

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
Transmission, LLC for a Certificate of Public  
Convenience and Necessity for the Ten West  
Link Project

Application 16-10-012

**RESPONSE TO PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF  
DIRECT TESTIMONY SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION.**

Roger E. Collanton  
General Counsel  
Anthony Ivancovich  
Deputy General Counsel  
Anna A. McKenna  
Assistant General Counsel  
Jordan Pinjuv  
Senior Counsel  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation  
250 Outcropping Way  
Folsom California 95630  
Tel.: (916) 351-4429  
[jpjuv@caiso.com](mailto:jpjuv@caiso.com)

Date: February 26, 2020

## Table of Contents

I. Introduction .....	1
II. Clarification of Terminology.....	2
III. Statement of Facts .....	3
IV. Cal Advocates Motion to Strike Should be Denied.....	6
A. The CAISO Elected to Comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) by Making the Model Available to Cal Advocates.....	7
B. The CAISO Is Open to Exploring the Option to Engage an External Computing Service to Conduct Cal Advocates' Proposed Modeling Runs.....	9
V. Cal Advocates Requested Runs are Extremely Burdensome.....	9
VI. Conclusion.....	11

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
Transmission, LLC for a Certificate of Public  
Convenience and Necessity for the Ten West  
Link Project

Application 16-10-012

**RESPONSE TO PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF  
DIRECT TESTIMONY SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION.**

**I. Introduction**

The Public Advocates Office's motion to strike rests on a misinterpretation of the Commission's Computer Model and Database Access discovery rule and a mischaracterization of the parties' meet and confer process leading up to its motion. The California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) has at all times been, and continues to be, willing to work with the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) to meet its reasonable computer modeling needs. Cal Advocates is not, however, permitted to compel the CAISO to perform the extremely burdensome computer runs it requested for the first time only 10 days before it filed the motion to strike. Rule 10.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure identifies three options for computer model discovery and unequivocally gives the sponsoring party—in this case the CAISO—the option to decide which option it will use. The CAISO selected the option where it provides its proprietary computer model to Cal Advocates so Cal Advocates can do runs on its own computer, and it did so on timely basis, notwithstanding Cal Advocates' claim to the contrary. The CAISO has already produced most of its model to Cal Advocates and committed to produce the remainder.

Cal Advocates seems to take the position that the CAISO must either do the computer runs itself or both give Cal Advocates its model and then also pay the cost for Cal Advocates to secure the commercially available software program used to run the CAISO's model. This is not what the Commission's Rules require and, if adopted, would impose a severe and unwarranted burden on the CAISO. As the Commission is aware, the CAISO is a not-for-profit entity that has no financial interest in any of the projects on which it provides analysis and testimony. There is

no basis to impose this additional burden, which would in turn be borne by the ratepayers of the CAISO.

CAISO does not object if Cal Advocates needs a reasonable amount of time to secure the necessary software and to perform its computer modeling before serving its responsive testimony in this proceeding. The Commission should, however, deny the motion to strike and allow the parties to continue moving forward under the discovery option CAISO has selected.

## **II. Clarification of Terminology**

The CAISO briefly clarifies the terminology used in this response and in the CAISO's transmission planning process. To conduct its economic transmission planning analysis, the CAISO conducts a production cost simulation based on a full network model of the CAISO transmission system (Production Cost Model). The CAISO builds the Production Cost Model based on the actual physical characteristics of the transmission system. The Production Cost Model is the CAISO's proprietary model and is one of two components to the CAISO's model. The CAISO provided its proprietary Production Cost Model to Cal Advocates in response to Cal Advocates Data Request DCRT-002 on January 3, 2020.

