

COMMITTEE WORKSHOP  
BEFORE THE  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
Implementation of Renewables ) Docket No.  
Investment Plan Legislation ) 02-REN-1038  
and )  
Implementation of Renewables ) Docket No.  
Portfolio Standard Legislation ) 03-RPS-1078  

---

 )

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

HEARING ROOM A

1516 NINTH STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2007

2:32 P.M.

Reported by:  
Peter Petty  
Contract No. 150-07-001

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

John L. Geesman, Presiding Member

Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, Associate Member

ADVISORS, STAFF and CONSULTANTS PRESENT

Suzanne Korosec, Advisor

Kate Zocchetti

Heather Raitt

Gabriel Herrera

Manpreet Mattu

ALSO PRESENT

Scott Galati, Attorney

Galati Blek, LLP

Les Guliasi

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Evelyn Lee, Attorney

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Brenda LeMay

Horizon Wind Energy

Steven Kelly

Independent Energy Producers Association

Clair Tortia, Attorney (via teleconference)

Chatburn (phonetic) and Park Lawfirm

Jeremy Weinstein (via teleconference)

PacifiCorp

Rob Campell (via teleconference)

PowerEx

## I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Opening Remarks	1
Presiding Member Geesman	1
Overview	1
Background	3
CEC Staff Presentation Proposed Guidebook Changes	4
Renewables Portfolio Standard Eligibility Guidebook	
New Renewable Facilities Program Guidebook	
Overall Program Guidebook	
Schedule	10
Public Comments	10
Scott Galati, Galati Blek LLP	10
Les Guliasi, PG&E	29
Brenda LeMay	63
Steven Kelly, IEP	76
Clair Tortia	81
Jeremy Weinstein, PacifiCorp	85
Rob Campbell, PowerEx	97
Adjournment	97
Reporter's Certificate	98

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 2:32 p.m.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: This is a  
4 workshop of the California Energy Commission's  
5 Renewables Committee. The topic is revisions to  
6 our guidelines for RPS eligibility in program  
7 implementation.

8 I'm John Geesman, the Presiding Member  
9 of the Commission's Renewables Committee. To my  
10 left Commissioner Jackalyne Pfannenstiel, the  
11 Commission's Chair and Associate Member of the  
12 Renewables Committee. To my right, Suzanne  
13 Korosec, my Staff Advisor.

14 Kate, why don't you get us started.

15 MS. ZOCCHETTI: Thank you. I'm going to  
16 lower the lights just a little bit here. So,  
17 welcome, everyone, good afternoon. Can you all  
18 hear me? Thank you.

19 I'm Kate Zocchetti; I'm the Program Lead  
20 for the RPS program at the Energy Commission. I  
21 want to thank you for coming today. I'd like to  
22 announce that if you are calling in and you don't  
23 realize that you can observe our slides here by  
24 going online at [www.energy.ca.gov/webcast](http://www.energy.ca.gov/webcast).

25 Likewise, if you want to call in, you

1 would call the number 800-779-9469, and the  
2 passcode is workshop. And for those parties that  
3 have been trying to call in during the business  
4 meeting, we apologize for the delay, again.

5 Just briefly go over the agenda. You've  
6 met the Renewables Committee. I'm going to go  
7 over our proposed changes to three of our  
8 guidebooks for the renewable energy program.  
9 That's the RPS eligibility guidebook, the new  
10 renewable facilities program guidebook, and the  
11 overall program guidebook.

12 I'll briefly go over our schedule that  
13 we've planned for the adoption of these revised  
14 draft guidebooks. And after that there will be  
15 opportunity for public comment, both from the  
16 folks that are calling in, and those here in  
17 attendance.

18 For the attendees that are here we ask  
19 that you fill out a blue card if you do want to  
20 make comment today; and give that to Heather here.  
21 Also give our reporter your business card. And  
22 when you are called to speak, please step up to  
23 the microphone there in the center of the room.  
24 And we'll have, I believe, the phone callers after  
25 that. And all commenters, please identify

1       yourself and your affiliation before you begin.

2               We haven't planned a break, but  
3       depending on how long we could go, we could  
4       introduce a break.

5               So, I'll just give a very brief  
6       background of the goal of the renewable portfolio  
7       standard, is to increase the diversity,  
8       reliability, public health and environmental  
9       benefits of California's energy mix.

10              As I'm sure most of you know, our  
11       current legislative goal from SB-107 last year is  
12       20 percent of renewables by 2010; and staying with  
13       the increase of at least 1 percent per year. The  
14       Governor has expanded that goal to 33 percent by  
15       2020.

16              Our roles, along with the PUC, are  
17       defined by the legislation. And the Energy  
18       Commission roles are to certify the facilities as  
19       RPS eligible; to design and implement an  
20       accounting system to track generation; and to  
21       distribute SEPs, supplemental energy payments.

22              Our process is to implement RPS rules  
23       through these guidebooks which are revised as  
24       needed to respond to public comments, lessons  
25       learned, regulatory development, and, of course,

1 legislative mandate.

2           When we have a business meeting adoption  
3 they become, these changes that we make become  
4 immediately effective.

5           So, I'll just launch into the proposed  
6 changes. In the summary form you do have access  
7 to the entire guidebook for RPS eligibility. All  
8 three guidebooks online. We have copies of the  
9 table of the RPS eligibility guidebook showing the  
10 changes in underline and strikeout. So I'm just  
11 going to go over a few of the highlighted sections  
12 and the changes we've made.

13           Previously we had two sections that  
14 dealt with facilities that use multiple fuels,  
15 including fossil fuel. So we thought it would be  
16 easier for the reader to combine those two  
17 sections into one new section. We really didn't  
18 change too much, but we did combine them into one  
19 section called renewable facilities using fossil  
20 fuels. So that's where you will find information  
21 about multi-fuel facilities.

22           In that section we clarify that for QFs  
23 operational before 2002, in order for them to use  
24 up to 25 percent of fossil fuel and still count  
25 all of their generation as RPS eligible, this is

1 clarified to show that this exception only applies  
2 to facilities that were renewable QFs prior to  
3 2002.

4 And also it requires -- it doesn't say  
5 it here, but it says it in the guidebook -- that  
6 they must currently be certified as a renewable  
7 QF.

8 Again, in that same section for biomass  
9 facilities, it's a little clarification about what  
10 we mean by de minimis, because the term de minimis  
11 applies not only to the RPS program, but to  
12 another program in the renewable energy program  
13 that most of you are familiar with, the existing  
14 renewables facilities program.

15 We allow, as per the legislation, a de  
16 minimis amount of fossil fuel use and still  
17 account a hundred percent of the generation as RPS  
18 eligible. And the Energy Commission defined 2  
19 percent to mean de minimis for the RPS and SEPs.  
20 But it's 5 percent for the existing renewable  
21 facilities program.

22 And then if the facility generation  
23 exceeds the de minimis amount per these  
24 definitions, then only the generation that is  
25 renewable will be counted towards RPS.

1           Moving on to the delivery requirement  
2 section, we wanted to clarify that for out-of-  
3 state facilities deliveries can be from any  
4 location in the WECC, in the Western Electricity  
5 Coordinating Council, as long as the energy is  
6 delivered into California.

7           We wanted to revise references to NERC  
8 tags previously by changing that term to NERC  
9 etags to reflect industry standard terminology.  
10 Everything's electronic, so.

11           On to the tracking system section,  
12 WREGIS, the Western Renewable Energy Generation  
13 Information System, we have modified the  
14 requirement that was previously already in the  
15 guidebook that said that participants in RPS must  
16 participate in our accounting system, to note that  
17 we will begin requiring participation January 1,  
18 2008. And I made a little note there that it's  
19 not in the guidebook but I wanted to point out to  
20 everyone who doesn't know, that WREGIS has waived  
21 fees for 2007.

22           And just sort of an aside, although I  
23 know it's important to folks, that we have tried  
24 to reformat and make our forms easier by last time  
25 we modified our guidebooks, which was in March, we

1 bifurcated the forms so that if you didn't have  
2 certain sections that applied to you, you didn't  
3 have to skip over that part and have a 12-page  
4 long form.

5           So we did find out after that that some  
6 of the forms that were in the hardcopy guidebook  
7 that was posted online differed from those that we  
8 revised pursuant to some folks asking for a little  
9 bit easier format. We found out that there were  
10 some inconsistencies. So we apologize for that.  
11 We accepted both kinds. And so the current  
12 guidebook will reflect those changes.

13           We just clarified that under  
14 supplemental energy payments that SEPs are not  
15 available for electricity use to service load that  
16 is not subject to the PGC.

17           And one SEP form was modified. A  
18 calculation was modified. It explains it here.  
19 That is something that has already been posted  
20 online for everyone's convenience. That is to  
21 calculate the per-kilowatt-hour supplemental  
22 energy payment to be paid out over ten years. And  
23 to calculate that it may be paid over ten years if  
24 no cap is applied.

25           I don't necessarily need to read these

1 definitions to you, but we did modify our  
2 definition for RPS purposes, our definition of  
3 electrical corporation, includes PacifiCorp,  
4 Sierra Pacific, Mountain Utilities and Bear  
5 Valley. But for the existing and all the other  
6 programs under the REPA, the renewable energy  
7 program, we added Bear Valley.

8 In the overall guidebook, which the  
9 definitions -- I'm sorry, I just mention these  
10 definitions, they are in the overall guidebook,  
11 but they're also reflected in the RPS eligibility  
12 guidebook and the new guidebook. But the overall  
13 program guidebook is really the home of the  
14 definitions. And we've modified the definitions  
15 of these terms to make it more clear. And we've  
16 also added some more definitions that we thought  
17 readers would appreciate.

18 As most of you probably know there are  
19 two bills on the Governor's desk that would affect  
20 our RPS eligibility guidelines. Senate Bill 1036  
21 would basically remove SEPs from the Energy  
22 Commission's purview. And Assembly Bill 809  
23 changes the definition of eligible hydroelectric  
24 facilities.

25 So, with that in mind, we have drafted

1       our schedule, being cognizant of if one or both of  
2       those bills passes, we will need another revision  
3       to our guidebooks. If neither of them pass we  
4       plan to, after today's workshop and considering  
5       everyone's comments, and incorporating all of  
6       that, we will send out revised guidebooks. And we  
7       plan for adoption in November.

8                 However, if one of those bills, or both,  
9       of course, are passed, then we will need to  
10      reflect those legislative changes in a second  
11      revision that would be publicly noticed in  
12      November with plans for adoption in December. So  
13      it basically bumps it by about a month.

14                So we do hope that all this is finished;  
15      and we plan that it is all finished by the end of  
16      the year.

17                This is where we would appreciate  
18      receiving your comments in writing by this Friday.  
19      And the address is shown here. You do need to  
20      send, I believe it's 12 copies to dockets. That  
21      information is on your workshop notice, those  
22      details. This is our contact information if you  
23      have specific questions about any one of the  
24      guidebooks. If you haven't already reviewed the  
25      guidebooks they're available online in underline/

1       strikeout.

2                   That is the end of my presentation. We  
3       can go back to the schedule -- or the agenda, I  
4       should say.

5                   So, open it to public comment.

6                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah, let's  
7       take this fairly slowly. These are staff-proposed  
8       changes. I think that members of the public,  
9       you're catching the Committee fairly cold on the  
10      subject. So, if we have to take some time to  
11      fully understand the context of what you're  
12      commenting upon, please bear with us.

13                  I'd also emphasize the value of written  
14      comments. We take those quite seriously, read  
15      through them, and carefully evaluate what the  
16      impact of the staff recommendation is, and the  
17      associated comment, before coming to a conclusion  
18      as a Committee.

19                  So, I'll go with blue cards. First one  
20      up is Scott Galati representing GB, LLP. I see  
21      you wear various hats, Scott, but who is GB, LLP?

22                  MR. GALATI: That's surprising, that's  
23      my firm.

24                  (Laughter.)

