

CPUC Public Agenda 3338 Thursday, June 26, 2014, 9:30 a.m. San Francisco, CA



Commissioners:
Michael R. Peevey
Michel Peter Florio
Catherine J.K. Sandoval
Carla J. Peterman
Michael Picker

www.cpuc.ca.gov





Safety and Emergency Information

- The restrooms are located at the far end of the lobby outside of the security screening area.
- In the event of an emergency, please calmly proceed out of the exits. There are four exits total. Two exits are in the rear and two exits are on either side of the public speakers area.
- In the event of an emergency and the building needs to be evacuated, if you use the back exit, please head out through the courtyard and down the front stairs across McAllister.
- If you use the side exits you will end up on Golden Gate Ave. Please proceed around the front of the building to Van Ness Ave and continue on down to the assembly point.
- Our assembly point is between the War Memorial Building and the Opera Building (House) which is on Van Ness Ave, located between McAllister and Grove.



Public Comment



- Per Resolution ALJ-252, any member of the public who wishes to address the CPUC about matters before the Commission must sign up with the Public Advisor's Office table before the meeting begins. If an individual has signed up using the electronic system on the Commission's website, they must check in with the Public Advisor's Office on the day of the meeting, by the sign-up deadline.
- Once called, each speaker has up to 3 minutes at the discretion of the Commission President, depending on the number of speakers the time limit may be reduced to 1 minute.
- A sign will be posted when 1 minute remains.
- A bell will ring when time has expired.
- At the end of the Public Comment Section, the Commission President will ask if there are any additional individuals who wish to speak. Individuals who wish to speak but did not sign up by the deadline, will be granted a maximum of one minute to make their comments.

The following items are NOT subject to Public Comment:

➤ Items: 13, 22, 39 and 39a.

➤ All items on the Closed Session Agenda





Public Comment



- Per Resolution ALJ-252, any member of the public who wishes to address the CPUC about matters before the Commission must sign up with the Public Advisor's Office table before the meeting begins. If an individual has signed up using the electronic system on the Commission's website, they must check in with the Public Advisor's Office on the day of the meeting, by the sign-up deadline.
- Once called, each speaker has up to 2 minutes to address the Commission.
- A sign will be posted when 1 minute remains.
- A bell will ring when time has expired.
- At the end of the Public Comment Section, the Commission President will ask if there are any additional individuals who wish to speak. Individuals who wish to speak but did not sign up by the deadline, will be granted a maximum of one minute to make their comments.

The following items are NOT subject to Public Comment:

>Items: 13, 22, 39 and 39a.

➤ All items on the Closed Session Agenda





Public Comment



- Per Resolution ALJ-252, any member of the public who wishes to address the CPUC about matters before the Commission must sign up with the Public Advisor's Office table before the meeting begins. If an individual has signed up using the electronic system on the Commission's website, they must check in with the Public Advisor's Office on the day of the meeting, by the sign-up deadline.
- Once called, each speaker has up to 1 minute to address the Commission.
- A bell will ring when time has expired.
- At the end of the Public Comment Section, the Commission President will ask if there are any additional individuals who wish to speak. Individuals who wish to speak but did not sign up by the deadline, will be granted a maximum of one minute to make their comments.
- •The following items are NOT subject to Public Comment:
 - >Items: 13, 22, 39 and 39a.
 - ➤ All items on the Closed Session Agenda





Agenda Changes



- Items shown on the Consent Agenda will be taken up and voted on as a group in one of the first items of business of each CPUC meeting.
- Items on Today's Consent Agenda are: <u>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, and 34.</u>
- Any Commissioner, with consent of the other Commissioners, may request an item from the Regular Agenda be moved to the Consent Agenda prior to the meeting.
- Item 44 from the Regular Agenda has been added to the Consent Agenda.
- Any Commissioner may request an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion on the Regular Agenda prior to the meeting.
- Item: 16 has been moved to the Regular Agenda.
- Item: None have been withdrawn.
- The following items have been held to future Commission Meetings:

Held to 7/10/14: 23, 30, 31, 40, 43, 45 and 46.