In the CAISO's transmission planning process and its direct testimony filed in this proceeding, the CAISO uses GridView, a commercially available computer software program sold by ABB, to conduct its production cost simulation using the CAISO's Production Cost Model.<sup>1</sup> The GridView software is widely used for transmission planning purposes and is specifically used to store and maintain the Western Electricity Coordinating Council's anchor data set. The CAISO contracts with ABB, the owner of the GridView software, as a licensee, to use the GridView software. Unlike the Production Cost Model, the GridView software is not part of the CAISO's computer model. It is standard computer software that anyone can purchase to conduct their own production cost simulation. In addition, entities can pay to obtain a GridView software license that allows use for consulting purposes. Although CAISO is not willing to pay for a GridView license for Cal Advocates, it is willing to work with the Commission and Cal Advocates to determine how to most efficiently compensate for Cal Advocates' access to the GridView software, as discussed in more detail below.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal Advocates is an active participant in the CAISO's annual transmission planning process and thus is well aware of this approach.

Separately, the CAISO uses production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets (Calculation Spreadsheets), using Microsoft Excel, to tabulate the production cost benefits that are calculated using the outputs of the GridView software. These Calculation Spreadsheets are proprietary to the CAISO, and the CAISO has informed Cal Advocates that it will provide these spreadsheets, pursuant to the appropriate confidentiality agreements, by February 28, 2020. Together, the Production Cost Model and the Calculation Spreadsheets constitute the CAISO's Model, as that term is used in Rule 10.4(d).

### **III. Statement of Facts**

Cal Advocates' motion contains multiple factual misrepresentations that require clarification. Most notably, the CAISO previously advised Cal Advocates that it will provide full access to the CAISO Model pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2) and has already provided access to its Production Cost Model. At the February 18, 2020, meeting between Cal Advocates and CAISO representatives—three days before Cal Advocates filed its Motion to Strike—the CAISO indicated that it had already made the Production Cost Model available to Cal Advocates and would make the Calculation Spreadsheets available by February 28, 2020, for Cal Advocates to execute its own runs, pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2). At that time, Cal Advocates did not argue or suggest that this approach would somehow fail to comply with Rule 10.4.<sup>2</sup> Instead, Cal Advocates stated its intent to request an additional three months to acquire and train on the GridView software, run the model itself, and prepare its direct testimony.<sup>3</sup>

Despite what the CAISO perceived to be further productive discussions with Cal Advocates on the morning of February 20, 2020,<sup>4</sup> during a subsequent telephone conversation later that day between Mr. Como, Ms. Purchia and Mr. Pinjuv, Cal Advocates claimed for the first time that the CAISO had failed to comply with Rule 10.4. CAISO's counsel, Mr. Pinjuv, immediately disputed this assertion, and the CAISO takes exception to any suggestion that it has

---

<sup>2</sup> See CAISO Exhibit 1, Declarations of Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeff Billinton, Robert Sparks, Yi Zhang and Nebiyu Yimer.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> On February 20, 2020, in a telephone conversation between Mr. Como and Mr. Pinjuv, the CAISO reminded the Cal Advocates of the possibility of engaging a third-party consultant to assist Cal Advocates in executing its runs and also indicated that the GridView software vendor, ABB, provides this service. The CAISO suggested this as a means to address the schedule concerns expressed by Cal Advocates, notwithstanding the fact that those scheduling concerns were the result of Cal Advocates' actions, not the actions of the CAISO.

not complied with Rule 10.4. The CAISO specifically and clearly noted that it intended to comply by making the CAISO Model available pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2). Cal Advocates' motion mischaracterizes this conversation by wrongly asserting that the CAISO stated that it would "elect not to comply with any of the choices under Rule 10.4(d)." <sup>5</sup> To the contrary, the CAISO has consistently maintained that it will comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) by making the CAISO Model available for Cal Advocates to run its own analysis and in fact, has already provided much of this material to Cal Advocates. The CAISO never agreed to execute the Cal Advocates' runs (*i.e.*, option (d)(1) in rule 10.4), and there is no requirement under the Rule 10.4(d) that the CAISO do so given that it clearly stipulates that it is the sponsoring party's discretion to select one of the three options.