25                  MR. GALATI: I'm never here on my own

1       behalf. But I am here on my own behalf, and I  
2       would like to thank you very much for the  
3       opportunity to make public comment.

4               As you know, both of you, that I'm not  
5       new to this area, but I've been asked recently by  
6       different proponents of renewable facilities, both  
7       out of state and out of the country, on how one  
8       would demonstrate the LORS compliance analysis.

9               And so I'm here to ask a few questions  
10       and try to get some guidance on that. And maybe  
11       we'll be able to follow up with some written  
12       recommendations on maybe where we can have some  
13       clarifications.

14               First with respect to out of country,  
15       one of the things that I wanted to have some  
16       clarification on, and we've been working with  
17       staff, I think, closely and having dialogue on  
18       this, as well. But I'm still confused, and I  
19       think that's my fault.

20               When a facility is going to be built out  
21       of the country, my understanding is that there  
22       would be a list of the LORS that would apply to  
23       that facility if it were built in this country, in  
24       California. And that there would be an assessment  
25       of whether or not the project would comply with

1 those LORS.

2 And I'm having difficulty on how I'd  
3 demonstrate that. One way that comes to mind, and  
4 a way I think that makes sense, would be -- I'm  
5 going to try to give a specific example.

6 Let's take the area of cultural  
7 resources, which is one of the areas listed.  
8 There are several federal and state laws that  
9 apply in California to both investigate, identify  
10 and protect cultural resource sites.

11 The way I would like to show that is a  
12 demonstration outside the country that they have a  
13 similar series of laws that result in the same  
14 investigation and protection of cultural sites  
15 that are important to that country.

16 I can think of no other way to  
17 demonstrate that an out-of-country facility would  
18 be as protective of the environment, especially in  
19 the area of cultural resources, for example.

20 This is a much more of a programmatic  
21 approach, and was wondering if that was what was  
22 intended; or can we have some additional guidance  
23 in the guidebook that that might be applicable.  
24 And, again, I'm talking about out of country.

25 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, let me

1 start, and, Gabe, maybe you can help us on this.  
2 What's our constitutional ability, as a state, to  
3 apply a state standard out of country? And I  
4 presume the countries we're talking about are  
5 either Canada or Mexico, because of the  
6 requirement that you be connected to the WECC  
7 grid.

8 MR. GALATI: Right, and I'm going to  
9 talk about Canada.

10 MR. HERRERA: Commissioner Geesman, the  
11 law does not --

12 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Microphone.

13 MR. HERRERA: The state law does not  
14 require that the Energy Commission apply  
15 California standards, environmental standards, on  
16 this out-of-country, or even an out-of-state  
17 facility.

18 What the law does require is that a  
19 facility that's located out of country be  
20 developed and operated in a manner as protective  
21 of the environment as a similar facility in  
22 California.

23 So the way the Energy Commission adopted  
24 its guidelines is to say show us, Mr. Out-of-State  
25 Facility, how you're going to operate and develop

1 your facility in such a way that it doesn't cause  
2 certain environmental standards to be exceeded.  
3 We want you to compare those environmental  
4 standards to the environmental standards in  
5 California.

6 And the guidebook identifies the 16 LORS  
7 environmental categories that the Commission uses  
8 for purposes of power plant siting cases.

9 Now, Mr. Galati has a unique opportunity  
10 here, because this is the first time we've got an  
11 out-of-country facility coming to us seeking  
12 certification. So, I think we will probably need  
13 to revise the guidelines once we go through this  
14 once.

15 But I have talked to Mr. Galati; I've  
16 talked to PG&E and others, as well, about how we  
17 would require this. And I think what Mr. Galati  
18 has proposed, I think, is a reasonable approach  
19 with respect to cultural resources.

20 With respect to other resource  
21 categories like air quality and water quality, I  
22 think we would expect to see the environmental  
23 standard in California, say for example, if it's a  
24 certain percentage of dissolved solids per volume  
25 of water in California, that the standard in out

1 of country be as protective, or as rigorous as  
2 that requirement.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Do we have  
4 the ability under NAFTA to do that?

5 MR. HERRERA: To do?

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: To do that as  
7 vigorous as California, or as rigorous as  
8 California?

9 MR. HERRERA: Well, I think until an  
10 appellate court tells us that California's law is  
11 unconstitutional, I think we're compelled to  
12 follow those requirements.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, I think  
14 we're compelled to follow the statute, but I think  
15 we're also compelled, if we can, to construe it in  
16 a fashion that's both consistent with --

17 MR. HERRERA: Right.

18 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- the  
19 constitution and what treaties the country has  
20 entered into.

21 MR. HERRERA: And I don't think we're  
22 trying to apply the law in such a way that we  
23 would violate either federal law or international  
24 treaty law.

25 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

1           MR. HERRERA: But again this is an  
2 opportunity for us to perhaps make some revisions  
3 after we go through this process for the first  
4 time.

5           MR. GALATI: Yes, and as a person who's  
6 trying to write it right now, I have very specific  
7 examples. Like, for example, let's take biology.  
8 In California we have designated California-  
9 protected species. They are not going to be the  
10 same protected species that are in B.C. But there  
11 are protected species and a whole regime for  
12 protecting what Canada has determined is an  
13 important environmental biological resources.

14           I would like to show that scheme as  
15 opposed to the standard. And part of the reason  
16 is when you look at several of the items, air  
17 quality might be one that's different; water  
18 quality might be. But most of them, it's very  
19 hard to say what is the standard. It's six.  
20 Above six is bad, below six is good. It's very  
21 very hard to identify those.

22           And so I think the word standard is  
23 certainly tripping me up. And I keep coming back  
24 to a more programmatic process approach. And I  
25 just wanted to get a feel from the Committee --

1       because it's certainly what I'm proposing to  
2       Gabe -- just want to get a feel from the Committee  
3       if we're heading in the right direction, or if we  
4       could get more guidance in this document that  
5       would say that that's okay. Because I'm a little  
6       concerned about how I make the demonstration, as  
7       it's currently written.

8                 MR. HERRERA: I think it's going to be  
9       difficult for program staff to determine that what  
10      Mr. Galati presents is adequate to actually see  
11      it. I mean we certainly have, I think, several  
12      months go make some revisions, if necessary. And  
13      hopefully during that time period I can work with  
14      program staff and Mr. Galati to see exactly what  
15      they've identified and how that would work.

16                But I think the law does require  
17      something more than an out-of-country facility  
18      merely indicating that it complies with its own  
19      requirements. Because if that was the case, the  
20      California Legislature didn't need to enact laws  
21      to require an out-of-country facility to comply  
22      with its own requirements. It would have to  
23      comply with its own requirements irrespective of  
24      California law.

25                So I think what California requires is a

1 little bit more. And we're trying to demonstrate  
2 that and require applicants to send us more  
3 information.

4 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: So, take the  
5 cultural resources area as an example. If Canada  
6 had no particular requirements in the cultural  
7 resources area, then it would be your view that we  
8 would be applying the statute and saying, aha,  
9 this one is deficient because they are not  
10 protecting cultural resources in the same way that  
11 California is.

12 MR. HERRERA: Right. But in that case  
13 if there wasn't something comparable, then I think  
14 what would happen is we could say, or the facility  
15 operator/developer could say, we'll agree to  
16 operate or develop our plant subject to these  
17 conditions that will essentially provide the same  
18 or the equivalent level of protection.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Same or the  
20 equivalent level. I mean this is a slippery  
21 slope, isn't it?

22 MR. HERRERA: It is. It's very  
23 slippery.

24 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: And it  
25 seems like when you get into air quality and water

1 quality it becomes even more difficult because  
2 it's hard to say that they have to be exactly the  
3 California standards.

4 MR. HERRERA: Right.

5 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Because  
6 most provinces may not have exactly the same  
7 standards as California.

8 MR. HERRERA: And they could vary  
9 depending on location within a province. And that  
10 holds true, I mean, depending on where you're  
11 located in California, the standards could be  
12 different.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

14 MR. HERRERA: With respect to air  
15 quality, --

16 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: We allow  
17 local variation to a considerable extent in  
18 California in many of our standards, and that's  
19 considered to be good government, to recognize  
20 that local variation.

21 MR. HERRERA: And I think we allow that  
22 in the guidebook now by allowing the applicant to  
23 identify whatever location in California they  
24 decide to compare their out-of-country facility  
25 to.

1                   So we don't say, pick the most rigorous  
2                   environmental transmission in California, which  
3                   may be --

4                   ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: So it  
5                   could be the least rigorous?

6                   MR. HERRERA: Yes, it could be. We're  
7                   not saying use South Coast Air Quality Management  
8                   District's air pollution standards. We're asking  
9                   applicants to tell us which standards they would  
10                  compare their facility to.

11                  PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And you think  
12                  that's a reasonable interpretation of what the  
13                  Legislature wanted in drafting this requirement?

14                  MR. HERRERA: I think it is. And the  
15                  reason I think so is because facilities, even if  
16                  sited in California, could vary in terms of what  
17                  standards they would need to comply with it. The  
18                  standard says a similar facility in California.  
19                  The Energy Commission, I guess, has the discretion  
20                  to decide where that similar facility is located,  
21                  but it's chosen to give the developer the  
22                  discretion to decide for himself. To that degree,  
23                  it has provided a little flexibility.

24                  MR. GALATI: One of the things we  
25                  certainly don't want to do is cherry-pick, okay,

1 and --

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: How could you  
3 avoid it?

4 MR. GALATI: I have an idea.

5 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

6 MR. GALATI: Let's take the area of  
7 noise, for example. There are noise standards  
8 that are developed by the community in generally  
9 noise elements in California. That's how it's  
10 done. Some communities decide to put a higher  
11 value on quiet nighttime hours than other  
12 communities.

13 If I could show you B.C. did the same  
14 thing, wouldn't I be showing you that they're  
15 protective of noise for the community of B.C. the  
16 same way California would be? I don't have to  
17 tell you the number is 45, because I'll go find a  
18 number that's 65.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Sure.

20 MR. GALATI: Because I can.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Sure.

22 MR. GALATI: And I don't think that that  
23 is really what's intended. I would prefer to say  
24 here's the program how they do it. It's a similar  
25 program how we do it. While the results might be

1 different, I don't know what the results are going  
2 to be, the results are both protective of the  
3 environment, as applied by their own laws.

4 And I think it's the standards when I  
5 start to quantify them that I'm really having  
6 difficulty. so I keep coming back to something  
7 more programmatic and something that is, you know,  
8 more process and programmatic oriented. And I  
9 know that that's where we sort of, we're not maybe  
10 seeing a hundred percent eye to eye. I'm just  
11 having difficulty literally doing it, as opposed  
12 to thinking about how to do it.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Do you think  
14 that approach would address each of the enumerated  
15 LORS that the guidelines articulate?

16 MR. GALATI: Certainly most of them. I  
17 haven't yet found one, other than air quality, I  
18 could say, you know, in a biomass facility what is  
19 the emissions, or, you know, what I would try to  
20 show is, you know, it's an offsetting approach, or  
21 whatever, or something like that so that the net  
22 result is X as opposed to a number.

23 But with respect to land use, that's a  
24 tough one. You know, land use entire regulation  
25 is done by city councils and supervisors based on

1 the wills of the community. So, height variances  
2 and all the local issues related to land use, I  
3 could pick a place where I was comparing a B.C.  
4 wind facility so it didn't need a height variance.

5 But I'm not sure that that's really  
6 getting around it, because I'll be maybe building  
7 a wind facility and I pick a place in California  
8 it wouldn't make sense to build a wind facility.

9 So, what I'd like to do is, again, make  
10 an attempt to try to show that there is a series  
11 of laws in place by working with B.C. council to  
12 determine this is how we protect our land use  
13 decisions. This is how we protect noise.

