California Energy Commission

IEPR Lead Commissioner Workshop
Electricity Infrastructure Issues in California
Caltrans District 7 Bldg, 100 S Main Street, Los Angeles
June 22, 2012 – 9:30 a.m.

AGENDA

Introduction/Housekeeping

Suzanne Korosec

Opening Remarks

Commissioner Carla Peterman, Lead Commissioner
Chair Robert B. Weisenmiller
Commissioner Michel Florio, California Public Utilities Commission
Commissioner Catherine Sandoval, California Public Utilities Commission
Commissioner Timothy Simon, California Public Utilities Commission
Steve Berberich, California Independent System Operator
James Goldstene, California Air Resources Board
Israel Rojas, Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Business and Economic Policy *(invited)*

Overview of Electricity Infrastructure Topic

Michael Jaske, California Energy Commission

Analyses by the California Independent System Operator

Neil Millar, California Independent System Operator – assessments for summer 2012, once-through cooling conclusions from 2011-2012 transmission planning process, plans for nuclear replacement study

Status Report on Air Resources Board Assembly Bill 1318 Project on Capacity Requirements/Emission Implications

Mike Tollstrup, Air Resources Board – project overview and status report
Neil Millar, California Independent System Operator – status report on analyses for AB 1318
Mo Beshir, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power – status report on analyses for AB 1318

Public Comments on Morning Presentations

LUNCH (approximately 12:15 – 1:30 p.m.)

California Public Utilities Commission Generation Procurement

Nathaniel Skinner, California Public Utilities Commission – presentation of objectives for 2012 LTPP proceeding (R.12-03-014)

California Energy Commission Infrastructure Assessment Study

David Vidaver, California Energy Commission – study scope

South Coast Air Quality Management District Energy Policy Affecting Electricity Infrastructure

Barry Wallerstein, South Coast Air Quality Management District – role of SCAQMD's energy policy and planning

BREAK

RMI Study on 2050 High Renewables/No Nuclear Future

James Newcomb/ Mathias Bell – study scope, approach, and results

Panel: Questions for the day's presenters, panel reactions/comments

Moderator: **Mike Jaske**, Energy Commission staff

Panelists:

Leslie Starck, Senior Vice President, Southern California Edison

James Avery, Senior Vice President, San Diego Gas & Electric Company

John Geesman, Legal Counsel, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility

V. John White, Executive Director, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies

Fran Inman, Senior Vice President, Majestic Realty Corporation

Angela Johnson Meszaros, Law Offices of Angela Johnson Meszaros

Jan Smutny-Jones, Executive Director, General Counsel, Independent Energy Producers Association

Public Comments

Adjourn (approximately 5:10 p.m.)

QUESTIONS TO GUIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS

The following questions are intended to provide a framework for written comments on the presentations and discussions at the June 22, 2012 workshop. Written comments are due by close of business July 13, 2012, and should be submitted using the process identified in the workshop notice, available at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012_energypolicy/documents/index.html#06222012.

1. The State Water Resources Control Board's once-through cooling (OTC) regulations will require many of the existing gas-fired power plants in the Los Angeles Basin to be retired, replaced, or modernized. The California Independent System Operator and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power analyses suggest that a portion of existing capacity should be repowered, or its electrical equivalent developed in the Western Los Angeles sub-area, to satisfy local capacity area requirements. Are there other options that should be examined in future analyses? The 2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report concluded that California needed contingency plans to deal with either extended outages of the existing nuclear power plants, or an inability to extend their operating licenses. What are the implications of this concern for the current California ISO assessments?

2. The San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station is in fact experiencing an extended outage at this time, so energy agencies and the California ISO have developed a summer of 2012 action plan which the California ISO presented at the workshop. Is there anything else that could or should be done for this summer? Are there any suggestions concerning the California ISO presentations on their plans for a nuclear generation backup study this year? Are there any suggestions for improvements in the RMI study? In the time that has elapsed since the Energy Commission's 2011 IEPR workshop on nuclear power, are there updates on the implications of the Japanese tragedy, or additional seismic studies, or any other developments that the Energy Commission should consider in the 2012 IEPR Update?

3. In light of recent and forthcoming air quality management plans from the South Coast Air Quality Management District and state implementation plans from the California Air Resources Board, along with the possibility that substantial electrification will be required to achieve ambient air quality standards, it will be necessary for state agencies, the California ISO, and local utilities to adapt existing resource and transmission planning and procurement processes to provide the electricity supplies needed to meet end-user requirements. How should agencies adapt their plans to reflect these considerations? How should plans be adapted to provide electricity supplies needed to satisfy North American Electric Reliability Corporation and Western Electricity Coordinating Council reliability standards?

4. Assuming that transportation and industrial process electrification are the key mechanisms to reduce criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions, what are the planning challenges in forecasting incremental electrical energy needs, changes in hourly load shapes, and compatible sources of supply beyond those already "in the pipeline" through existing policies? How could these challenges be mitigated or overcome?

5. What are the implications of the ongoing transformations of the power and transportation infrastructure in the Los Angeles Basin? What are the likely complementary and/or conflicting aspects of these policies? How do we best achieve the complementary aspects? What are the challenges we need to address?

NOTE: Because the June 22 workshop is focused on long-term infrastructure planning issues, parties who are interested in making specific comments on the situation at the San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station should provide those as part of their written comments.