Held to 8/14/14: 9, 28, 29, 35, 39, and 39a.





Regular Agenda

- Each item on the Regular Agenda (and its alternate if any) will be introduced by the assigned Commissioner or CPUC staff and discussed before it is moved for a vote.
- For each agenda item, a summary of the proposed action is included on the agenda; the CPUC's decision may, however, differ from that proposed.
- The complete text of every Proposed Decision or Draft Resolution is available for download on the CPUC's website: www.cpuc.ca.gov.
- Late changes to agenda items are available on the Escutia Table.





Regular Agenda – Energy Resolutions

Item # 16 [13023] – Amendment of Seven Energy Efficiency Finance Pilot Program Implementation Plans

Res E-4663 - SoCalGas Advice Letter (AL) 4562, AL 4581; SDG&E AL 2545-E/2243-G, AL2558-E/2253-G, PG&E AL 3433-G/4320-E, AL 3439-G/4327-E, AL 3441-G/4328-E; SCE AL 2969-E, AL 2989-E, filed on November 19, 2013 and December 19, 2013 respectively.

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Approves as amended the seven 2013-2015 Pilot Program Implementation Plans for finance pilots filed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Southern California Gas Company (SCG) and San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), and the accompanying PG&E tariff for the Energy Efficiency Line Item Charge sub-pilot.
- Approves the seven finance pilots to begin immediately.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no safety considerations in relation to these financing pilot programs.

ESTIMATED COST:

• There are no additional ratepayer costs associated with this Resolution beyond the \$75,244,931 authorized by D.12-11-015, of which \$65.9 million was allocated by D.13-09-044.



Item # 36 [12824] – Solar Energy Industries Petition to Modify Decisions (D.) 09-06-049 and D.12-02-035

A08-03-015 - Application of Southern California Edison Company for authority to Implement and Recover in Rates the Cost of its Proposed Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Program.

Ratesetting

Comr. Peevey / Judge Ebke

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Denies the Solar Energy Industries Petition to Modify Southern California Edison Solar Photovoltaic Program.
- Closes the proceeding.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

None as a result of this decision.

ESTIMATED COST:





Item # 36a [13028] - ALTERNATE TO AGENDA ITEM 12824

A08-03-015 - Application of Southern California Edison Company for authority to Implement and Recover in Rates the Cost of its Proposed Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Program.

Ratesetting Comr. Peterman

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

Partially grants the petition for modification of D.12-02-035 by the Solar Energy Industries
Association and requires Southern California Edison to conduct at least one, and possibly
two, additional solicitations in the Solar Photovoltaic Program prior to any proposal to
terminate the program.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

None as a result of this decision.

ESTIMATED COST:





Item # 37 [12834] – Addresses Compensation Request of the Utility Consumers' Action Network

A11-05-023 - Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

Ratesetting

Comr. Peevey / Judge Yacknin

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

 Denies award to Utility Consumers' Action Network for failure to make a substantial contribution to Decision 13-03-029.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

None as a result of this decision.

ESTIMATED COST:





Item # 37a [13019] - ALTERNATE TO AGENDA ITEM 12834

A11-05-023 - Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

Ratesetting Comr. Peevey

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

• Awards Utility Consumers' Action Network for substantial contribution to Decision 13-03-029.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

 Substantial contribution by intervenors, as found here, enhances the Commission's ability to resolve safety and other issues under Pub. Util. Code Section 451 to take all actions "... necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public."

ESTIMATED COST:

• \$17,001.88; plus interest, to be paid by San Diego Gas & Electric Company.





Item # 38 [13038] – Resource Adequacy Requirements for Local Capacity and Flexible Capacity for 2015 and Modifications to the Resource Adequacy Program

R11-10-023 - Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program Refinements, and Establish Annual Local Procurement Obligations.