14 And then the Commission can look at  
15 those and say, that makes sense to us.

16 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Are you going  
17 to raise a comment about in-U.S. facilities, as  
18 well? Or can I jump to that hypothetical?

19 MR. GALATI: Yeah, I had a comment on  
20 in-state facilities, only because I just wanted  
21 clarification. My understanding is in-country,  
22 out of state, that my understanding that that's a  
23 different analysis.

24 We're looking to see whether or not  
25 something right cross the border is really

1 affecting California. As opposed to whether it's  
2 just as protective as California.

3 We're looking at something so if I'm in  
4 the beginning of a watershed that ends up in  
5 California, something I do here affects a  
6 California standard, that, to me, if I'm across  
7 the border and my air emissions go into  
8 California. Those are something that I think are  
9 easily addressed.

10 That's my understanding how that is  
11 interpreted, is whether I'm causing or  
12 contributing to a violation of California  
13 standards. Not whether the facility, itself,  
14 complies with California standards. Or is as  
15 protective as California's. Am I interpreting  
16 that right?

17 MR. HERRERA: That's correct, yes.

18 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

19 So, Gabe, your concern is the direction  
20 Scott is headed in is simply saying that my  
21 facility will comply with all of the local laws in  
22 my jurisdiction, and that it's not providing any  
23 meaningful significance to the words that the  
24 Legislature adopted in this standard or in this  
25 requirement?

1           MR. HERRERA: Yeah, that's my  
2 reservation, is the Legislature would not have  
3 needed to speak on that particular point for an  
4 out-of-country facility to comply with the out-of-  
5 country requirements. So the Legislature must  
6 have meant something more than just that.

7           But if Scott is suggesting that his  
8 analysis will compare standards to the extent  
9 there are numeric standards to compare to. And to  
10 the extent they're not, like resources, cultural  
11 resources for example, then perhaps in those  
12 particular areas he shows that what the out-of-  
13 country facility does, or other country does,  
14 evaluates or utilizes a process to make sure that  
15 there aren't any impacts in that resource.

16           Perhaps that would be adequate. Again,  
17 the --

18           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Are the words  
19 of the statute that apply to out-of-country the  
20 same as the words that apply to in-country but out  
21 of state?

22           MR. HERRERA: No, they're different.

23           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay, so the  
24 Legislature clearly contemplated a different  
25 standard --

1 MR. HERRERA: Yeah.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- to address  
3 the two situations.

4 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Are the  
5 words in the statute essentially what we have  
6 picked up in the guidebook?

7 MR. HERRERA: Yes.

8 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Okay, so  
9 those are very different.

10 MR. HERRERA: I think the analysis for  
11 the out-of-state, but in-country facilities is  
12 perhaps a little bit easier because in that --

13 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Yeah,  
14 that is --

15 MR. HERRERA: -- case, as Scott has  
16 pointed out, you know, if you have a facility  
17 located right across California border then it  
18 might be easy to show that, you know, the emission  
19 plume from this biomass plant is wafting into  
20 California, and causing California to exceed  
21 certain air standards.

22 But say if you have a facility in  
23 Wyoming or Idaho and it's a wind facility, you  
24 know, that's probably an easier analysis because  
25 it might be hard to show that there's any direct

1 impacts on California.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Migratory  
3 birds.

4 MR. HERRERA: Well, I mean that's one  
5 area. Bats. Understand you guys had a pretty  
6 good discussion on that before lunch.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: We're  
8 pretty --

9 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: We're  
10 pretty knowledgeable of that area right now.

11 MR. GALATI: And I listened to the last  
12 part of that conversation, so I know that that's  
13 not a LORS.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. GALATI: The guidelines that now we  
16 need to demonstrate compliance with.

17 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: I'm glad  
18 you understood that part of it.

19 MR. GALATI: I did; I understood that  
20 very clearly.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: It's your  
22 feeling, Gabe, that we have the ability to be more  
23 restrictive on an out-of-country project than an  
24 in-country, but out-of-state project?

25 MR. HERRERA: Yes.

1                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Consistent  
2 with NAFTA?

3                   MR. HERRERA: I reviewed general  
4 provisions of NAFTA and felt that it was  
5 consistent. Again, the out-of-country facility is  
6 when you compare to an in-state facility, it is  
7 subject to California's environmental standards.  
8 The argument is that you're treating it the same.

9                   But I recognize there are certainly  
10 ambiguities in the law and the Commission  
11 certainly has the discretion to modify the LORS  
12 list, or to revise the way it evaluates the  
13 analysis of those LORS categories.

14                  PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah, but  
15 ideally the guidelines should be sufficiently  
16 bright-lined that we're not dealing with  
17 everything on a case-by-case basis.

18                  MR. HERRERA: You know, it could be,  
19 also, in terms of a programmatic approach, once  
20 this analysis for an out-of-country facility is  
21 done, perhaps that analysis could be used for all  
22 future out-of-country facilities.

23                  So, for example, in B.C. and the  
24 Commission approves it once for a particular  
25 facility, and then any other facilities that might

1 be sited in British Columbia would just rely upon  
2 the work that was already done for the earlier  
3 facility.

4 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Pretty broad  
5 range of potential types of projects we're likely  
6 to see, though.

7 MR. HERRERA: Yeah, it would have to  
8 vary by project type.

9 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: So maybe we  
10 could have a B.C. guidebook and a Mexico  
11 guidebook.

12 Well, Scott, we look forward to seeing  
13 what you have to submit.

14 MR. GALATI: Okay.

15 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: You got  
16 anything else you want to bring to our attention  
17 here?

18 MR. GALATI: Not at this time, thank  
19 you.

20 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Thank you.  
21 Les Guliasi, PG&E.

22 MR. GULIASI: Thank you; good afternoon,  
23 Commissioners and Staff. Les Guliasi with PG&E.  
24 We've made a lot of progress over the last year  
25 when we first started discussing guidebook changes

1       pursuant to legislation that was passed in 2007,  
2       SB-107.

3               We've been working very closely with the  
4       staff since that time up to today. So press  
5       further with some additional revisions and  
6       clarifications that are needed in the guidebook.

7               If you recall we had lots of good,  
8       productive discussions about shaping arrangements  
9       dealing with intermittent resources from the  
10      Northwest. We made very important and significant  
11      guidebook changes to allow dairy and biogas  
12      resources.

13              These are important, and they're  
14      important for us for many reasons. And certainly  
15      chief among them is the requirement that we need  
16      to reach 20 percent deliverables by 2010. And  
17      then go beyond that.

18              What I'm going to talk to you about  
19      today is a pretty high-level depiction of what we  
20      intend to provide in written form on Friday. What  
21      I'm going to say to you reflects our practical  
22      experience in dealing in the commercial  
23      marketplace for power.

24              The remarks also reflect the guidance  
25      that we've gotten from developers and from sellers

1 of renewable power.

2 What they're telling us is that the  
3 guidebooks, while instructive, are not as clear as  
4 they need to be. And so our goal here is to  
5 provide you information in written form on Friday  
6 that will add further clarification to the  
7 guidebooks to provide greater certainty, not only  
8 for us, but for the developers and the sellers who  
9 want to enter this market.

10 So, I think it's important for you, the  
11 Committee, to hear what we're going to say and  
12 what we're going to submit. But it's also  
13 important to have this information on the record.  
14 And it's important for this dialogue to occur so  
15 that sellers and developers get the clarity that  
16 they're seeking.

17 We handed out, and I believe you have  
18 before you, the summary. And we provided copies  
19 available in the foyer; if people need to see  
20 copies, they're on the table back there.

21 The handout really is in two parts. The  
22 first part is sort of a set of principles that we  
23 wanted to address. And the second part has to do  
24 with some of the specific issues that we'll be  
25 addressing in written form on Friday.

1           So, if you'll bear with me just for a  
2 moment I wanted to walk through these three pages  
3 to provide you with some of our thinking and the  
4 reasoning behind our effort to make further  
5 clarifications and improvements to the guidebook.

6           The important word on the front page  
7 here is expanding. What we want to do is find  
8 every opportunity to expand available resources.  
9 We need to increase the availability of resources,  
10 putting it very simply.

11           Again, these are sort of some guiding  
12 principles that we came up with in thinking  
13 through this process to provide you with wording  
14 changes and clarifications.

15           We believe that the revisions should be  
16 drafted with the goal of promoting renewable  
17 developments; that's a key and kind of  
18 foundational issue.

19           Eligibility criteria should be no  
20 stricter than required by statute. I think the  
21 discussion we just had a few minutes ago about  
22 out-of-country and out-of-state deliveries is  
23 instructive. To the extent that we can have clear  
24 bright lines, that's great. We need that kind of  
25 clarification.

1           And the dialogue we had about the degree  
2           to which the Energy Commission has some discretion  
3           is important, but not to be restrictive. To think  
4           about expanding, not contracting.

5           The CEC should exercise its discretion  
6           in favor of broadening the renewable market.  
7           Certification process should be clear, reliable,  
8           streamlined to avoid discouraging development in  
9           the interests of California.

10          And I might say also, enduring. These  
11          guidelines should last. They shouldn't be changed  
12          arbitrarily. Obviously to the extent that we can  
13          make further improvements and clarification,  
14          great. But we should have something that endures.

15          The revisions should address real-world  
16          problems. We believe that any retroactive  
17          application of eligibility criteria creates costly  
18          uncertainty and deters development.

19          Current out-of-state and out-of-country  
20          certification requirements, we've heard, have  
21          deterred prospective sellers. The guidebook  
22          revisions are needed to implement legislation, but  
23          they should be clear, correct, complete and  
24          timely.

25          And I'm going to return to some of these

1 in specific form as I walk through the other  
2 pages.

3 The requirements should not create the  
4 impression that out-of-country resources are  
5 ineligible. Again, these are things that we're  
6 hearing. We're not making this up. These are  
7 things we're hearing in our commercial  
8 negotiations.

9 And finally, QF eligibility criteria  
10 should create an incentive to go green. I was  
11 thinking about a baseball analogy. You know, some  
12 say that the tie goes to the runner. What we want  
13 you to do here is create the incentive to give the  
14 green flag and move forward, not provide  
15 disincentives.

16 And sometimes those disincentives are,  
17 frankly, in all cases. Those disincentives are  
18 not intentional. We think they come about through  
19 restrictive interpretation of statute. Or  
20 sometimes they just come about because we're all  
21 struggling to work through this. But we need to  
22 continue to work together to make these  
23 clarifications so we can expand the number of  
24 resources available to us.

25 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I wonder if

1       you would elaborate a bit on your second point on  
2       this page about the inhibiting effect of current  
3       out-of-state and out-of-country certification  
4       requirements. Which ones do you have in mind?

5               MR. GULIASI: I think the dialogue we  
6       just heard kicked off by Mr. Galati is precisely  
7       the kind of things that we're talking about. We  
8       are hearing from developers that there isn't  
9       enough clarity in the current guidebook. They  
10      don't know what to do. They don't know how to  
11      apply the guidebooks. And we're struggling with  
12      that.

13              I'm going to get -- I guess I can get to  
14      that issue now. What I wanted to do is explain  
15      why it's important for us, besides just the  
16      general notion that we want to increase the  
17      available supply.

18              As you may know, I know some of you  
19      know, that we were awarded \$14 million from the  
20      California Public Utilities Commission to  
21      investigate the feasibility of available and  
22      potential renewable resources from British  
23      Columbia.

24              As a parenthetical to that, you, I  
25      believe, know that we have begun to investigate

1 the possibility of a very large expansion in  
2 development of a transmission line with other  
3 parties, municipal utilities and others included,  
4 to reach beyond California into the Northwest, and  
5 then into British Columbia.

6 We think this transmission line will be  
7 needed to import renewable resources from the  
8 Northwest and from British Columbia.