Until the afternoon of February 20, 2020, contrary to Cal Advocates' assertions, the CAISO believed that Cal Advocates could and would execute its own runs using the CAISO's Production Cost Model, as the Cal Advocates attorney indicated at the November 4, 2019 prehearing conference. At that hearing, Cal Advocates' counsel stated that "as soon as we [Cal Advocates] can get information out of both the applicant and CAISO, we will work with them diligently in a good faith to try ***to generate our own product.***" <sup>6</sup> (emphasis added). Furthermore, in arguing for an extended period for Cal Advocates to prepare its opening testimony, Mr. Como explained that Cal Advocates needed "to do the economic analysis of the CAISO's work as well as DCRT's work and ***do our own analysis as well.*** It is a very data crunching process with a lot of iterations, and we want that to go along, and we're not going to sit on our hands waiting for something." <sup>7</sup> (emphasis added.)

Despite these representations, Cal Advocates waited until February 10, 2020 to make its request for the CAISO to run its preferred scenarios—nearly two full months after the CAISO submitted its direct testimony. Furthermore, Cal Advocates' February 10, 2020 request simply assumed that the CAISO would elect option (d)(1) of Rule 10.4. As the Commission's rules make clear, the CAISO has three options under Rule 10.4 to either: (1) conduct the runs itself, (2) make the model available to Cal Advocates to run on its own computer, or (3) have the model run by an external computer service. <sup>8</sup> The rule clearly stipulates that it is the sponsoring party's

---

<sup>5</sup> February 20, 2020 afternoon telephone call between Mr. Como, Ms. Purchia and Mr. Pinjuv.

<sup>6</sup> Prehearing Conference Transcript p. 43:13-16.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 43:6-12.

<sup>8</sup> Rule 10.4(d)(1)-(3).

right to elect one of the three options, and there is no indication in the rule that the requesting party can force the sponsoring party into choosing whichever option the requesting party may prefer.

The CAISO recognizes that Cal Advocates apparently assumed that the CAISO would opt to do the runs itself, but it had no basis for making this assumption. As Cal Advocates notes, Mr. Como sent CAISO counsel a three-line email stating that it would “be sending you input assumptions for CAISO to run in your gridview [sic] model for 10 West Links [sic]. Please expect that in the next two weeks.”<sup>9</sup> This email, however, merely reflects Cal Advocates’ presumption of which option the CAISO would select, not the CAISO’s actual election. At no time did the CAISO indicate its agreement to select that option, nor does Cal Advocates provide any evidence suggesting otherwise. Indeed, given that Mr. Como’s email lacked any context or information regarding the scope or content of the requested runs, the CAISO did not have the basic information it needed to evaluate which option would be most feasible. Cal Advocates did not provide any further information that would have enabled such a determination until February 10, 2020, a full month later, when it finally provided the actual modeling requests.

On Friday, February 7, 2020, Ms. Purchia and Mr. Pinjuv had a telephone conversation regarding Cal Advocates’ imminent 10.4(d) modeling request. As follow up to this conversation, Ms. Purchia sent an email to Mr. Pinjuv indicating that Cal Advocates would “indicate in our request that CAISO wishes to exercise its option to run the computer modeling on its own.”<sup>10</sup> Three minutes later, Mr. Pinjuv clarified by email noting “I need to confirm with my team exactly how we will handle this request.”<sup>11</sup> As a further follow up, on Monday, February 10, the CAISO specifically explained that it could not determine which option it would elect under Rule 10.4(d) until after it had actually seen and reviewed Cal Advocates’ requests. In an email to Ms. Purchia, Mr. Pinjuv explained that:

given that Rule 10.4(d) provides that the access to the model will be provided at the election of the sponsoring party, I don't think we need to determine that before you send the request. Also, seeing your request in writing would help us determine how to respond.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See Cal Advocates Attachment 3 to Motion to Strike.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> See CAISO Exhibit 2: Email from Mr. Pinjuv to Ms. Purchia

This exchange provides clear evidence that the CAISO did not agree to conduct modeling runs on behalf of Cal Advocates to comply with Rule 10.4(d). Cal Advocates motion notably fails to include this final email response from the CAISO.

