

STAFF WORKSHOP
BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:)
)
Preparation of the 2009 Integrated) Docket No.
Energy Policy Report) 09-IEP-1D
)
Electric Transmission Data Requests)
-----)

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
HEARING ROOM A
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2008

1:10 P.M.

ORIGINAL

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

STAFF PRESENT

Mark Hesters

ALSO PRESENT

Jacqueline Jones (via teleconference)
Southern California Edison Company

Mohamed Bashir (via teleconference)
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

John Tomkins (via teleconference)
Seabreeze Pacific RTS

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	1
Introductions	1
Opening Remarks	1
Mark Hesters, CEC Staff	1
CEC Staff Presentation	2
Mark Hesters, CEC Staff	2
Schedule	8
Discussion	9
Closing Remarks	12
Adjournment	12
Certificate of Reporter	13

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:10 p.m.

MR. HESTERS: This is the Energy Commission Staff workshop for the 2009 Integrated Energy Policy Report on our staff draft forms and instructions for submitting electric transmission related data.

I'm Mark Hesters with the strategic transmission planning office. Most of your comments -- my name appears in the forms as a reference -- oh, sorry, I'm not used to having to be this close -- as the reference for comments and questions to the forms and instructions.

I'll just go through. It's a fairly short presentation. I'm going to make the presentation. We'll have a discussion for any comments or questions, and we'll go to the next steps which includes the calendar for the sort of final adoption of the forms and instructions, and when we expect to receive submittals from transmission-owning utilities.

One other thing. If you are listening on the webcast and wish to call in, the number is 1-888-566-5914; the passcode is IEPR; and the call leader is Suzanne Korosec. That also shows up on

1 some of the slides.

2 All right, let's start out with the
3 forms. Essentially who must file are electric
4 transmission system owners. We try to keep these
5 things as simple as possible, but also where there
6 are agencies such as the Transmission Agency of
7 Northern California, they may file, and we like it
8 if they file on behalf of their members, if there
9 were coordinated projects.

10 Where there are merchant projects such
11 as the Lake Elsinor advanced pump storage project
12 that is connecting to a utility, we request that
13 the utility or utilities file information on that
14 project.

15 We have a list of the major, some of the
16 major transmission projects in California. And
17 with that list we have the transmission order that
18 we'd like to file the information. I'm not going
19 to go over each of these; the list is pretty self-
20 explanatory.

21 What to file. We have these forms and
22 instructions are very similar to the forms and
23 instructions that we used in the 2007 Integrated
24 Energy Policy Report. We're not trying to create
25 a lot of extra work; we're not asking for

1 utilities to create a transmission plan for our
2 filing. What we would like to have filed is the
3 most recent transmission expansion plan.

4 And then descriptions of the bulk
5 transmission network. These include limits on
6 imports into the utility's control area or the
7 transmission owner's control area; limits on
8 moving bulk power within the area; and finally,
9 the transmission that's required to meet state
10 energy policy goals, which includes transmission
11 for renewable portfolio standards; replacement of
12 aging power plants, and included in that would be
13 the proposed rule by the State Water Resources
14 Control Board to eliminate the use of once-through
15 cooling in coastal plants. And also the need to
16 reduce local capacity needs.

17 And the other request to be filed are
18 potential corridor needs.

19 Is this -- do I have to be this close to
20 this thing?

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. HESTERS: And, again, what to file
23 is -- again, we want general descriptions on
24 limits on imports into your system. Just an
25 example of this would have been the Devers-Palo

1 Verde 2 line that was an import into the Edison
2 system. Again, that's an older line, but that's
3 an example.

4 We want a general description of those
5 lines and plans to upgrade import capability
6 through 2018. We're also looking for a general
7 description of maintenance that would affect the
8 ability to import power into an area through 2011.
9 Partly we use that in summer assessments, and it
10 helps us to know if there's going to be limits in
11 the next couple years that are somehow affecting
12 the ability to import power.