9 We're supposed to produce a report on  
10 the feasibility of renewable resources in British  
11 Columbia by the end of this year. Moreover, we're  
12 supposed to propose to the Public Utilities  
13 Commission a demonstration project. Again, to  
14 demonstrate the feasibility of developing  
15 resources, principally wind, and principally small  
16 hydro resources in British Columbia.

17 We'd like to be able to launch that  
18 demonstration project as early as the first  
19 quarter of next year.

20 Moreover, it's important for us, if we  
21 are going to achieve the 20 percent renewable  
22 target by 2010, and then go beyond that to  
23 whatever the mandate may be, 33 percent or  
24 whatever, in whatever year is chosen by the  
25 Legislature, we're going to need these resources.

1 And we're relying on you to help us expand the  
2 existing supply; help us find new available  
3 resources that we can depend on to reach these  
4 mandates.

5 And, you know, here we are, the third  
6 quarter of 2007. And you know as well as anybody  
7 how difficult it is to get a project permitted and  
8 sited and constructed and have deliveries. Time  
9 is running short and we need all the help we can  
10 get and all the encouragement we can get.  
11 Likewise, developers, sellers of renewable power,  
12 need that kind of encouragement, that kind of  
13 clarity. So that's the reason behind the  
14 proposals that we will make and provide to you on  
15 Friday in writing.

16 So I don't think I need to say anything  
17 more about the out-of-state and the out-of-  
18 country --

19 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Well,  
20 Les, --

21 MR. GULIASI: Yes.

22 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: --  
23 before you leave that, on your matrix, I know you  
24 haven't quite got to it yet, but on the out-of-  
25 country you do have a recommended change that I

1 just don't understand at all.

2 On eligibility criteria, out-of-country,  
3 it's page 2 of the matrix. The third column is  
4 recommended change. And it says that once we find  
5 that the development that the requirements are as  
6 protective of the environment of California. And  
7 the rest of that, it should also find that a  
8 jurisdictional renewable resource which  
9 demonstrates compliance with those requirements,  
10 is RPS eligible. What are you trying to say  
11 there?

12 MR. GULIASI: I think this -- what I  
13 wanted to say is that I think, in trying to cram,  
14 you know, some wording into a box, didn't do  
15 justice to the idea. And we'll fully flesh this  
16 out in our comments.

17 But the jurisdiction, itself, refers to  
18 the British Columbia jurisdiction, specifically.  
19 But the concept is, you know, what was termed a  
20 programmatic approach, as, you know, we heard a  
21 little bit earlier from Scott Galati. It's  
22 basically the same concept, the same approach.

23 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay, just so  
24 I understand our earlier exchange, when I asked  
25 you about which of the current out-of-state and

1 out-of-country certification requirements had  
2 deterred prospective sellers, I think what you  
3 said was when you used the word current you mean  
4 those proposed in the staff guidebook.

5 MR. GULIASI: Yeah, the whatever, 15 or  
6 16, whatever number of categories you have.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay, --

8 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: The  
9 LORS.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- okay, but  
11 we're talking about things that have been  
12 proposed, as opposed to existing --

13 MR. HERRERA: No. Just to clarify,  
14 Commissioner, pardon me for interrupting, but  
15 those 16 categories have been in the guidebook  
16 since its adoption, I think in '06, '04. It's  
17 been in there for awhile and we just -- we've made  
18 some minor clarifications based on, frankly,  
19 suggestions from PG&E. But we haven't changed  
20 those 16 categories.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay. I'm  
22 learning more as this workshop goes on.

23 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: So,  
24 you're suggesting those 16 are just too many,  
25 and --

1                   MR. GULIASI: No, no, I'm not saying  
2 there's anything wrong with that list. I think  
3 what I'm saying is the application, you know, when  
4 you get to the LORS --

5                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Then that  
6 they, in your experience, --

7                   MR. GULIASI: -- that's where people --

8                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- they've  
9 deterred prospective sellers?

10                  MR. GULIASI: Yes. It's the lack of  
11 clarification and the lack of, you know, what to  
12 do and how you demonstrate compliance with the  
13 guidebook, and presumably the statute behind it,  
14 that requires, you know, the project to be as  
15 protective of the California environment.

16                  We need to go back just for a moment on  
17 the banking and shaping issue. As I mentioned  
18 earlier, that's the first one listed in the  
19 eligibility criteria, having, as I mentioned  
20 earlier, we've made a tremendous amount of  
21 progress and I think all we're asking for here is  
22 a very simple clarification that we introduce the  
23 word intermediary in the guidebook so that it's  
24 clear to developers that -- and it's explicit,  
25 that a load-serving entity can achieve delivery

1 from an out-of-state renewable entity through an  
2 intermediary, not just a generator, itself.

3 I think that's consistent with the  
4 intent. And we've worked very closely with staff  
5 to understand this, but it would help. Again,  
6 this is an example of what we're hearing in our  
7 negotiations, the kind of clarification that is  
8 needed.

9 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And it's your  
10 belief, I presume, that that does not present  
11 insurmountable documentation requirements? That  
12 we could just as easily document that purchases  
13 from an intermediary were actually coming from an  
14 eligible renewable facility as we could purchases  
15 from that generator, itself.

16 MR. GULIASI: I believe you can. I mean  
17 there is already a burden placed on parties to  
18 make that demonstration. I don't think it would  
19 be any more burdensome to add this as a further  
20 clarification.

21 The next issue has to do with small  
22 hydro. Kate mentioned that if AB-809 is signed by  
23 the Governor we would have to return here and have  
24 further discussion about the application of that  
25 new statute.

1           When we addressed this issue about a  
2           year ago it was my understanding that the CEC was  
3           fully supportive of developing responsible small  
4           hydro facilities to add further to the eligible  
5           supply of renewable resources. And we think the  
6           passage of this legislation will help further.

7           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Other than  
8           conforming to the legislation, if it's signed, do  
9           you have any comments on small hydro beyond that  
10          statutory conformity?

11          MR. GULIASI: Not today. I mean we've  
12          talked in general terms about doing everything we  
13          can to expand the supply, and include, you know,  
14          further resources from small hydro in an  
15          environmentally responsible way. We don't have  
16          anything more specific to add to that.

17          The next issue has to deal with hybrid  
18          fuels from small power producers.

19          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Now, Les, you  
20          skipped over --

21          MR. GULIASI: I'm sorry.

22          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- a whole  
23          bunch of stuff you had on out-of-state deliveries  
24          and out-of-country deliveries. Are you doing that  
25          intentionally, or --

1           MR. GULIASI: Yes. I said a moment ago  
2 I don't think there's any need to go any further  
3 into that issue. I think it was just covered --

4           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

5           MR. GULIASI: -- in the dialogue that --

6           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: So you find  
7 yourself in general agreement with the approach  
8 that Mr. Galati's proposing --

9           MR. GULIASI: Yes.

10          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- to submit  
11 to us?

12          MR. GULIASI: Yes. And, again, we will  
13 add some specific recommendations in what we  
14 submit on Friday.

15          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

16          MR. GULIASI: What we're asking for,  
17 with respect to the hybrid fuel for small power  
18 producers, is a very simple change, the deletion  
19 of one word, renewable. We think that the  
20 guidebook, as written now, is too restrictive in  
21 its interpretation.

22                 So on page 24 if you deleted the word  
23 renewable from the guidebook I think it would  
24 solve that particular problem.

25                 The next issue has to do with a simple

1 clarification. On the precertification of  
2 deliveries, we're finding that in some cases an  
3 eligible renewable resource cannot meet all the  
4 requirements for certification at the time the  
5 facility begins operation and commences  
6 generation.

7           What we would like is that the guidebook  
8 reflect and explicitly state that deliveries by a  
9 generator that is precertified will be  
10 retroactively deemed RPS eligible once it's met  
11 the conditions for certification. This is, again,  
12 just a clarification that, I think, would help.

13           The next two issues deal with  
14 certification. I think they're not identical, but  
15 they're similar. The first one has to do with one  
16 certification and a recertification is required.  
17 What we're finding is that the staff has asked  
18 parties to recertify their facility sometimes  
19 during the two-year certification period. Even  
20 though there may not be any applicable, you know,  
21 change in law during that period, there's been  
22 this request by the staff for parties to recertify  
23 their facilities.

24           I sort of think about this as like, you  
25 know, a requirement by the Department of Motor

1 Vehicles when you have a drivers license. You're  
2 to give them your drivers license for whatever  
3 number of years, and during the period of time  
4 when you're issued your license to the time it  
5 expires, the law will change. And there will be  
6 new laws put in place affecting motor vehicle use  
7 and driving and so forth.

8 We're not required to go back to the DMV  
9 and take a new test just because the law changed.  
10 There's a presumption that, you know, you  
11 understand the new law and you drive in accordance  
12 with the new laws.

13 If you have to go back and take a test  
14 when your license expires, you know, you would be  
15 held accountable to understand what those new laws  
16 are.

17 And we don't think it's necessary for a  
18 facility to have to recertify their project during  
19 the two-year period when it has already been  
20 certified.

21 Similarly, though this is somewhat  
22 different, is the issue about grandfathering.  
23 Again, certification period runs for two years.  
24 We believe that it would be -- it would add great  
25 certainty and stability to the market if the

1 requirement were not in place to have  
2 certification or recertification of an eligible  
3 resource just because, you know, the law changed  
4 for the period of time of the duration of the  
5 contract in place.

6 Again, if you can't depend on your  
7 project being eligible and if we can't depend on  
8 counting the delivery from that project, it just  
9 adds a great deal of confusion. And we're not  
10 going to have an easy time achieving the goals.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And you feel  
12 that that uncertainty has impeded you, to date?

13 MR. GULIASI: I'm not --

14 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: You've had  
15 contracts where there's been some uncertainty as  
16 to whether or not some future change in  
17 legislation could render the resource ineligible  
18 and that's caused a problem for you in the  
19 contract?

20 MR. GULIASI: Well, we know certainly  
21 there's a cost. If a project loses its  
22 certification there's certainly a cost. Certainly  
23 we lose the credit --

24 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Have you  
25 signed contracts with projects where you thought

1       that there was a risk that they could lose their  
2       certification?

3               MR. GULIASI:  No, not that I'm aware of.  
4       But, again, there's a cost.  If you lose  
5       certification, you know, that project drops off.  
6       We lose the credit.  There may be a cost to us  
7       with respect to a payment for ending the contract.  
8       Or if there is such a cost, someone has to bear  
9       that cost.  Typically customers bear that cost.

10              So we want to avoid that situation.  And  
11       I think it would be prudent to do something to  
12       help us so we don't face that situation.

13              There may be situations that I'm  
14       personally not aware of.  I could find out, but --

15              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN:  Yeah, is this  
16       is anything other than a hypothetical concern, I'd  
17       like to know about it.  I think I understand what  
18       you're driving at, and you'd like it more  
19       explicitly stated that there's an implied  
20       grandfathering through the effect of the contract.

21              I'm a little bit skeptical that that's  
22       been an actual problem to date in any of your  
23       existing contracts.  I doubt that you'd sign --

24              MR. GULIASI:  Well, if you'd give me a  
25       moment I might -- I'm going to ask one of my

1 colleagues here --

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

3 MR. GULIASI: -- and see if there  
4 actually is such a situation.

5 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And I don't  
6 want to hold you just to whatever you're told  
7 today.

8 (Pause.)

9 MR. GULIASI: Thank you for the brief  
10 timeout. What my colleagues told me was there has  
11 been an instance in the past with respect to  
12 biomass facilities. If you recall, there was that  
13 whole episode, and I just didn't recall a few  
14 minutes ago, where, you know, biomass facilities  
15 were all of a sudden ineligible. And it took an  
16 act of the Legislature to clarify that and enable  
17 biomass facilities to become eligible again.

18 But I'm also told from my colleague who  
19 is intimately involved in contract negotiations  
20 that this is always an issue that comes up from  
21 counter parties.