Ratesetting

Comr. Florio / Judge Gamson

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Adopts Local Capacity requirements for 2015;
- Adopts Flexible Capacity requirements for 2015 and counting rules;
- Adopts refinements to the Resource Adequacy Program; and
- Closes the proceeding.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

 Ensuring a highly reliable electrical system across California utilities will promote safety by minimizing the likelihood of outages.

ESTIMATED COST:

Not known at this time.





Regular Agenda – Communication Resolutions and Reports

Item # 41 [13036] – Implementation of New Timelines for California Advanced Services Fund Applicants

Res T-17443

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Implements new timelines for applicants to the California Advanced Services Fund (CASF).
- Describes how existing providers may exercise their right of first refusal as provided under
- Senate Bill 740.
- Lists areas in California that various CASF-funded regional consortia groups have identified as priorities for broadband infrastructure deployment.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

 Broadband internet enhances public safety operations and applications in law enforcement, disaster relief, traffic management, and virtually every other aspect of public safety.

ESTIMATED COST:





Resolution T-17443 Implementing SB 740



Zenaida Tapawan-Conway

Program and Project Supervisor Communications Division Commission Meeting June 26, 2014





Changes Instituted by Senate Bill 740

- ☐ Expanded eligibility for CASF to entities that are **not** telephone corporations, with the following conditions:
 - Must provide last-mile broadband access to HH that are unserved by an existing facilities-based broadband provider and only receive funding to provide broadband access to households that are unserved or underserved.
 - Funding for a CASF project proposing to provide broadband access to an underserved household shall not be approved until after any existing facilities-based provider has had an opportunity to demonstrate to the Commission that it will, within a reasonable timeframe, upgrade existing service. An existing facilities-based provider may, but is not required to, apply for CASF funding to make that upgrade.
 - A local governmental agency may be eligible for an infrastructure grant only
 if the infrastructure project is for an unserved household or business, the
 Commission has conducted an open application process, and no other
 eligible entity applied.





Existing Providers – "Right of First Refusal"

- ☐ "Opportunity to demonstrate"
 - Existing Provider has until November 1, 2014 to make a commitment to build out networks in underserved service territories to provide served speeds
 - Must submit letter to CD's Director showing project area
- ☐ "Within a reasonable amount of time"
 - Existing provider has until May 1, 2015 to finish project (or if receiving federal Connect America Funds by the CAF deadline)
 - May file for extension up to 6 months for permitting issues, CEQA issues, and acts of God (including weather), with documentation
- ☐ May 2, 2015
 - Any existing provider which made a commitment to build, but failed to do so loses its ROFR.
 - May continue to use the CASF challenge process to show that it provides served speeds or inform the CPUC of its progress



Local Government Agencies

- "Unserved household or business"
 - Must provide at least one household or business with a last mile connection
- ☐ "After the Commission has conducted an open application process and no other entity has applied"
 - On May 2, 2015, the Commission will begin accepting applications from local government agencies
- ☐ Tribal Governments are not considered local government agencies and may apply as non-telephone corporations





Timing of Applications

CASF Application Schedule	Deadline
Last Date for an Existing Provider to Declare its Commitment to Build	November 1, 2014
CD Begins Accepting Applications	December 1, 2014
Last Date for an Existing Provider to Submit Completion Report for Areas it Committed to Build out or Submit a Request for Extension	May 1, 2015
Date When Local Government Agencies May Begin to Apply for CASF Grant in Unserved Areas	May 2, 2015





Priority Areas for Broadband Projects

- ☐ 182 communities in 47 counties
 - Designated by regional consortia and 4 unrepresented counties as priority areas for broadband projects
 - Intended to highlight areas that providers may want to consider in proposing CASF projects and
- ☐ Priority areas identified by other agencies
 - Governor's Office of Business and Economic Development (GO BIZ)
 - California Environmental Protection Agency/Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
 - California Department of Food and Agriculture





Availability Data

- ☐ Staff performed a high-level validation of consortia's submitted data on priority areas.
 - Alerts broadband providers, consortia or other interested stakeholders to the general broadband availability status in these communities.
 - Further "ground-truthing" efforts may be undertaken for specific project areas proposed in future applications before any funds are granted.
- ☐ Some priority areas are currently designated as served based on advertised mobile service speeds only.
- ☐ Currently, Staff is conducting research on variations in wireless service quality which will soon be released in a report.
 - This may result in changes on how advertised wireless speeds are used in the California Broadband Availability Map to determine CASF eligibility.