13 We're also looking for information on
14 limits on bulk transmission within the
15 transmission owner's network. An example of this
16 is the Edison south-of-Lugo constraint. If
17 there's plans, a general description of the limits
18 and also any plans to upgrade those limits through
19 2018. And also any maintenance that affects these
20 bulk transmission limits within the network for
21 2011.

22 The third category is transmission for
23 state policy goals. These seem to be driving a
24 lot of our transmission needs for the next year --
25 10 to 15 years. One of the biggies is the need to

1 meet renewable energy targets; also greenhouse gas
2 targets.

3 We are fully involved in the renewable
4 energy transmission initiative, which is the RETI
5 process. We understand that a lot of that is
6 going to be -- or a lot of the transmission that's
7 going to come out of that process is not available
8 until March.

9 We don't expect utilities to file, or
10 transmission owners to file that data. We are
11 part of RETI. We will get that information there.

12 Where there are projects that aren't
13 tied into RETI, we would expect that those would
14 be filed by the transmission owners.

15 We also have the transmission required
16 for the retirement of aging power plants, and
17 compliance with the State Water Resources Control
18 Board once-through cooling policies.

19 And finally, the elimination of or
20 reduction of local capacity requirements.

21 This is actually new from the 2007 forms
22 and instructions. In 2007 we didn't have
23 regulations for our potential corridor needs. So
24 this time we're asking for a little bit more
25 information on corridors.

1 Basically we're looking for corridors
2 associated with imports into transmission owner
3 system, imports within the transmission owner
4 system, and for new transmission projects or
5 potential transmission projects to meet state
6 policy goals.

7 We're looking for corridors that provide
8 opportunities to link with federal corridors.
9 Again, opportunities to provide transmission for
10 furthering RPS goals, and including opportunities
11 to export renewable-based generation to areas
12 outside of California.

13 We're looking for corridors that provide
14 an opportunity to import out-of-state power,
15 opportunities to improve reliability or else
16 reduce congestion, and finally, corridor
17 opportunities to upgrade existing lines. So it
18 keeps going.

19 For point-to-point transmission needs
20 we're looking for opportunities -- these are again
21 corridors that are needed to meet future load
22 growth.

23 And the potential for impacting
24 sensitive lands that are inappropriate for energy
25 corridors. So areas that are not acceptable for

1 corridors, we'd like those identified, as well.

2 Again, we brought this up last, was the
3 consideration of the Garamendi principles. The
4 Garamendi principles are essentially four. The
5 first on is to upgrade existing facilities. The
6 second is to use existing corridors.

7 The third is to minimize environmental
8 impacts -- this is all transmission related. And
9 the fourth is to coordinate transmission planning.

10 The next was to describe any local, work
11 with local agencies on identifying corridors and
12 any other major corridor issues.

13 We have two last corridor questions.
14 One is that if you're not planning to propose a
15 corridor, identify the circumstances under which
16 or planning timeframes under which you might
17 obtain a corridor designation before building a
18 line.

19 We're trying to flesh out our
20 regulations and our corridor program, providing us
21 information on when a utility or a transmission
22 owner would use a corridor will help us do that.

23 The other one is if you would never use
24 the Energy Commission's corridor designation
25 process, we'd like to know why not. These are

1 sort of more qualitative questions rather than
2 specific transmission-related data.

3 And I'm going to skip the questions and
4 go into the schedule real quick. And then we'll
5 come to questions.

6 Our schedule for the forms and
7 instructions at this point are we're looking for
8 written comments filed by December 18th. Those
9 would be directed to -- I'm going to give you a
10 website and a subject heading for that. The
11 website is the docket at energy.state.ca.us and
12 the subject would be docket number 9-IEP-1D
13 transmission planning.

14 And those we're looking for by December
15 18th. We would then incorporate comments and
16 publish a staff final set of forms and
17 instructions by January 2nd. These would then
18 come up before the full Commission at the
19 Commission business meeting on January 14th. We
20 would post those on January 16th. And we would
21 expect responses by March 16th.

22 And then in April or May we would hold
23 our Committee workshop on our draft transmission
24 project and corridor recommendations.