22 And I guess what I'm telling you is that  
23 what I said earlier, these are, you know, real-  
24 life circumstances. And to the extent that you  
25 could assist by providing that clarity or give

1 further assurance, it would just help us. And it  
2 would allow us to sign contracts more swiftly and  
3 bring clarity to the market.

4 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Can I ask the  
5 staff, was there a point in time where biomass  
6 projects all of a sudden became ineligible and it  
7 took an act of the Legislature to reinstate them?

8 MR. HERRERA: Well, there were some new  
9 requirements, for example, under Senate Bill 107,  
10 that applied to existing biomass facilities, the  
11 same biomass fuel limitations that previously had  
12 been applied only to biomass facilities seeking  
13 SEPs.

14 So, where a newer biomass facility would  
15 have to limit the type of biomass fuel it used to  
16 receive SEP, what the Legislature did was took  
17 those requirements and straddled existing biomass  
18 facilities with those requirements in order for  
19 those existing biomass facilities to receive  
20 funding from the existing renewables facility  
21 program.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But did an  
23 existing RPS contract drop out of eligibility and  
24 the Legislature have to reinstate it? I mean  
25 that's the way I heard the situation described.

1           MR. HERRERA: I'm not aware if that  
2 happened. And, also, if I could just quickly  
3 interject to say that although program staff has  
4 asked for facilities to reapply for RPS  
5 certification based on changes in the law, and so  
6 we've applied it in our guidelines, we haven't  
7 done it for any others. It's always been because  
8 there was a change in the law.

9           PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

10          MR. HERRERA: Most recently, SB-1250 and  
11 SB-107, those requirements changed some of the  
12 eligibility requirements that we then had to apply  
13 on some of the facilities that had previously  
14 sought and obtained certification.

15          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: You got  
16 anything to add?

17          MR. GULIASI: I want to thank staff  
18 counsel for the clarification. But, I think there  
19 was a biomass facility whose funding was at risk.  
20 But there is a clear example with respect to  
21 conduit you know, hydro, where last year passage  
22 of legislation made conduit hydro ineligible. The  
23 Legislature is attempting to address that issue  
24 now. So, --

25          PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Did you have

1 contracts with conduit hydro projects which you  
2 now think are no longer eligible, and it's going  
3 to take a change of statute to put them back in?

4 MR. GULIASI: Again, I think this is  
5 also in the category of, you know, avoidance.  
6 It's one to avoid --

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: No, I'm clear  
8 on that situation. But what you were describing  
9 before, and I think the relief that you're asking  
10 for, has to do with projects with which you have  
11 signed a contract. And your concern is that those  
12 contracted-for-projects will fall out of  
13 eligibility based on some change in law.

14 And I'm trying to get a better  
15 understanding of exactly which risk it is you're  
16 asking us to address. If it's the prospective  
17 what will be eligible in the future, I'm clear on  
18 what you're describing there.

19 It's those existing contracts that have  
20 a risk of all of a sudden becoming ineligible is  
21 what I'm trying to get some clarification on.

22 MR. GULIASI: I understand. Well, I  
23 can't give you that precise clarification now.  
24 We'll see what we can do with respect to the --

25 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think your

1 counsel --

2 MR. GULIASI: -- guidance -- My counsel  
3 can -- okay, go ahead.

4 MS. LEE: I'm sorry, Les. Commissioner  
5 Geesman, Evelyn Lee from PG&E. Actually, this  
6 year we were asked by staff to recertify our  
7 resources. And one of the types of resources was  
8 hydro.

9 Due to SB-107, a subset of small hydro  
10 was identified, conduit hydro. And we had not  
11 been in the habit of certifying them separately.  
12 But we were asked by staff to do so.

13 I know that we have PG&E proprietary  
14 conduit; and it's my belief that we also had small  
15 QF conduit that we had to identify. But due to  
16 the pendency of AB-809, which would make conduit  
17 re-eligible, we decided to suspend that exercise.  
18 So that is actually the example that we were  
19 trying to provide to you.

20 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay, you're  
21 not talking about a contract then that you'd  
22 already signed and counted as eligible that falls  
23 out of eligibility?

24 MS. LEE: Yes, sir. In fact, these  
25 small hydro facilities were part of our RPS

1 baseline, because these contracts were signed a  
2 long time ago under PURPA. So we were at risk for  
3 losing an amount of our baseline. And the exact  
4 amount could be quantified if we looked at our  
5 compliance report, but I don't have that exact  
6 figure here.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And because  
8 of that circumstance you feel it inhibits  
9 prospective contracts with similar types of  
10 facilities?

11 MS. LEE: No, actually. I think there  
12 are, I can't keep them all straight in my mind  
13 now, but at least three types of circumstances  
14 where the lack of grandfathering causes problems  
15 for PG&E.

16 There's the conduit hydro; there's the  
17 situation where developers are reluctant to  
18 execute contracts with us knowing that the  
19 eligibility criteria can change during the term of  
20 their 10-to-20-year contract. That imposes  
21 potential costs on them if they're required by the  
22 contract to maintain eligibility, maintain  
23 eligibility under the RPS statute in order to  
24 receive payments.

25 And also it creates a problem for the

1 California consumer who would have to continue to  
2 pay a contract price even if the developer lost  
3 its eligibility.

4 I mean these are unresolved -- these are  
5 unresolved issues, because nothing like that has  
6 come up yet, you know. The situation where we  
7 sign a new 10- to 20-year contract and somebody  
8 has fallen out of eligibility.

9 But it's a distinct possibility if the  
10 law is interpreted as we understand the guidebook.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Is the  
12 converse not also a potential risk, where, in  
13 essence, you want to contractually indemnify a  
14 party or perhaps indemnify -- have us implicitly  
15 indemnify you from noncompliance with the law  
16 simply because you've signed a contract?

17 MS. LEE: I don't think in terms of  
18 indemnification, because that implies there was a  
19 transfer of funds, and we're not asking for that.

20 What we're asking for is some certainty  
21 when we contract with a developer who meets the  
22 certification requirements on the date of  
23 delivery, that that contractual arrangement, which  
24 requires payment, a set sum of money, will be  
25 respected for the 10- or 20-year period.

1                   Anything less creates a risk for the  
2                   developer, and creates a risk for the consumer.

3                   Also there's a point that Gabe and I  
4                   have ventured to discuss, which is laws generally  
5                   do not have retroactive effect unless provided so  
6                   by the legislation. And I don't think that's been  
7                   the case in any of the legislation involving RPS  
8                   eligibility.

9                   So it's our understanding that the  
10                  Legislature does not intend to decertify or reduce  
11                  the categories of RPS-eligible resources through  
12                  legislation.

13                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah, I mean  
14                 it would seem to me that that would run into  
15                 potential dangers of impairing a contract.

16                 MS. LEE: Yes, I agree.

17                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And the  
18                 conduit hydro issue, if my memory's correct, that  
19                 came into status of legal uncertainty not so much  
20                 because of any intention of the Legislature, so  
21                 much as because of a chaptering sequence issue in  
22                 terms of when the Governor signed different pieces  
23                 of legislation, wasn't it?

24                 MS. LEE: That's right.

25                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: So it was one

1 of those unintended consequences that I believe  
2 AB-809 and I thought there was another one, SB-410  
3 maybe, were intended to correct. Of course, it's  
4 taken awhile to correct it, so I recognize your  
5 concern about the time that's passed.

6 MS. LEE: Right, but you point out sort  
7 of the fickleness of the whole scheme, that I  
8 don't believe there's any intent, any policy  
9 purpose in decertifying the conduit hydro  
10 facilities, yet, you know, we were at risk of  
11 being decertified until Ms. Zocchetti and I  
12 realized that 809 was going to solve the problem.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

14 MS. LEE: Thank you.

15 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: That's  
16 helpful.

17 MR. GULIASI: Just a couple more items,  
18 and I think that really they can be classified  
19 under the heading of sort of housekeeping.

20 I'm on page 4 of the handout that I left  
21 you. The first one just has to do with, you know,  
22 process, something I've been sort of harping on  
23 the whole time up here

24 To the extent that the guidelines, as  
25 published, are clear, that would just help. It

1 would help the market, help the developers, help  
2 us.

3 The next item has to do with some out-  
4 of-state issues in the certification requirements.  
5 We're asking that you create a form in which the  
6 purchaser will verify the California delivery and  
7 consumption required to be submitted as an  
8 attachment. Again, this is a very simple kind of  
9 housekeeping cleanup issue.

10 The last issue has to deal with WREGIS.  
11 What we're asking for here is just some  
12 flexibility in the mandatory participation date.  
13 Now it's set to be January 1st. I understand that  
14 there's so many issues that need to get worked out  
15 with respect to WREGIS, and it would just help if  
16 you were to provide a little bit more flexibility  
17 in the mandatory participation date for WREGIS.  
18 And we'll provide more written information about  
19 that in our comments on Friday.

20 I guess the last thing I want to say  
21 is --

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I wanted --

23 MR. GULIASI: Yes.

24 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- perhaps  
25 you might address it in your comments on Friday,

1 as to what those many remaining issues might be  
2 that would in any way jeopardize the January 1st  
3 date.

4 MR. GULIASI: I think they're just, you  
5 know, issues with respect to, you know,  
6 contractual issues among the parties with WREGIS  
7 that are being worked out. And I don't know how  
8 long it will take to resolve those issues. Let's  
9 hope that those issues can be resolved.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah.

11 MR. GULIASI: But we're just asking you  
12 to build in a little bit of flexibility in case  
13 some of those issues can't get resolved by January  
14 1st.

15 And finally I just want to talk a little  
16 bit about the timing of the adoption of the  
17 guidebook. Recognizing that the guidebook is a  
18 living document, we've been here before to talk  
19 about changes. These changes are important. As I  
20 said, they're intended to add clarity and  
21 certainty.

22 Yet we don't want to get into an endless  
23 cycle of these revisions, either. To the extent  
24 that they need it, we'll be here and we'll work  
25 with you and we'll work with staff on a continuous

1 basis to add the clarification we need and others  
2 need, parties need.

3 Recognizing we may have to be back here  
4 after the first of the year, after certain  
5 legislation is passed, but to the extent that you  
6 can wrap up this process and adopt the changes  
7 that we're talking about now, and post them on the  
8 website and have current forms and so forth up and  
9 running, it would just add that clarity that we're  
10 seeking and that others are seeking, and that  
11 we're experiencing others telling us they need  
12 when we sit down across the negotiating table.

13 So, I'm just asking you to do what you  
14 can to wrap this up, and provide the clarity  
15 sooner rather than later, recognizing we'll have  
16 to be back here anyway sometime early next year.

17 And I don't want -- and let me just say  
18 finally, I don't want to impose an undue burden on  
19 anybody, and particularly the staff. But, again,  
20 to the extent that you can wrap this up and post  
21 adopted guidelines, that would help.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: What is it  
23 that you think is going to compel you to be back  
24 here after the first of the year?

25 MR. GULIASI: Well, we talked about the

1 passage of legislation. We've talked about the  
2 thorny issue that we're dealing with respect to  
3 out-of-country issues. You know, it may not be  
4 possible to resolve and provide the clarity that  
5 we need with respect to the out-of-country  
6 delivery issues in the next three months, or two  
7 months.

8 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Really?

9 MR. GULIASI: Well, --

10 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I take it  
11 then from your comment that if it's not you would  
12 suggest that we bifurcate the guidebook to get  
13 something finalized before the end of the year,  
14 and then hold out on the remaining issue until  
15 next year.

16 MR. GULIASI: Well, you know, maybe  
17 you're more hopeful than I am. I mean, I don't  
18 know how much to read into your remark. But if --

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Maybe we have  
20 a different metabolism than your company does.  
21 I'm at a bit of a loss, looking at the two pieces  
22 of legislation that were mentioned as potentially  
23 impacting this. What's going to be so hard about  
24 either of those two pieces of legislation? It may  
25 be that the out-of-country issue is more

1 complicated than any of us right now know. But is  
2 the passage of additional time really going to  
3 contribute that much to our insight?