CAISO reviewed the requests received on February 10, 2020 and, within the five business days required under Rule 10.4(f), notified Cal Advocates that it would instead provide its Model to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2). Cal Advocates incorrectly mischaracterizes the CAISO's response as late by referring to calendar days, rather than the five business day period expressly specified in Rule 10.4.<sup>13</sup> The CAISO first notified Cal Advocates that it would comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) by making its Model available for Cal Advocates to run during a February 14, 2020 telephone call.<sup>14</sup> Subsequently, the CAISO reiterated its election during the February 18, 2020 conference call with Cal Advocates and CAISO representatives. Both of these communications were within the five-business day period required by Rule 10.4(f). During the February 18 conference call, the CAISO also noted that the GridView software the CAISO uses to run the production cost simulation is commercially available.

These facts are indisputable. The only issue regarding this matter is to determine how Cal Advocates will run the production cost simulation, and how the Commission will manage compensation for use of the commercially available GridView software. Once the access and compensation issues are addressed, the CAISO would not oppose a reasonable extension of the procedural schedule to allow Cal Advocates adequate time to conduct its modeling runs and prepared testimony.

#### **IV. Cal Advocates Motion to Strike Should be Denied.**

Cal Advocates Motion to Strike should be denied, because the CAISO has complied with the requirements of Rule 10.4(d) by making its proprietary Model available and has been more than helpful in suggesting means by which Cal Advocates may access the commercially available GridView software.

Cal Advocates reading of Rule 10.4 is improper and would put the CAISO and any similarly situated party in an untenable position. Rule 10.4(d) provides as follows:

(d) If a party requests access to a computer model, the sponsoring party, may at its election, either

---

<sup>13</sup> The CAISO notes that Monday, February 17, 2020 was Presidents' Day, a federal and state holiday.

<sup>14</sup> February 14, 2020 telephone call between Ms. Purchia and Mr. Pinjuv.



- (1) make the requested runs on its own computer,
- (2) make the model available to the requesting party to run on that party's own computer, or
- (3) have the requested model run produced for the requesting party by an external computer service

The CAISO is entitled to choose which option it will use and is not required to pay Cal Advocates, or any other party, for the cost of purchasing commercially available software that is used to run its model.

**A. The CAISO Elected to Comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) by Making the Model Available to Cal Advocates.**

The CAISO sought to comply with Rule 10.4 by making the CAISO Model available to the Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d). Cal Advocates' claims that this constitutes non-compliance, presumably because the CAISO has not offered to pay for Cal Advocates' license to use the GridView software, a computer program that is commercially available and not proprietary to the CAISO. The CAISO has used ABB's GridView software for its transmission modeling since 2006, and Cal Advocates (and its predecessors) have been active participants in the CAISO's annual transmission planning processes. The CAISO uses this program specifically because it is commercially available and widely used in the industry. This allows stakeholders participating in the CAISO's transmission planning process to run their own modeling using the same program that the CAISO uses. Cal Advocates and its consultant in this proceeding, Flynn RCI, are regular participants in the CAISO's transmission planning process and should be well aware that the CAISO has historically used GridView software to conduct production cost modeling.

The GridView software is available to Cal Advocates, its consultant, and any other party that requests access. However, because ABB owns the GridView software, it is available at a cost to licensees. The CAISO maintains a license to use GridView for its transmission planning purposes. The CAISO's license specifically limits the CAISO to using the GridView software only for its own studies. The license also forbids the CAISO from selling, assigning, leasing or otherwise transferring the software to any third-party. Other consultants can obtain a license that allows use on behalf of third parties, but because the CAISO does not conduct consulting for other entities, it does not maintain such a consulting license.

The CAISO notes that the use of widely used commercially-available software has addressed many of the historical concerns regarding transparency and access to planning tools. The CAISO uses commercially available products in planning processes, and provides access to the models themselves through its Market Participant Portal to address access and transparency concerns throughout its transmission planning processes. Accordingly, the CAISO does not employ proprietary in-house software programs that parties would need to run the models posted through its annual transmission planning processes, nor in developing the testimony in this proceeding.

