



**California Energy Commission
IEPR Lead Commissioner Workshop**

Southern California Electricity Reliability

August 20, 2014 – 10:00 a.m.

**University of California, Los Angeles
California NanoSystems Institute Auditorium**

AGENDA

Introduction

Heather Raitt, IEPR Lead

Opening Comments

Commissioner Janea Scott, Lead Commissioner for IEPR and Transportation
Chair Robert Weisenmiller, California Energy Commission
Commissioner Michael Picker, California Public Utilities Commission
Chairman Mary Nichols, Air Resources Board
Steve Berberich, California Independent System Operator
Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District
Jonathan Bishop, State Water Resources Control Board

Background and Purpose of the Workshop

Mike Jaske, Energy Commission

Panel 1: Update on Activities Identified in Draft Plan

Preferred Resource Development and Generation Power Purchase Agreements

- Cynthia Walker, California Public Utilities Commission
- James Avery, San Diego Gas & Electric
- Ron Nichols, Southern California Edison

Generation Permitting, Roger Johnson, Energy Commission

Lunch

Panel 2: Continued Update on Activities Identified in Draft Plan

Transmission System Additions

- Phil Pettingill, California Independent System Operator
- James Avery, San Diego Gas & Electric
- Dana Cabbell, Southern California Edison

Contingency Mitigation Planning, Mike Jaske, Energy Commission

Break

Panel 3: Environmental Agency Considerations

Air Credits in South Coast Air Basin and San Diego

- Mohsen Nazemi, South Coast Air Quality Management District
- Tom Weeks, San Diego Air Pollution Control District

State Water Resources Control Board Once Through Cooling Compliance, Chief Deputy Director
Jonathan Bishop

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Greenhouse Gas Regulations, Tung Le, California Air
Resources Board

Public Comments (~3:30pm)

Lead Commissioner Summation/Closing Remarks

Adjourn

Questions for Panelists

Panel 1: Preferred Resources and Conventional Generation

Q1 – What is the status of IOU efforts to develop overall procurement plans?

Q2 – What is the status CPUC review and approval of IOU plans?

Q3 – How have the IOUs proposed to translate direction to procure “preferred resources” into specific proposals to secure energy efficiency, demand response, distributed generation, etc.?

Q4 – D.14-03-004 seemingly authorizes the IOUs to submit conventional generation PPAs to the CPUC for review and possible approval. What is the status of IOU efforts to prepare and submit PPAs?

Q5 – What issues exist for getting Pio Pico development underway, and what are the key milestones for its scheduled development that SDG&E envisions at this time?

Q6 – What issues have surfaced in the AFC proceedings at the CEC for the five power plant applications for certification (AFC) or permit amendments for repowering fossil once-through cooling facilities?

Panel 2: Other Activities within the Draft Plan

Q1 – What is the status of the transmission system upgrades that the ISO Board has approved as partial mitigation for the loss of SONGS? Or loss of fossil OTC facilities?

Q2 – How is the ISO using its annual transmission planning process to study further transmission system upgrades?

Q3 – What progress is being made to obtain necessary approvals and to develop each of the transmission system upgrade projects approved by the ISO Board in recent Transmission Plans?

Panel 3: Environmental Considerations

Q1 – Does South Coast AQMD anticipate sufficient credits in its internal bank to cover generation development needed to replace SONGS and fossil OTC facilities, including the requirements of LADWP?

Q2 - What specific pollutants are covered by SCAQMD Rule 1304(a)(2) exemption from offsets and how available/costly are ERCS for other pollutants that generation developers will have to acquire through open markets?

Q3 – What is the ERC situation in SD APCD if additional fossil generation development were desired?

Q4 – Do the two air districts envision issues with permitting a conventional generator as a contingency mitigation measure that would “sit on the shelf” undeveloped and triggered only under specific conditions?

Q5 – What kind of “package” of analysis and policy review would SWRCB like to have submitted to it to support a recommendation to delay an OTC compliance date by 1-3 years as a contingency mitigation measure?

Q6 – How do the final USEPA regulations for new generation pursuant to CAA 111(b) and proposed regulations for existing generation pursuant to CAA 111(d) affect either the general approach proposed by agency staff in the Preliminary Southern California Reliability Plan or the specific procurement plans set forth by the CPUC in D.14-03-004?