4 MR. GULIASI: Well, I think we can  
5 separate the two issues. The legislation may be  
6 simple. Those clarifications may not require much  
7 effort. And if that's the case, we have enough  
8 time from when the Governor signs those bills to  
9 when you're going to issue your revised  
10 guidebooks.

11 I just know that things take a long  
12 time. And we've --

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think  
14 you're used to dealing with the other Commission.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MR. GULIASI: Well, I --

17 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: They don't  
18 take that long here.

19 MR. GULIASI: I am used to dealing with  
20 the other Commission, and this is really --

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: This isn't a  
22 rate case.

23 MR. GULIASI: I'm used to dealing with  
24 this Commission, as well. Let's say that I'm  
25 hopeful. And, you know, I'll take it as a

1 positive signal that you, the Committee, will read  
2 the comments that we're going to provide and  
3 others will provide, carefully.

4 And, again, we'll continue to work with  
5 staff. We've been doing that quite constructively  
6 for quite a long time. And if we can move forward  
7 and you see the wisdom in the kind of programmatic  
8 approach that we're talking about with respect to  
9 out-of-country deliveries and other parties you've  
10 heard from today can provide you with the  
11 necessary information; and we can get that  
12 information codified in the guidebook, great.

13 We can run at a high rate, and our  
14 metabolism can move very quickly. And we'll do  
15 that, we'll do whatever we can with alacrity to  
16 help you.

17 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think you  
18 should figure the troops are going to be home by  
19 Christmas.

20 MR. GULIASI: Okay. Commissioner  
21 Geesman, you probably have a personal interest in  
22 seeing this through.

23 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: No, if it  
24 takes more time I'm willing to extend it to New  
25 Years.

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. GULIASI: We'll be here. We'll  
3 sacrifice our Christmas vacations. Thank you.

4 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Thanks, Les.  
5 Those are the only blue cards I have. Is there  
6 anyone else who wants to address us?

7 Or actually, I've got a third one.  
8 Steven -- I got Brenda's in front of yours, so  
9 let's let her speak.

10 MS. LeMAY: I've spent a lot of time  
11 with Steve. I think I'm on a career shadowing day  
12 with the two of you, and I'm very impressed.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MS. LeMAY: For those of you who didn't  
15 have to sit in the morning session, it was quite  
16 extensive.

17 So, Brenda LeMay with Horizon Wind  
18 Energy. Good afternoon. I don't know if I'm  
19 stepping into a bees' nest here or not, but I do  
20 appreciate the changes that were made; the  
21 clarifications were really helpful. And it was  
22 some of the things that I was hoping for the first  
23 time around. It's good to live with these for a  
24 little while, though, to work with some of the  
25 companies to see how it might actually play out.

1           Actually, first I want to comment on the  
2           certification process. I find it to be fairly  
3           straightforward to certify an out-of-state  
4           windfarm. It does put the risk on the developer  
5           if, for whatever reason, somewhere down the road  
6           windfarms are no longer RPS eligible, that we then  
7           have a contract that we can't satisfy.

8           I don't know how, if you have to certify  
9           it every two years and there's, for some reason, a  
10          change. I don't -- you know, I'm taking a bet  
11          that that's not going to happen. But that is a  
12          risk in the contract as it stands.

13          The other comment I wanted to make  
14          was --

15                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Because --

16                 MS. LeMAY: Go ahead.

17                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Let me  
18          apologize, because for proprietary reasons  
19          Commissioner Pfannenstiel and I don't see these  
20          contracts, --

21                 MS. LeMAY: Sure.

22                 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- but  
23          there's a clause in the contract that requires you  
24          to stay eligible?

25                 MS. LeMAY: Well, you can actually look

1 at it on the form contracts for both PG&E and  
2 SoCalEdison in their RPS --

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But we're  
4 told each contract is entitled to individual  
5 negotiation, is highly customized because of the  
6 special value added brought by both the utility  
7 and the developer.

8 MS. LeMAY: Sure, I would say that it's  
9 a tough one for the developer to put onto the  
10 utility. You know, you sort of try to divide the  
11 risks as to what's in your control, what's not in  
12 your control. And basically in this case -- in  
13 our case, and what we've seen, is the developers  
14 take RPS-related regulatory risk.

15 And that's standard across the country  
16 and I'm not trying to --

17 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

18 MS. LeMAY: -- say that we couldn't do  
19 better, but, you know, that's typically where it  
20 lands.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I mean there  
22 is a compliance risk; there's no way of getting  
23 around that.

24 MS. LeMAY: Right, right, but in this  
25 case you get precertified, which is very helpful.

1       Because then you mitigate that risk. But then if  
2       you have to do it every two years, it begs the  
3       question as to why.

4               PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Now the staff  
5       says that they only impose that on change of law.  
6       Is that consistent with the way you've read it?

7               MS. LeMAY: No. But, you know, I've had  
8       a long week.

9               PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Kate, did I  
10      mischaracterize?

11              MS. ZOCCHETTI: Just slightly.

12              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

13              MS. ZOCCHETTI: We do require -- oh, I'm  
14      sorry --

15              MS. LeMAY: Page 39.

16              MS. ZOCCHETTI: -- we require  
17      reapplication every two years. And so when they  
18      get their certificate it does have an expiration  
19      date on it.

20              And in addition to that, if there's a  
21      change in the law, it says in the guidebook that  
22      the Energy Commission will contact affected  
23      parties in writing, and that they need to respond  
24      to that request for reapplication.

25              Otherwise it's every two years.

1                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Now, what's  
2 our rationale for the frequency, every two years?

3                   MS. ZOCCHETTI: I'll have to look to my  
4 historical memory over here, Gabe and Heather.  
5 Probably just to make sure that everything remains  
6 the same. Is that --

7                   MS. RAITT: Yeah, it was basically to  
8 keep the records up to date, and I think that was  
9 actually a decision that we made back when we were  
10 first forming the program. It's one part of a  
11 program that we'd seen was considered to be useful  
12 to keep the program up to date, basically.

13                   MS. ZOCCHETTI: And it can --

14                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But what's  
15 that mean in terms of keeping the records up to  
16 date? I mean why didn't we make it every two  
17 weeks?

18                   MS. RAITT: Well, because that would be  
19 too burdensome.

20                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah. But --

21                   (Laughter.)

22                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- we came to  
23 the determination two years was the right cycle.  
24 My presumption is that Commissioner Pfannenstiel  
25 wouldn't agree to anything that stupid, but I

1 probably did.

2 (Laughter.)

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: What was my  
4 rationale?

5 MR. HERRERA: We'd have to go back and  
6 check. I mean one of the things that we did was  
7 we said every two years, and then we put it upon  
8 the applicant to notify us if there were any  
9 changes. For example, if the project had been  
10 sold and there was now a new company owner, they  
11 were required to notify us of these kind of  
12 changes.

13 But to make sure those kind of things  
14 didn't fall through the cracks, we still required  
15 reapplication or recertification every two years.

16 The Commission, of course, has  
17 discretion to extend that, make it five years, if  
18 it wanted to. And we'd have to go back and look  
19 at the rationale, but for some reason two years  
20 seemed like a good fit.

21 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: Can we  
22 do that --

23 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah, but --

24 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: I'm  
25 sorry. Can we do that now in this guidebook

1 change, if we wanted to make that change?

2 MR. HERRERA: Sure.

3 MS. ZOCCHETTI: I think it was our  
4 understanding that the facilities often change  
5 hands quite a bit, and --

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

7 MS. ZOCCHETTI: -- and we just wanted to  
8 keep on top of --

9 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And certainly  
10 that's been our experience with the licenses that  
11 we issue in our siting program. But our  
12 information needs and addressing those information  
13 needs may be quite a bit different than  
14 contributing or creating a compliance risk on the  
15 part of the project.

16 And I'd just like to unbundle those if  
17 we can. And maybe there's something else that has  
18 motivated us. And, if so, we ought to take --

19 MS. ZOCCHETTI: And this could very well  
20 be a case where we, you know, we learn every time  
21 that what we thought initially made sense needs to  
22 be reevaluated. We're certainly open to that.

23 MS. LeMAY: Yeah, we're not going to put  
24 a gas turbine to power to blow the wind -- to make  
25 the wind blow. But, extending that would

1       certainly again mitigate some of the potential  
2       risk. I mean it's a 20-plus-year lifecycle for  
3       the equipment.

4               MR. HERRERA: Commissioner Geesman, if I  
5       could interject real quick. It could also have  
6       been the fact that the law was changing. I mean  
7       it seems like every year the Legislature changes  
8       requirements for RPS eligibility. And so we felt  
9       a two-year cycle might be a good opportunity to  
10      catch and implement some of those changes across  
11      the board.

12              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah, I guess  
13      I have a contract hangup there. And I know that  
14      Les and Evelyn construed the hypothetical as if it  
15      created some sort of economic burden on the  
16      customer, conveniently ignoring the fact that 90-  
17      plus percent of all of the energy associated with  
18      every RPS contract any of the IOUs have signed has  
19      come in below the market price referent. So it's  
20      actually a cost benefit to the customer.

21              But assuming that that were not the  
22      case, just seems to me that if somebody signed a  
23      contract with a utility that both parties are  
24      probably entitled to some form of presumption that  
25      they'll remain eligible for the program based on

1       having been eligible when the contract was entered  
2       into.

3               Now, we've taken the approach that the  
4       Legislature shifts eligibility requirements. It  
5       sounds like, by implication you think that we  
6       should then reach through those contracts and  
7       determine that an existing contract is no longer  
8       eligible for the program. I'm not certain we've  
9       ever had that philosophy consciously stated.

10              MR. HERRERA: Well, I think what we've  
11       done is, you know, we've revised the guidelines  
12       based on new changes in the law.

13              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right,  
14       prospectively.

15              MR. HERRERA: Prospectively. And so we  
16       haven't tried to apply the changes in the law  
17       retroactively or retrospectively like an ex post  
18       facto law, making something that was legal at one  
19       point in time, illegal. So we haven't done that.

20              We've always applied the new eligibility  
21       requirements prospectively, saying from the  
22       effective date of the legislation, for example,  
23       then these'll be the new requirements.

24              There are limitations in both the U.S.  
25       and the State Constitution that preclude the

1       Legislature from enacting laws that could impair  
2       contractual obligations. And perhaps that's the  
3       argument that PG&E is making here.

4               But even if that's the case, the  
5       Legislature still has ability, for public policy  
6       reasons, to make changes in law that could impact  
7       responsibilities.

8               You know, here, PG&E, we're talking  
9       about existing contracts that they may have  
10      entered into 15, 20 years ago.

11              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I didn't find  
12      that example very compelling, frankly.

13              MR. HERRERA: Okay.

14              PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think that  
15      you can always adjust the utilities' baseline up  
16      or down. And the Legislature has the ability to  
17      do that. I think either regulatory Commission has  
18      the ability to do that. They may not like it, but  
19      I don't think in that circumstance we're impairing  
20      somebody's contract.

21              The case that Brenda's talking about,  
22      though, it seems to me that we are creating or  
23      contributing to a larger compliance risk that it's  
24      hard for me to see the public benefit in doing so.

25              MR. HERRERA: I don't think that's been

1 the case. I mean in the context of existing  
2 contracts I think that's one issue, the issue --  
3 the newer contract that Brenda raised, I think, is  
4 a more compelling argument. Trying to apply those  
5 requirements on this previously certified facility  
6 is problematic.

7 But I think with respect to existing  
8 facilities one could look at the change of  
9 requirements as the Legislature essentially  
10 changing the rules for which the utilities have to  
11 prove compliance with the RPS eligibility  
12 requirements. Instead of ratcheting up the  
13 percentage, they just say, okay, this existing  
14 geothermal facility, existing biomass facility is  
15 no longer eligible.