Cal Advocates position seems to indicate that a Rule 10.4 sponsoring party must either (1) conduct modeling runs on behalf of any other requesting party to a proceeding or (2) pay for all requesting parties' access to otherwise commercially available computer software. This is an untenable position for any sponsoring party, and is not consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 1822, the enabling legislation for Commission Rule 10.4.

Section 1822(e) requires the Commission to “establish appropriate procedures for determining the appropriate level of compensation for a party’s access” to computer models. This language anticipates that access to computer programs can be costly and that it may not be appropriate to require the sponsoring party to pay for everything that the requesting party may need to perform its own analysis of another party’s computer model. This language also makes clear that part of the Commission’s role is to manage the costs of modeling requests and achieve an appropriate balance. In this case, Cal Advocates’ costs are directly covered by the applicant (DCR Transmission, LLC). The applicant must then have its total project costs approved by the Commission in this proceeding. Having the applicant/Cal Advocates bear the cost of the applicable software is thus appropriate, as it provides transparency to the Commission to review whether the costs were worthwhile and it ensures that the applicant will ultimately pay for and eventually recover the modeling costs as part of the overall project costs.

Similarly, if parties other than Cal Advocates request modeling, the Commission is in the best position to manage potential modeling costs, especially if such requesting parties apply for intervenor compensation. In that context, the Commission will have the opportunity to review the modeling costs and to determine whether costs were appropriate and contributed to the outcome of the proceeding.

In contrast, Cal Advocates' reading of Rule 10.4(d) would allow any requesting party to force the CAISO to either (1) model individual requested modeling runs itself or (2) pay for access to otherwise commercially available software, with no opportunity for the Commission to review whether those costs were reasonable. Rule 10.4(d) does not require the CAISO to incur such an expense, and imposing these costs on the CAISO, a not-for-profit entity, would be unreasonable and inequitable. If the CAISO were required to bear the costs, these costs would presumably be subsumed in the CAISO's federally regulated operating budget. The CAISO has neither the internal resources nor the funding resources to provide unlimited consulting services on behalf of requesting parties in Commission transmission proceedings or to pay for other parties to purchase commercially available software.

**B. The CAISO Is Open to Exploring the Option to Engage an External Computing Service to Conduct Cal Advocates' Proposed Modeling Runs.**

To date, there has been no meaningful discussion with Cal Advocates regarding option 10.4(d)(3), which would have the CAISO contract with an external contracting service to conduct the modeling runs. The cost management concerns with this option are similar to those under the 10.4(d)(2) option addressed above, but the CAISO would be open to this option to more expediently provide the modeling and limit any necessary extension to the current procedural schedule. The CAISO, however, disagrees with Cal Advocates' suggestion that the CAISO would need to manage the external computing service to avoid "introduc[ing] additional inconsistencies." Under this option, the CAISO would not act as a "general contractor" on behalf of Cal Advocates. It is unreasonable to expect the CAISO to act as an intermediate party sorting out "inconsistencies" between Cal Advocates' expectations and the results of the modeling runs. However, with that qualification, the CAISO would be open to exploring this option to limit any potential unreasonable extension of the procedural schedule.

**V. Cal Advocates Requested Runs are Extremely Burdensome.**

The modeling runs Cal Advocates requested in this proceeding are also extremely burdensome from a time, resources, and cost perspective. The CAISO estimates the runs Cal Advocates requested the CAISO to conduct would take approximately five weeks, with significant computing and labor resources involved in the process. In addition, Cal Advocates' request indicated that it may pursue additional modeling runs after the initial runs are completed.

This would require that the CAISO divert its resources from its other responsibilities to executing model runs that Cal Advocates or its consultants can execute themselves. CAISO and Cal Advocates have not had the opportunity to thoroughly discuss the burdensome nature of Cal Advocates request—largely because Cal Advocates leapt directly to filing a motion to strike. But the burdensome nature of the request demonstrates that Commission must have an adequate compensation mechanism in place pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1822.