Regular Agenda – Communication Resolutions and Reports

Item # 41 [13036] – Implementation of New Timelines for California Advanced Services Fund Applicants

Res T-17443

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Implements new timelines for applicants to the California Advanced Services Fund (CASF).
- Describes how existing providers may exercise their right of first refusal as provided under
- Senate Bill 740.
- Lists areas in California that various CASF-funded regional consortia groups have identified as priorities for broadband infrastructure deployment.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

 Broadband internet enhances public safety operations and applications in law enforcement, disaster relief, traffic management, and virtually every other aspect of public safety.

ESTIMATED COST:





Regular Agenda – Water/Sewer Orders

Item # 23 [13063] – Southern California Edison Company's Rate Increase for Santa Catalina Island Water Operations

A10-11-009 - Application of Southern California Edison Company for authority to Among Other Things, Increase its Authorized Revenues for Santa Catalina Water Operations, and to Reflect that Increase in Rates.

Ratesetting

Comr. Peevey / Judge Rochester

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Adopts all-party settlement agreement on revenue and rate design for Southern California Edison Company's (SCE) Santa Catalina Water operations.
- Closes the proceeding.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

Allows SCE's Catalina Water operations to continue to provide safe, reliable water at reasonable rates.

ESTIMATED COST:

 Average water uses will see a 31.37% increase in their monthly rate from \$74.04 to \$97.27. Includes a \$8.895 million rate base transfer to SCE's electric customers and \$2.485 million capital disallowance borne by SCE shareholders.



Regular Agenda – Water/Sewer Orders

Item # 42 [12595] – Golden State Water Company's Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity and Settlement Agreement

A08-08-022 - In the Matter of the Application of Golden State Water Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct and Operate a Water System in Sutter County, California; and to establish Rates for Public Utility Water Service in Sutter County, California.

Ratesetting

Comr. Peevey / Judge Kim

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

- Grants Golden State Water Company a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct and operate a municipal and industrial water system in Sutter County.
- Orders a General Rate Case for filing.
- Approves the Settlement Agreement.
- Certifies the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Project.
- Authorizes the issuance of a Notice of Determination for the Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- Closes the proceeding.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

Allows the Commission to continue to fulfill its duties under Pub. Util. Code § 451, including to take all actions
necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and the convenience of utility patrons, employees, and the
public.

ESTIMATED COST:



Regular Agenda – Water/Sewer Orders

Item # 42a [12925] - ALTERNATE TO AGENDA ITEM 12595

A08-08-022 - In the Matter of the Application of Golden State Water Company for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct and Operate a Water System in Sutter County, California; and to establish Rates for Public Utility Water Service in Sutter County, California.

Ratesetting Comr. Peterman

PROPOSED OUTCOME:

 Grants Golden State Water Company a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct and operate a municipal and industrial water system in Sutter County.

- · Orders a General Rate Case for filing.
- Modifies the contested Settlement Agreement to eliminate the use of incremental acquisition to develop the Proposed Project.
- Certifies the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Project.
- Authorizes the issuance of a Notice of Determination for the Project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
- Grants parties 60 days to either stipulate to this modification or to request other relief.
- · Leaves proceeding open.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

• Allows the Commission to continue to fulfill its duties under Pub. Util. Code § 451, including to take all actions necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and the convenience of utility patrons, employees, and the public.