25 And the rest of it is up in the air.

1 I think that's where we are. Questions
2 and comments?

3 (Pause.)

4 MR. HESTERS: No questions in the room?
5 I guess we have three questions on the line.
6 We've got Jacqueline Jones from Southern
7 California Edison, clarification of data
8 requirements.

9 MS. JONES: I don't have any specific
10 questions. That was just in case I needed to
11 ask --

12 (Laughter.)

13 MS. JONES: But we're glad to show that
14 Southern California Edison is participating.

15 MR. HESTERS: Okay. We have Mohamed
16 Bashir from LADWP, discussion of all interested
17 parties, topic number two.

18 MR. BASHIR: Mark, thank you for the
19 opportunity to participate. LADWP -- support and
20 provide the data in this. We will provide
21 (inaudible) if there are any questions (inaudible)
22 document data (inaudible).

23 In addition, (inaudible) work with your
24 staff.

25 MR. HESTERS: That sounds good. And

1 then we have John Tomkins with Seabreeze Pacific
2 RTS.

3 MR. TOMKINS: Yes, sir, thanks for the
4 opportunity to participate here. We had one
5 simple question, and it was on your slide. List
6 of the major transmission projects.

7 And, of course, our Seabreeze Pacific
8 RTS dc project, which I assume you mean the West
9 Coast Cable there, is identified. And our
10 transmission owner that should supply the
11 information to you is PG&E.

12 Now, I assume that PG&E would be happy
13 to do that. If they didn't want to, should a
14 merchant transmission owner send you our stuff
15 directly?

16 MR. HESTERS: That would be fine, too.

17 MR. TOMKINS: Okay, because we have one
18 other project. West Coast Cable is the first,
19 1600 megawatts, from basically the northwest to
20 San Francisco.

21 And our second project is Trident. And
22 Trident would go from Vancouver Island, and
23 interconnections to northern B.C., then to Alaska,
24 down to San Francisco.

25 MR. HESTERS: That would be, actually we

1 appreciate that a lot if you would file that. We
2 don't want to hinder or imply that we don't want
3 people filing.

4 MR. TOMKINS: Well, we don't -- well,
5 I'll be happy to talk to the folks at PG&E, and
6 I'm sure they'd supply whatever you want. But
7 we'd be happy to supply it ourselves if that's
8 necessary.

9 MR. HESTERS: We'd also, I mean one of
10 the other things that came up at the last, two
11 years ago when we were discussing the forms and
12 instructions was that some of these projects,
13 again the LEAPS comes to mind because it connects
14 Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric, or also
15 some of the Greenpath projects that connected IID
16 and other utilities, was that if the utilities
17 wanted to coordinate and just have one filing on
18 those projects, that works, too. And we'd
19 actually like to encourage that and minimize the
20 duplication.

21 I guess I had one other thing to add
22 that actually came up late, was a discussion of
23 one of the other things we'd like to see is an
24 update on projects that we have recommended in
25 previous strategic investment plans, just an

1 update on their status.

2 These projects include phase one of the
3 Tehachapi project; Devers-Palo Verde 2; TransBay
4 DC Cable; the Sunrise Power Link; and Greenpath
5 IID. Some of the names have changed on the
6 Greenpath, that's why I'm talking about it that
7 way. That was all from the 2005 strategic
8 transmission investment plan.

9 From the 2007 strategic transmission
10 investment plan we had Central California Clean
11 Energy project; the Greenpath North; the Tehachapi
12 segments 4 through 11; the LADWP Tehachapi
13 Upgrade; and the Lake Elsinor advanced pump
14 storage project.

15 Again, as we said last time, and we said
16 in the forms and instructions, themselves,
17 providing links and contacts to webpages is a fine
18 way to respond to these requests.

19 I see some puzzled looks, but I don't
20 have any -- no questions.

21 MR. HESTERS: I think that's all we
22 have.

23 (Whereupon, at 1:26 p.m., the workshop
24 was adjourned.)
25

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 Staff 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 the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of December, 2008.



PETER PETTY