16 And so it's similar to changing the  
17 requirements.

18 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right. And I  
19 think that's within the Legislature's purview to  
20 do.

21 MR. HERRERA: I agree, as well.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But, Brenda,  
23 I understand the contract assigns the developer  
24 compliance risk. And you may not attach a gas  
25 turbine to your windfarm, but somebody may choose

1 to cofire their biomass facility with a different  
2 fuel next year.

3 I don't think it's our intent, and I've  
4 yet to see a public purpose in trying to impose a  
5 new requirement on an existing contract where  
6 there's not a clearly established legislative  
7 rationale and directive for us to do that.

8 So if we can clarify that a bit in the  
9 guidebook I'd be inclined to do it.

10 MS. LeMAY: Great. Would you prefer  
11 that I draft something, or would you just -- do  
12 you want to just chat later?

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think  
14 chatting is probably the better approach.

15 MS. LeMAY: Okay. I am concerned that  
16 my perspective is wind, and it certainly --

17 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah.

18 MS. LeMAY: -- doesn't apply to the  
19 whole thing. So I don't know if you want to carve  
20 out wind, or -- I don't know what the best  
21 approach is, given the --

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I think  
23 talking to the staff is probably the best place to  
24 start.

25 MS. LeMAY: Okay. And then the second

1 comment I had was on section 2(e) delivery  
2 requirements. It's my belief, and it's informed,  
3 that most of the contracts that will be signed for  
4 out-of-state, you know, and the term banking and  
5 shaping will be firm energy -- and I know there  
6 might be some history here that I'm not privy to,  
7 but I think it's overreaching to say that it has  
8 to be firm.

9 So I would either strike that or just  
10 say firm and nonfirm. And, again, I don't want to  
11 have to raise a whole lot of stuff. I actually  
12 think that this works great; and in fact, most of  
13 the contracts will be firm. But I don't think  
14 that that's what the law -- the intent of the law  
15 was.

16 So, for wind, it's --

17 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Does the  
18 staff have a response to that?

19 MS. RAITT: Yeah, I think that was  
20 intended just to be descriptive, and so we need to  
21 clarify that. That was intended to restrict it to  
22 firm.

23 MS. LeMAY: I didn't think so. And as I  
24 was reading, because, you know, I'm thinking about  
25 firm, as well, that's my mindset. But then I took

1 a step back and thought, you know, it might not be  
2 the approach going forward.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

4 MS. LeMAY: That was it. It looks  
5 great.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay.

7 Thanks.

8 MS. LeMAY: From a wind perspective.

9 Thank you.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Steven Kelly.

11 MR. KELLY: Steven Kelly with IEP.

12 Thank you, Commissioners.

13 Just real quickly, on the subject you  
14 were just talking about, about changing law and  
15 comparing today with the existing resources, I'd  
16 just make the observation that the existing  
17 contracts are primarily the QF contracts.

18 The difference that exists today is  
19 those contracts, I don't believe, had language  
20 that said you had to remain eligible to changing  
21 standards for eligibility. There was language in  
22 those old contracts about maintaining QF status.

23 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Right.

24 MR. KELLY: And that had to be  
25 maintained. But that was pretty stable, and once

1       you attained it, you were pretty good.

2                   There is a little bit of difference  
3 here, and I agree with Brenda. Now what I  
4 understand is how can these utilities have a  
5 specific provision in the new contracts that say  
6 you have to maintain eligibility vis-a-vis the  
7 rules passed by the Legislature. And it does make  
8 things rather complicated for a developer.  
9 Certainly, at least it's going to increase prices  
10 as they try to buy insurance or if they could for  
11 those changing --

12                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well,  
13 let's --

14                   MR. KELLY: -- conditions --

15                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: -- assume,  
16 Steven, that we have a desire within our statutory  
17 authority to uncomplicate that as much as we can.  
18 But to preserve the Legislature's ability to say  
19 two years from now you can't cofire your biomass  
20 facility with ground-up automobiles.

21                   Some --

22                   OPERATOR: Hello, this is the  
23 Conferencing Coordinator; can I help you?

24                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Doing a good  
25 job so far.

1 OPERATOR: Okay. Somebody signaled for  
2 the operator.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I don't think  
4 so.

5 ASSOCIATE MEMBER PFANNENSTIEL: I think  
6 it was an error.

7 OPERATOR: Okay, I'll --

8 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Thank you.  
9 So that's the tension.

10 MR. KELLY: Yeah. I understand. I mean  
11 obviously it's kind of complicated because you  
12 wouldn't be counting a resource that's deemed  
13 ineligible by the Legislature for RPS. And I  
14 don't know -- I have to think about this one,  
15 about how to make it a smoother process to enter  
16 into the contracts and make that work.

17 I haven't really had time to think about  
18 it until I heard the discussion this afternoon.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, you  
20 should assume we have a desire to uncomplicate it  
21 as much as we can.

22 MR. KELLY: Yeah. My other comment was  
23 related to the filing of comments on Friday of  
24 this week. And a couple observations.

25 I heard the discussion that there may be

1 yet another iteration of your process for  
2 conforming to the legislation, if it's signed and  
3 so forth.

4 And I've kind of stumbled across this  
5 workshop, quite frankly. I'm looking around the  
6 room and I notice that it's pretty much filled  
7 with utilities, because they have the resources to  
8 do this.

9 And I'm surprised that there aren't a  
10 lot of other people.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: They would  
12 say because they have the commitment to do it.

13 MR. KELLY: I know, and the ratebase.  
14 But could I ask whether you might consider an  
15 extension of time for parties to file comments?

16 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: How much?

17 MR. KELLY: Well, I presume this  
18 legislation is going to be passed, and we're going  
19 to have another get-go at this thing. And I don't  
20 know how -- I heard your dialogue about how  
21 quickly you would like to. And I understand  
22 PG&E's concern about the need to firm up and  
23 provide some regulatory certainty here.

24 But I would like some additional time to  
25 seek out my members' review of this document; and

1 certainly provide myself a little additional time  
2 to look at this, which I cannot do by Friday.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Is one week  
4 beyond Friday sufficient?

5 MR. KELLY: It would be certainly  
6 sufficient for me to be able to provide you  
7 written comments. It will take a little bit  
8 longer if I'm going to solicit input from my own  
9 members, because that requires me to one, get them  
10 to read it.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Two weeks?

12 MR. KELLY: Two weeks I think would be  
13 nice if you could afford that.

14 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: We'll do  
15 that. But let me tell you, paramount in my mind  
16 is having this done by the end of the year. And  
17 unless I'm wrong, if the Governor signs either or  
18 both of those pending bills, it's a little hard  
19 for me to see those as sufficiently complicated to  
20 incorporate into these guidelines, to require an  
21 additional workshop.

22 So, we may simply rely on a written  
23 comment period for any conformity that we feel  
24 compelled to do for the legislation that's signed.  
25 We'll just have to see.

1 MR. KELLY: Yeah.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But paramount  
3 is getting this resolved by the end of the year.

4 MR. KELLY: I would share that goal.  
5 And if you could give us a couple weeks, that  
6 would hopefully --

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Two weeks  
8 from Friday.

9 MR. KELLY: Thank you.

10 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Other  
11 comments? Nothing from Edison? They've got both  
12 the resources and the commitment.

13 Okay, thank you all very much. We'll be  
14 adjourned.

15 (Pause.)

16 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Speak very  
17 closely into it.

18 MS. MATTU: Clair Tortia; she'll be the  
19 first one making comments.

20 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay. Clair,  
21 go ahead.

22 MS. TORTIA: Hi, can you hear me?

23 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yes.

24 MS. TORTIA: Okay. My name is Clair  
25 Tortia and I'm from Chatburn (phonetic) and Park;

1 we're a lawfirm in Los Angeles. And we represent  
2 several potentially eligible facilities that have  
3 questions about how to structure new contracts  
4 that qualify for the California RPS.

5 Specifically we have a question about  
6 2(e), delivery requirements. And I know someone  
7 just addressed this issue. But, this is on page  
8 30 of the draft guidelines. There's a section  
9 that says out-of-state energy may be banked or  
10 shaped to allow for delivery of product into  
11 California.

12 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yes.

13 MS. TORTIA: And then there's the -- the  
14 guidebook gives several examples. It's example  
15 two that we're focused on. Several of our clients  
16 have an arrangement that is similar to this one,  
17 but it isn't exactly the same. And we just wanted  
18 to -- we are seeking confirmation that the  
19 arrangement that we're envisioning would be in  
20 compliance.

21 That example two says a third party may  
22 provide banking and shaping services. For  
23 example, a retail seller could buy energy and RECs  
24 from an RPS-eligible facility and execute a second  
25 PPA to resell the energy from the RPS-eligible

1 facility, but not the RECs, to a third party that  
2 provides banking and shaping services.

3 Then the third party could provide the  
4 retail seller with the firm schedule for delivery  
5 into California. And what we're envisioning is  
6 something where the retail seller could enter into  
7 a PPA with the RPS-eligible facility under which  
8 the facility would sell the energy, but not the  
9 associated, RECs to a third party that would  
10 provide the banking -- the shaping and firming  
11 services.

12 And then the shaping and firming entity  
13 would sell an equivalent amount back to the  
14 facility. And the facility would then get that  
15 energy and the RECs originally generated by the  
16 facility to the retail seller in California.

17 So, we were just looking for  
18 confirmation that the arrangement that we're  
19 envisioning would also fit under the guidelines.

20 And, additionally, a related question is  
21 that some of our clients are, you know,  
22 potentially renewable energy facilities, are  
23 located outside of California. And they intend to  
24 contract with California retail sellers. But for  
25 liquidity reasons, the facilities may rely on such

1 delivery outside the state, but within the WECC.

2 And we just wanted to confirm that they  
3 could pick various points of delivery so long as  
4 the same quantity of energy is finally delivered  
5 to a hub in California.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Does staff  
7 want to respond today, or do you want to take the  
8 liberty to have a separate conversation with her?

9 MR. HERRERA: I think a separate  
10 conversation would be helpful. It sounded like  
11 the first example actually fit into one of the  
12 footnotes on page 31 of the guidebook. But maybe  
13 we just need to clarify it with the caller.

14 MS. TORTIA: Yeah, it's similar to the  
15 example in the guidebook except that it's similar  
16 to example 2, but the retail seller contracting,  
17 when he's contracting with -- the eligible  
18 facility would contract with a shaper, firmer  
19 rather than a retail seller contracting with a  
20 shaper, firmer. That's the main difference.

21 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, I would  
22 encourage you to be in contact with Gabe Herrera  
23 of our staff.

24 MS. TORTIA: Okay. Again, we could just  
25 send our comments this Friday.

1 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay. Great.

2 MS. TORTIA: Thanks very much.

3 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. MATTU: Next we have Jeremy  
5 Weinstein from PacifiCorp.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Go ahead,  
7 Jeremy.

8 MR. WEINSTEIN: Good afternoon. Thank  
9 you very much for the opportunity to comment on  
10 these guidebooks, these comments -- I mean the  
11 revised guidelines.

12 And as a general statement, representing  
13 PacifiCorp, we're very pleased with the direction  
14 things are moving. We do have a couple of  
15 specific comments and I think, Commissioner, that  
16 some of what I have to say probably will go  
17 directly to your request for some examples of what  
18 people seeking out-of-state and other entities  
19 seeking certification would -- you asked for  
20 specific experiences in terms of some of the  
21 extra-territorial jurisdiction issues and the  
22 recertification issues.

23 And so I bring those to the table and  
24 would like to discuss them with you.

25 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Good.

1                   MR. WEINSTEIN: With the group. And  
2 when we had the original workshop back in January,  
3 we originally surfaced the concerns we have with  
4 the language in the guidebook, that the language  
5 did leave itself open to extra-territorial  
6 application of California law. And you expressed  
7 deep incredulity at that time.

