyes2777@hotmail.com

Dorian S. Houser
7951 Shantung Drive
Santee, CA 92071
dhouser@cox.net

Kevin Brewster
8502 Mesa Heights Road
Santee, CA 92071
lzpup@yahoo.com

Phillip M. Connor
Sunset Greens Home Owners
Association
8752 Wahl Street
Santee, CA 92071
connorphil48@yahoo.com

Mr. Rob Simpson, CEO
Helping Hand Tools
1901 First Avenue, Suite 219
San Diego, CA 92101
rob@redwoodrob.com

*Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter
Robert W. Wright
c/o Law Office of Robert W. Wright
716 Castro Street
Solana Beach, CA 92075
bob.wright@mac.com

HomeFed Fanita Rancho, LLC
Jeffrey A. Chine
Heather S. Riley
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble
Mallory & Natsis LLP
501 West Broadway, 15th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101
jchine@allenmatkins.com
hriley@allenmatkins.com
jkaup@allenmatkins.com
vhoy@allenmatkins.com

Preserve Wild Santee
Van Collinsworth
9222 Lake Canyon Road
Santee, CA 92071
savefanita@cox.net

Center for Biological Diversity
John Buse
Aruna Prabhala
351 California Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104
jbuse@biologicaldiversity.org
aprabhala@biologicaldiversity.org

INTERESTED AGENCIES

California ISO
e-recipient@caiso.com

City of Santee
Department of Development Services
Melanie Kush
Director of Planning
10601 Magnolia Avenue, Bldg. 4
Santee, CA 92071
mkush@ci.santee.ca.us

*indicates change

INTERESTED AGENCIES (cont.)

Morris E. Dye
Development Services Dept.
City of San Diego
1222 First Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101
mdye@sandiego.gov

Mindy Fogg
Land Use Environmental Planner
Advance Planning
County of San Diego
Department of Planning & Land Use
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123
mindy.fogg@sdcountry.ca.gov

**ENERGY COMMISSION –
DECISIONMAKERS**

KAREN DOUGLAS
Commissioner and
Presiding Member
karen.douglas@energy.ca.gov

ANDREW McALLISTER
Commissioner and
Associate Member
andrew.mcallister@energy.ca.gov

Raoul Renaud
Hearing Adviser
raoul.renaud@energy.ca.gov

Eileen Allen
Commissioners' Technical
Adviser for Facility Siting
eileen.allen@energy.ca.gov

Galen Lemei
Advisor to Commissioner Douglas
galen.lemei@energy.ca.gov

Jennifer Nelson
Advisor to Commissioner Douglas
jennifer.nelson@energy.ca.gov

David Hungerford
Advisor to Commissioner McAllister
david.hungerford@energy.ca.gov

Pat Saxton
Advisor to Commissioner McAllister
patrick.saxton@energy.ca.gov

ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF

Eric Solorio
Project Manager
eric.solorio@energy.ca.gov

Stephen Adams
Staff Counsel
stephen.adams@energy.ca.gov

**ENERGY COMMISSION –
PUBLIC ADVISER**

Jennifer Jennings
Public Adviser's Office
publicadviser@energy.ca.gov

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I, JOHN T. KAUP, declare that on December 3, 2012 I served and filed copies of the attached STATUS REPORT OF INTERVENOR HOMEFED FANITA RANCHO, LLC, dated December 3, 2012. This document is accompanied by the most recent Proof of Service list, located on the web page for this project at: <http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/quailbrush/index.html>.

The document has been sent to the other parties in this proceeding (as shown on the Proof of Service list) and to the Commission's Docket Unit or Chief Counsel, as appropriate, in the following manner:

(Check all that Apply)

For service to all other parties:

- Served electronically to all e-mail addresses on the Proof of Service list;
- Served by delivering on this date, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to the name and address of the person served, for mailing that same day in the ordinary course of business; that the envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on that date to those addresses marked ***"hard copy required"** or where no e-mail address is provided.

AND

For filing with the Docket Unit at the Energy Commission:

- by sending an electronic copy to the e-mail address below (preferred method); **OR**
- by depositing an original and 12 paper copies in the mail with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION – DOCKET UNIT
Attn: Docket No. 11-AFC-03
1516 Ninth Street, MS-4
Sacramento, CA 95814-5512
docket@energy.ca.gov

OR, if filing a Petition for Reconsideration of Decision or Order pursuant to Title 20, § 1720:

- Served by delivering on this date one electronic copy by e-mail, and an original paper copy to the Chief Counsel at the following address, either personally, or for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service with first class postage thereon fully prepaid:

California Energy Commission
Michael J. Levy, Chief Counsel
1516 Ninth Street MS-14
Sacramento, CA 95814
michael.levy@energy.ca.gov

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, that I am employed in the county where this mailing occurred, and that I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the proceeding.

John T. Kaup

John T. Kaup