ESTIMATED COST:





Commissioners' Reports















Management Reports







Regular Agenda – Management Reports and Resolutions

Item #47 [13009]

Report and Discussion by Safety and Enforcement Division on Recent Safety Program Activities





Hazard Analysis and Mitigation Report

Aldyl A Polyethylene Gas Pipelines in California

Steven Haine
Risk Assessment Section
Safety and Enforcement Division
June 26, 2014





About Risk Assessment Team

- Promotes safety by ensuring regulated entities integrate risk analysis into their decision-making process.
 - Focus is on Major Funding Requests
 (e.g. PG&E GT&S, SCE GRC)
- Hazard Analysis and Mitigation Reports
 - Analyzes a potential "risk" with technical and policy lens.
 - Understanding risk is essential to managing risk.





Failure by Slow Crack Growth

- Slow crack growth can take many years to develop at stress levels below yield strength.
 - Caused by rock impingement, squeeze-offs, etc.
- Early vintage (1965 to 1970) most at risk.
- Middle vintage (1970 to 1983) also at risk of failure but at a reduced rate.
- 30% to 40% of 1970 to 1972 vintage have low ductile inner wall defect also most at risk.







Concerns with Aldyl A Failure

- Long time lag between stress and pipe failure.
- Failure is abrupt, with no detectible sign of enlarging crack until pipe actually leaks.
- Intermediate leak rate. When Aldyl A pipe does leak due to slow crack growth, it leaks at intermediate rate between pinhole leak and full rupture leak.
- Sufficient rate to migrate underground and accumulate in buildings, but not sufficiently high to be reliably detected right away by residents.





Issues Among California Operators

- Poor material traceability.
 - No documentation of manufacturing year, resintype, manufacturer name.
- Inventory uncertainty.
 - Location of Aldyl A pipes, etc.
- Operators reacted very slowly to manufacturer warnings and PHMSA safety advisories.
- Do not take advantage of <u>opportunistic identification</u> after excavation to improve knowledge of inventory.





Recommendations & Next Steps

 Failures due to slow crack growth will rise on pre-1973 low ductile inner wall Aldyl A due to squeezeoffs and pre-1984 Aldyl A due to rock impingement will rise in the future.



- Operators to submit proposal to address findings
 - Report to be served to us and various parties in 60 days.
- We will analyze the proposals and follow up with suggestions on next steps.





Thank You!

Steven Haine
Risk Assessment & Enforcement Section
Safety and Enforcement Division
steven.haine@cpuc.ca.gov



Link to Report: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/safety/Risk_Assessment.htm





Regular Agenda – Management Reports and Resolutions

Item #47 [13009]

Report and Discussion by Safety and Enforcement Division on Recent Safety Program Activities





Management Reports







Update on Federal Greenhouse Gas Regulations



Brian Turner

Deputy Executive Director for Policy and External Relations

California Public Utilities Commission

June 26, 2014





Presentation Overview

- Federal Greenhouse Gases (GHG) regulation to date
- President's Climate Action Plan
- Clean Power Plan
 - Target-Setting
 - Compliance Planning
 - Next Steps





History of Federal GHG Regulation

- 2007 Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) are determined to be "air pollutants" under the Clean Air Act
- 2009 "Endangerment Finding" EPA must regulate
 - U.S. commitment at Copenhagen to reduce GHG emissions 17% below 2005 levels by 2020
- 2010 Federal GHG standards for model year (MY) 2012-2016 car and light duty vehicles





History of Federal GHG Regulation

2010 – EPA issues PSD/NSR pre-construction permitting rules to begin regulating stationary sources of GHGs

2012 – Standards for heavy duty vehicles for MYs 2014-2018 (Phase I)

2012 – Phase II Light-duty vehicle standards for MY 2017-2025





The President's Climate Action Plan

- Climate Action Plan Announced June 2013
- Broad Array of Federal Regulation, Investment, and Convening Focused on both Mitigation and Adaptation/Resiliency







Climate Action Plan Transportation Goals

Develop post-2018 GHG and fuel economy standards for heavy duty vehicles (Phase II)

- Collaborate with ARB
- Phase II Standards to be Issued by March 2016







Climate Action Plan Energy Efficiency

Develop New Standards for Appliances and Federal Buildings through 2030

Implement Grants and Loan Guarantees to Encourage Investment in Energy Efficiency