8                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: I did. Still  
9 do.

10                  MR. WEINSTEIN: What I'd like to do is  
11 just read to you an email that I did get from  
12 Commission Staff that I think, at least my  
13 interpretation of it, it does seek to assert  
14 extra-territorial jurisdiction.

15                  And this was a staff response to an  
16 application that we had filed for a wind facility  
17 in Idaho. And this was the second application  
18 because we had filed a group of applications for  
19 our facilities before the end of last year. And  
20 post the last revisions to the guidebooks we were  
21 asked to refile any applications.

22                  And so we were asked for more  
23 information, list the LORS, and we were told --  
24 and I wrote a letter back saying, you know, here's  
25 the list of LORS. And none of them apply in

1 Idaho. Just kind of going one by one, you know,  
2 California rules are (inaudible) don't apply in  
3 Idaho.

4 And so I received back a response saying  
5 according to the data provided is insufficient and  
6 does not meet our intended purpose. We request  
7 this information to determine if the facility is  
8 operating under standards as strict or stricter  
9 than the standards facilities located within  
10 California are subject to. Would the facility be  
11 able to operate within California and not violate  
12 environmental quality laws, ordinances,  
13 regulations and standards.

14 It is not simply a matter of not  
15 violating any of California's LORS, because the  
16 facility is -- by California. Please identify and  
17 compare standards that Wolverine Creek is subject  
18 to -- the name of the facility -- that corresponds  
19 to the LORS.

20 And I have, you know, of course, we've  
21 developed what I hope is perceived as a productive  
22 relationship with Commission Staff. And staff  
23 helpfully, along these lines, interact with us and  
24 kind of temper that by saying okay, what we want  
25 you to do is pretend the facility's in California

1 and tell us the LORS that would be applicable to  
2 the facility in California.

3 And to me it still is kind of the same  
4 animal, which is the staff is looking at the  
5 manual and they're reading the manual and they're  
6 taking the manual to say that you look at what  
7 California law is, you apply it to the facility  
8 even if it's not in California.

9 So that's, I guess, my example of what I  
10 perceive as an extra-territorial application of  
11 California law.

12 And so we would respectfully request,  
13 and we will propose in written comments we're  
14 submitting at the end of the week, some language  
15 that I hope says that the analysis should be okay,  
16 you know, what in California is affected by this  
17 facility. And then you apply California law just  
18 affecting California.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, I think  
20 that's consistent with the way Mr. Herrera had  
21 earlier described are intended these draft  
22 guidelines. Gabe?

23 MR. HERRERA: I'm raising my hand,  
24 Jeremy, because I know you and I had a followup  
25 conversation. I think there was a bit of

1 confusion from program staff.

2 But I also believe, and correct me if  
3 I'm wrong, but I sent you an email identifying how  
4 the Energy Commission intended to apply the out-  
5 of-state requirement, including an example that  
6 referenced, for example, the LORS in Modoc County,  
7 which would be the county in California closest to  
8 PacifiCorp's proposed Idaho wind facility, right?

9 MR. WEINSTEIN: But, --

10 MR. HERRERA: Okay, --

11 MR. WEINSTEIN: -- and I'm, you know,  
12 digesting that, kind of look at that saying  
13 certainly we very much appreciate that; certainly  
14 to step back and saying, okay, pretend Idaho is in  
15 California.

16 But what this actually still does is  
17 says pretend the facility is in California, when  
18 it isn't.

19 So, I mean I do realize that, I mean  
20 what we're being asked to do, and this is a -- let  
21 me correct what I just said. You are not saying  
22 pretend it's in California from the sense of okay,  
23 here's how it applies. You're saying give us the  
24 list of what applies, and then you can say it  
25 doesn't apply. You did say that.

1                   But, that is kind of a -- you know, we  
2                   discussed this, and you know, kind of the  
3                   perception of the developer is now at the position  
4                   of identifying, you know, the county in California  
5                   that it's closest to, and doing legal research on  
6                   that county. And there's no -- it's hard for me  
7                   to fathom, like the benefits to the Energy  
8                   Commission or to the public at large of  
9                   determining what the environmental laws are in  
10                  Modoc County that would be applicable to a wind  
11                  facility, when there's no wind facility in Modoc  
12                  County under discussion.

13                  PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Try again,  
14                  Gabe.

15                  MR. HERRERA: Well, you know, I think  
16                  what we're trying to do is we're just trying to  
17                  apply, you know, the language in the statute. And  
18                  obviously we're required to do something because  
19                  the Legislature identified that this out-of-state  
20                  facility can't impact California standards.

21                  So what we've asked applicants to do is  
22                  identify those standards that could be potentially  
23                  impacted. And I don't think it's adequate for a  
24                  developer to come in and say we're located in  
25                  Wyoming, we're located in Idaho, and therefore

1       there's no way in heck that we can impact anything  
2       in California without you telling us those  
3       resources in California that could be potentially  
4       impacted.

5               PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN:   But I guess  
6       where I'm thrown off is the Modoc County example.  
7       It's really a question of whether there's any  
8       impact from this facility in Idaho that physically  
9       takes place within the state boundaries of  
10      California.

11             MR. HERRERA:   Right.   As an example, I  
12      mean I just went to the California map; found that  
13      Modoc County is in the upper, you know, right-hand  
14      corner of California.   And said, that would be the  
15      county in California closest to a proposed site in  
16      Idaho.   You know, direct line of sight.

17             And I said, as an example, for example,  
18      if there are any impacts in Modoc County, then we  
19      would want the developer to identify those.

20             PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN:   Yeah, but  
21      that doesn't mean that you wouldn't be equally  
22      concerned with impacts in Imperial County, the  
23      completely opposite end of the state.

24             MR. HERRERA:   I gave it as an example  
25      only, Commissioner Geesman, because the guidebook

1 allows the applicant to identify, you know, the  
2 applicable LORS for California. And they could  
3 compare themselves to, for example, Imperial. I  
4 just went with the one that was physically, you  
5 know, the location in California physically most  
6 closest to the Idaho site.

7 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But that  
8 seems to me to be just a random selection.

9 MR. HERRERA: It was random. The  
10 guidebooks don't identify which county or which  
11 LORS that the applicant needs to identify. And,  
12 again, the problem is that the LORS in California  
13 vary depending on where you're located.

14 MR. WEINSTEIN: And I would say that  
15 therefore one could say that the exercise, in  
16 toto, is random because we're being asked to  
17 identify and figure out what laws would apply in a  
18 place in which the facility had no impact.

19 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And isn't the  
20 better test physical impact within -- on the  
21 California environment?

22 MR. WEINSTEIN: That's what we would  
23 propose.

24 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, I guess  
25 that, Gabe, --

1 MR. HERRERA: Yeah, I think it would be.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And is that  
3 consistent with the statute?

4 MR. HERRERA: That is consistent with  
5 the statute. Again, I gave Modoc County in my  
6 discussions with Mr. Weinstein as an example  
7 only.

8 But if you had a small hydro facility  
9 that might be located closest to say Modoc County,  
10 but the water course emptied out in Trinity, then,  
11 of course, you'd want to analyze the impact in  
12 Trinity County, not in Modoc.

13 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: But the  
14 triggering requirement is some physical impact on  
15 the environment inside California.

16 MR. HERRERA: That's correct.

17 MR. WEINSTEIN: And all we're saying is  
18 we would like the manual to be revised so it's  
19 clear that that -- that what Gabe is saying is the  
20 standard, and not what we initially heard from  
21 staff is the standard.

22 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: So I think I  
23 share that belief, Jeremy. We do look forward to  
24 your suggested wording of how to best accomplish  
25 that.

1                   MR. WEINSTEIN: Thank you very much,  
2 Commissioner. And I just have one other item that  
3 is, I think, also along the lines of what you  
4 asked for, experiences people had had with respect  
5 to items that were brought up by other commenters.

6                   And one of the experiences that we've  
7 had is we have 11 facilities for which, since,  
8 well, really in the past year, we've filed four  
9 applications.

10                   And we've had the experience of filing  
11 applications, even getting certifications prior to  
12 the end of last year, and being asked by staff to  
13 refile all applications post the passage of SB-107  
14 on the grounds that the law had changed. And  
15 we're very happy to be accommodating.

16                   And really my only request at this  
17 juncture is to respectfully request that if the  
18 manual is changed, that people who have received  
19 their certification or who have pending  
20 applications receive some sort of safe harbor so  
21 they don't have to refile because the forms have  
22 changed.

23                   PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: That seems  
24 reasonable to me. I mean, am I missing something?

25                   MS. RAITT: I think the -- well, the

1 substance of it is not that they would have to  
2 refile because of the forms, but because there was  
3 a law change that changed the eligibility  
4 requirements. And that's what we had implemented.

5 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Well, let me  
6 ask without dwelling on it too long, in the  
7 circumstance that I think he's referring to, SB-  
8 107 had passed but not gone into effect. And you  
9 wanted something refiled? Why wouldn't the  
10 earlier recertification to have been sufficient?

11 MS. ZOCCHETTI: Well, SB-107 went into  
12 effect in January of this year. And our  
13 guidebooks came out in March. And we asked those  
14 who might be affected by the changes in the law to  
15 reapply, whether or not they were in the queue or  
16 already had been certified or precertified.

17 Is that right, Jeremy? Isn't that what  
18 you're referring to?

19 MR. WEINSTEIN: Right.

20 MS. ZOCCHETTI: Okay. It wasn't because  
21 of a change in the form. The forms changed at  
22 that same time --

23 MR. WEINSTEIN: There was, like the  
24 final two weeks of -- I mean obviously one could  
25 imagine we sort of pushed back on this. And I

1 think we did have some disconnect or some kind of  
2 requirement that was put on it through the changes  
3 of the form. I can recall there was something  
4 additional on that. I can't really -- the  
5 specifics, I did put together a timeline --

6 But all I'm asking for is I'm not asking  
7 to say, okay, we're all asking for the safe harbor  
8 at this stage, so we don't have to do it again.

9 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah.

10 MS. RAITT: I just want to say --  
11 Jeremy, this is Heather Raitt. It sounds like you  
12 had the unfortunate experience of maybe catching  
13 us, we were in a little bit of a learning curve,  
14 and got some misinformation from staff. And, you  
15 know, I regret that. But that sounds a little bit  
16 like there were just, you know, learning and  
17 process going on during the time when you were  
18 certifying with us.

19 MR. WEINSTEIN: Right, we're very happy  
20 to participate, you know, we're -- we and our  
21 customers are in this together, but we just kind  
22 of want -- we're looking for what we see would be  
23 fairer treatment if we did have a safe harbor.  
24 Because we didn't like having to do it over and  
25 over again, as you can imagine. The fourth time

1 was not the charm.

2 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Yeah. Well,  
3 hopefully we can avoid that in the future.

4 MR. WEINSTEIN: thank you very much,  
5 Commissioner.

6 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Thank you,  
7 Jeremy. Anyone else on the phone?

8 (Pause.)

9 MS. MATTU: We might have one from Rob  
10 Campbell from PowerEx. We're opening up his line.

11 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Mr. Campbell?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: Actually we -- this is  
13 Rob Campbell with PowerEx. And I'm the Manager of  
14 Renewables and Power Trading. And we didn't have  
15 any comments. Generally our sense of it is  
16 supportive of the changes and think staff's done a  
17 great job so far.

18 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: Okay, thank  
19 you.

20 PRESIDING MEMBER GEESMAN: And that's  
21 all our commenters on the phone? Anybody else in  
22 the audience have anything to add?

23 Great. We'll be adjourned.

24 (Whereupon, at 4:24 p.m., the Committee  
25 Workshop was adjourned.)

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, PETER PETTY, an Electronic Reporter, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Committee Workshop; that it was thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said workshop, nor in any way interested in outcome of said workshop.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of October, 2007.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345