California Energy Commission

IEPR Lead Commissioner Workshop
Identifying and Prioritizing Geographic Areas for Renewable Development in California
May 10, 2012 – 9:00 a.m.
AGENDA

Introduction

Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead

Opening Comments

Commissioner Carla Peterman, Lead Commissioner
Chair Robert Weisenmiller

Summary of *Renewable Power in California: Status and Issues* Report

Suzanne Korosec, IEPR Lead

Panel 1: Preferred Characteristics of Priority Areas

Moderator: Matt Coldwell, Energy Commission

Panelists: Ginger Torres, Pacific Gas and Electric
Roger Salas, Southern California Edison
Randy Howard, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Jennifer Barrett, County of Sonoma
Noah Long, Natural Resources Defense Council
Cara Peck, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
John Gamper, California Farm Bureau Federation
Ryan Drobek, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies
Michael Wheeler, Recurrent Energy
Jeffrey Russell, UC Berkeley School of Law's Center for Law, Energy and the Environment

Questions:

1. *Preferred characteristics of priority areas have been identified in various forums and can be generally grouped into three distinct categories: 1) preferred sites for permitting, 2) preferred sites for interconnection, and 3) preferred sites for economic development. From your perspective, what are the specific preferred site characteristics for the three categories and which are the highest priority? Are the three categories mutually exclusive?*
2. *What data sets, information, and resources currently exist that could be useful in identifying geographic areas with preferred site characteristics? What additional data sets, information, and resources will be needed?*
3. *Transparent, publicly available data are needed for state and local governments, utilities, and other stakeholders to make informed, integrated energy planning decisions about priority areas. What are the barriers to making needed data sets more transparent and publicly available?*
4. *How can more transparent publicly available data be used in the future to better inform an integrated energy planning process?*

LUNCH (Approximately 11:30-12:30)

Panel 2: Regional Strategies to Identify Priority Geographic Areas for Renewable Development

Presentations:

Scott Flint, Energy Commission: Overview of DRECP

Bill Pfanner, Energy Commission: Overview of the Energy Aware Planning Guide, Facility Siting and Permitting Guide, and CaLEAP

Discussion

Moderator: Eli Harland, Energy Commission

Panelists: Wade Crowfoot, Governor's Office of Planning and Research
John Gamper, California Farm Bureau
Kim Delfino, Defenders of Wildlife
Sky Stanfield, Interstate Renewable Energy Council
Josh Hart, Inyo County
Ethan Elkind, UC Berkeley Center for Law, Energy, and Environment
Tim Snellings, Butte County/California County Planning Directors Association
Ginger Torres, Pacific Gas & Electric
Mary Deming, Technical Consultant for Southern California Edison

Questions:

5. *Would conducting programmatic environmental review minimize the level of project-specific environmental review? Can the DRECP be a model for other regions of California? What would be the next steps if we did a programmatic review for another region of California?*
6. *How are local governments accommodating renewable energy development (i.e. general plans, combining districts, ordinances, development agreements)? Are there any examples of recent procurement programs that reflect site preferences?*
7. *How are local and state governments balancing renewable energy development and farmland preservation?*
8. *How can local and state governments advance renewable energy development on brownfields and other underutilized sites?*
9. *How are local governments using the land use planning processes to capture economic benefits of renewable energy development? Are local governments providing incentives to attract renewable energy investment?*

BREAK (Approximately 2:45-3:00)

Panel 3: Developing Local Goals to Build Towards the 12,000 MW Goal for Distributed Generation

Presentations:

Eli Harland, Energy Commission, Developing Local, Soft Targets to Achieve 12,000 MW Goal

Snuller Price, Energy + Environmental Economics, Technical Potential for Local Distributed Photovoltaics in California

Discussion:

Moderator: Eli Harland, Energy Commission

Panelists: Wade Crowfoot, Governor's Office of Planning and Research
Tim Tutt, Sacramento Municipal Utility District
Randy Howard, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Alex Levinson, Pacific Environment
Strela Cervas, California Environmental Justice Alliance
Albert Lopez, Alameda County
Nash Gonzalez, Santa Clara County (Invited)
Eric Parfrey, Yolo County

Snuller Price, Energy + Environmental Economics
Mary Leslie, Los Angeles Business Council
Bernadette Del Chiaro, Environment California

Questions:

As the Energy Commission works with stakeholders to establish targets, addressing the following questions can help transform these soft targets into attainable and realizable targets.

10. *Does the proposed methodology provide a sound mechanism for translating the statewide 12,000 MW goal into local targets? Please propose an alternative if you disagree with this methodology for developing soft targets.*
    a. *Are there additional "levers" or criteria the Energy Commission should include in developing soft targets? If you suggest additional criteria, is information needed accessible, reliable, and accurate?*
    b. *Please comment on whether you agree with, or describe how you would change, the following "lever" weightings included in this analysis:*
        i. *40 percent for consumption by county*
        ii. *20 percent for low/moderate share of statewide income less than 80 percent of median income*
        iii. *20 percent for statewide share of unemployment*
        iv. *20 percent to reflect electrical grid requirements*
11. *The Energy Commission used the results of the E3 preliminary assessment, Technical Potential for Local Distributed Photovoltaics in California (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/NR/rdonlyres/8A822C08-A56C-4674-A5D2-099E48B41160/0/LDPVPotentialReportMarch2012.pdf) to estimate available distribution and transmission grid capacity. Is the capacity information a proxy for least cost, best fit?*
12. *Should the Energy Commission continue to include the Department of Water Resources in the development of soft targets (given it is not subject to the RPS)?*

Public Comments

Adjourn