Expand the Better Buildings Challenge

 Improve energy efficiency 20% by 2020 in commercial and industrial buildings and multi-family housing





Climate Action Plan Electricity

- Accelerate Renewable Energy Permitting on Public Lands and Federal Facilities
- Upgrade and Modernize the Grid to Facilitate
 Clean Energy and Improve Reliability
- Promulgate Rules to Address Mew and Existing Power Plants





Power Plant GHG Emissions







New Power Plants – 111(b)

September 2013 - EPA Released Proposed Rule for New Electric Generating Units (EGUs)

CO2 Limits Based Solely on Fuel Type and Size

California's Comments:

- EGUs are increasingly being used to integrate variable renewable resources
- Set appropriate standards that reflect how the EGU is being used





Existing Power Plants - CAA § 111(d)

- Clean Air Act Section 111(d)
 - Used infrequently in 40 years
 - Categories of existing sources that are not otherwise regulated under CAA and would be regulated under Section 111(b)
- Sources Covered by the Rule are Fossil-Fuel Fired EGUs Covered by 111(b)
 - Some smaller units, those that don't sell majority of electricity exempted
- Section 111(d) Provides Significant Role to States
 - EPA to develop process similar to SIP process for conventional pollutants
 - EPA establishes minimum emission limits
 - States must submit plans that establish standards for covered sources



Clean Power Plan Summary

- Released June 2, 2014 (FR published 6/18)
- Projected to Achieve 30% Reductions by 2030 from 2005 Levels
- Emission Guidelines Set Minimum State Emission
 Goals Based on "Best System of Emission Reduction"
- States Must Develop Plans with Standards to Meet Limits
- EPA Provides Broad Flexibility for State Plans; States May Build on Existing State Programs, Develop Multi-State Plans



Rule Proposes Emission Goals for States

- EPA Identifies "Best System of Emission Reduction" as a Combination of Four "Building Blocks" of Strategies
 - 1. Improving Efficiency at Fossil Fuel Power Plants
 - 2. Shifting Electricity Dispatch to Lower-Carbon Fossil Fuel-Fired Power Plants
 - 3. Increasing Renewable and Nuclear eneration
 - 4. Increasing Demand-Side Energy Efficiency
- EPA Proposes State Goals Based on What is easonably Achievable in each "Building Block," Taking into Account Cost and Technological Feasibility
 - State Goals Expressed as <u>rate</u> (lbs CO2/MWh) but
 States May Translate to <u>mass</u> (tons CO2)



State Compliance Plans

- State Flexibility to meet EPA-established oals
- State Plans must Include Emission Limits on Affected EGUs
- Plan Approaches: Direct Emission Limits or Portfolio Approach
- Option to Develop Multi-State Approaches
- EPA Provides a Flexible Timeline





California's targets

EPA proposed California's emission baseline is:

- 698 lb CO2/MW-hr in 2012

California's proposed target is:

- 537 lb CO2/MW-hr by 2030

Preliminary Analysis by ARB Staff Suggest that California Will More than Meet the Targets





Timeline for Plan Development & Submission

- October 16, 2014 – Comment Period Ends

June 1, 2015 – Final Rule to be Issued

June 30, 2016 – Initial State Plans Due

June 30, 2017 – Final State Plans for Individual States Due

June 30, 2018 – Final Plans for Multi-State Programs Due

January 1, 2020 - Proposed Start of Interim Goal Performance Period

January 1, 2030 – Proposed Start of Final Goal Performance Period



Next Steps

- CARB, CPUC, and CEC coordinating technical review and preparing comments
- Consult with regulatory colleagues through NARUC, Western Interstate Energy Board
- Consult with industry, environmental, and other stakeholders to solicit views
- Work with other Western states to evaluate opportunities for regional collaborations





Management Reports







The CPUC Thanks You For Attending Today's Meeting

The Public Meeting is adjourned.

The next Public Meeting will be:

July 10, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in San Francisco, CA