Rule 10.1 states that parties may obtain discovery of information “reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, unless the burden, expense, or intrusiveness of that discovery clearly outweighs the likelihood that the information sought will lead to discovery of admissible evidence.” Cal Advocates’ modeling request contemplates analyzing 20 new modeling runs. The requested modeling is unreasonably burdensome and intrusive. The CAISO itself only conducted four modeling runs to prepare its own testimony. The burdensome nature of the request weighs in favor of finding a less intrusive method to complete the runs that properly allows Cal Advocates to weigh the burden of the additional runs versus their probative value.

The CAISO provides modeling-backed testimony in numerous Commission proceedings as a service to Commission to inform its evidentiary record. If the CAISO were forced to conduct modeling runs on behalf of other parties or pay for their commercially available software licenses, it would substantially reduce the CAISO’s ability to participate effectively. Although such cost-shifting might be appropriate for an investor-owned utility or project sponsor that has a pecuniary interest in seeing new infrastructure approved by the Commission, it is not proper to impose this on the CAISO. The CAISO has no similar interest and is a not-for-profit corporation charged with operating the transmission system in an open, reliable, and economic manner.

It is unreasonable to strike the CAISO’s testimony based on Rule 10.4, because the CAISO can clearly comply with Rule 10(d) by electing option (2). Moreover, there is no statutory or rule based requirement that requires the sponsoring party to elect either of the other two options. Any such requests must consider whether the requested actions are unduly burdensome and whether there are other less burdensome, less intrusive options to provide Cal Advocates responsive information. The CAISO has taken action to ensure Cal Advocates can

conduct its own analysis and, as discussed above, the CAISO is prepared to discuss any further arrangements it can facilitate so Cal Advocates can complete its analysis in a timely manner.

## **VI. Conclusion**

The Commission should deny Cal Advocates' motion to strike.

Respectfully submitted,

**By: /s/ Jordan Pinjuv**

Roger E. Collanton

General Counsel

Anthony Ivancovich

Deputy General Counsel

Anna A. McKenna

Assistant General Counsel

Jordan Pinjuv

Senior Counsel

California Independent System

Operator Corporation

250 Outcropping Way

Folsom California 95630

Tel.: (916) 351-4429

[jpjuv@caiso.com](mailto:jpjuv@caiso.com)

Date: February 26, 2020

EXHIBIT 1

Declarations of Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeff Billinton, Robert Sparks, Yi Zhang and Nebiyu Yimer

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Jordan Pinjuv, declare as follows:

1. My name is Jordan Pinjuv and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

  
Jordan Pinjuv

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Robert Sparks, declare as follows:

1. My name is Robert Sparks and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Robert Sparks

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.



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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Jeffrey Billinton, declare as follows:

1. My name is Jeffrey Billinton and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Jeffrey Billinton

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Nebiyu Yimer, declare as follows:

1. My name is Nebiyu Yimer and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Nebiyu Yimer

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Yi Zhang, declare as follows:

1. My name is Yi Zhang and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Yi Zhang

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.

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

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten  
West Link Project

Application 16-10-012  
(Filed October 12, 2016)

**DECLARATION**

I, Neil Millar, declare as follows:

1. My name is Neil Millar and I am employee at the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO).
2. On February 18, 2020, I participated in a conference call with representatives from the CAISO and the Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) regarding Cal Advocates February 10, 2020 request for the CAISO to run production cost modeling.
3. The conference call occurred on the fifth business day after the CAISO received Cal Advocates request.
4. Present on the conference call for Cal Advocates were Joe Como, Robyn Purchia, Jerry Melcher, Joseph Abhulimen, and consultant Pushkar Wagle.
5. Present on the conference call for CAISO were Jordan Pinjuv, Neil Millar, Jeffrey Billinton, Robert Sparks, Nebiyu Yimer, and Yi Zhang.
6. During the conference call, CAISO attorney Jordan Pinjuv represented that the CAISO would not elect to model Cal Advocates proposed runs pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(1).
7. Instead, Mr. Pinjuv stated that the CAISO had elected to comply with Rule 10.4(d)(2) and had already made its proprietary production cost model available. The CAISO also noted that it would make its production cost benefit calculation spreadsheets available to Cal Advocates pursuant to Rule 10.4(d)(2).
8. Mr. Pinjuv clarified that the CAISO could not provide the ABB GridView software directly to Cal Advocates.
9. During the conference call, Cal Advocates did not claim that the CAISO failed to comply with Rule 10.4.
10. Instead, Cal Advocates indicated that it would request an additional three-month delay for filing its testimony in order to allow Cal Advocates time to buy ABB's GridView software and to be trained, conduct the runs and finalize its testimony.
11. Mr. Como specifically requested that the CAISO not oppose Cal Advocates three-month extension request.

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.



Neil Millar

Executed this 26th day of February, 2020 in Folsom, California.

EXHIBIT 2

Email from Mr. Pinjuv to Ms. Purchia

---

**From:** Pinjuv, Jordan  
**Sent:** Monday, February 10, 2020 3:30 PM  
**To:** 'Purchia, Robyn'  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Request

Robyn,

I have an internal meeting set tomorrow afternoon to discuss the issue, but given that Rule 10.4(d) provides that the access to the model will be provided at the election of the sponsoring party, I don't think we need to determine that before you send the request. Also, seeing your request in writing would help us determine how to respond. I understand that you'll want a heads up on the approach we're taking, so we can set a follow up meeting so you and I can discuss the approach after we've reviewed the request.

Thanks,  
Jordan

-----Original Message-----

From: Purchia, Robyn <Robyn.Purchia@cpuc.ca.gov>  
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 3:04 PM  
To: Pinjuv, Jordan <JPINJUV@caiso.com>  
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: Request

Hi Jordan,

Have you heard anything different than what you told me on Friday? We're getting ready to send out the request, and it would be helpful to have some guidance.

Best,  
Robyn

Robyn Purchia  
Attorney  
California Public Utilities Commission  
Office: (415) 703-2354  
Cell: (415) 509-2050

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This is a privileged attorney-client/attorney work-product communication. It is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Do not print, copy, or forward.

-----Original Message-----

From: Pinjuv, Jordan <JPINJUV@caiso.com>  
Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 4:37 PM  
To: Purchia, Robyn <Robyn.Purchia@cpuc.ca.gov>  
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] RE: Request

Thanks, I need to confirm with my team exactly how we will handle this request. I believe it will be most efficient if we do the modeling, but that's subject to check.

Thanks,  
Jordan

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 7, 2020, at 4:34 PM, Purchia, Robyn <Robyn.Purchia@cpuc.ca.gov> wrote:

>  
> Will do. And we'll indicate in our request that CAISO wishes to exercise its option to run the computer modeling on its own.

>  
> Best,

> Robyn

>  
> Robyn Purchia

> Attorney

> California Public Utilities Commission

> Office: (415) 703-2354

> Cell: (415) 509-2050

>  
> CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This is a privileged attorney-client/attorney work-product communication. It is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Do not print, copy, or forward.

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Pinjuv, Jordan <JPINJUV@caiso.com>

> Sent: Friday, February 7, 2020 4:33 PM

> To: Purchia, Robyn <Robyn.Purchia@cpuc.ca.gov>

> Subject: Request

>  
> Robyn,

>  
> Just to follow up on our call, will you please direct any requests to me rather than to ISO witnesses directly?

>  
> Thanks,

> Jordan

>  
> Sent from my iPhone

>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> \*\*\*\*\* The foregoing electronic message, together  
> with any attachments thereto, is confidential and may be legally privileged against disclosure other than to the intended recipient. It is intended solely for the addressee(s) and access to the message by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this electronic message, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic message in error, please delete and immediately notify the sender of this error.  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> \*\*\*\*\*