



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

Tree Mortality Task Force Bioenergy Working Group Agenda

April 29th, 2016, 11:00 – 12:30

Natural Resources building, 1416 9th St., Sacramento,
CAL FIRE Large Conference Room - 1506, 15th floor (east end of hallway)
Conference Call Line: 916-324-6897 (no passcode required)

I. Roll call of Working Group Members (Kim)

Lead	Supports	Agency
Kim Carr	Chris Anthony, Whitney Bray	Cal Fire
Le-Huy Nguyen		California Energy Commission
Maria Sotero	Judith Ikle	CPUC
Evan Johnson		CalRecycle
Angie Lottes		Watershed Research and Training Center
Matt Plummer	Niel Fischer	PG&E
Larry Swan		US Forest Service Region 5
Clair Jahns		Natural Resources Agency
Sandy Goldberg		OPR
George Wiltsee		So California Edison
Brittany Dyer		Madera County Supervisor's Office
Skip Barwick		Delano facility
Staci Heaton		RCRC
Mik Ruzzo		SDG&E
David Branchcomb		Sierra Pacific Industries

II. Approval of Agenda (Kim) Approved with no additions

III. BioRAM Adopted Resolution E- 4770

- a. IOU advice letters and comments (CPUC and submitters)
 - i. Megha is currently reviewing BioRAM riders and comments
 1. If comments are made that identify an error which is substantive and relevant, such as a mistake in the riders, the Energy Division then has to write a

www.treetaskforce.org



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

Resolution which has to be adopted by the Commissioners. If there are no substantive issues but some small issues, such as misapplying some criteria, staff can address the issue by accepting the disposition letter. If there are no issues, the staff will accept the riders. If a Resolution is needed, staff will likely have to complete analysis and also draft the Resolution, and the Resolution will have to be considered at a Commission voting meeting approximately two months later. Further delay could then be caused if a Commissioner holds the Resolution at the meeting.

2. There is only one voting meeting in July, rather than the regular 2 per month, so if a Resolution is required and a Commissioner holds it, the program may not start until Fall.

ii. Comments on BioRAM Riders

1. Cal Fire's comments were focused on the fuel restrictions
 - a. An Registered Professional Forester (RPF) is not needed to identify fuel that originated in HHZ, that amount of training is just not necessary to determine origin of fuel and chain of custody
 - b. Restricting the entire fuel feedstock to forest feedstock is unnecessary, fuel that is not from HHZ should be able to be ag or other fuel type depending on the location of the plant
 - c. Canceling contracts after just one year of not meeting the fuel requirement is an unnecessary penalty. Facilities may have a year in which enough fuel is not available from the HHZ but they should have the option to meet the requirement in later years.
2. USFS commented on contract penalties:

Facilities should be expected to control the amount of HHZ fuel they can access. The Forest Service, a main fuel source for many facilities, will conduct work as needed and an event such as wildfire may occur which requires their capacity to react to and they may not be cutting enough HHZ material during a given time period. This means that trucks, loggers, many of those working on HHZ land, will be redirected to other work and no HHZ material will be available, possibly causing facilities to not meet the fuel requirement.
3. Community Renewable Energy: it's also worth considering that plants can't shut down quickly just because there is no HHZ material available. They may have to consume some other material and shouldn't be penalized for that
4. PG&E: there is going to have to be fuel planning occurring to ensure that facilities meet the minimum amount of material. Planning on a scale that is larger than each fuelyard is a better way to ensure that facilities have access to HHZ material. Is this planning going on at a higher level?
5. CPUC: We shouldn't just remove the requirement to use an RPF just because there aren't enough available.



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

6. Cal Fire, CBEA, WRTC: We are saying that original location information tracking, which is all that is needed to ensure that a tree came from HHZ, can be done by someone like a licensed timber operator or other entity with less training than an RPF. RPFs are appropriate for timber harvest planning and other things which require years of schooling and training.
 7. PG&E: we think that there needs to be oversight to ensure that the fuel is coming from HHZ additional to the paperwork that travels with a truck load. If an RPF is not appropriate, what type of person should we require to do an auditing exercise?
 8. USFS: Licensed Timber Operator CAL FIRE: there is also a shortage of LTOs
 9. Regulations Working Group: we are looking into this and will get back to you
 10. Cal Fire: we will coordinate call to address rider issues offline.
- b. Bilateral contracting status (Utilities) – PG&E is in contact with all contracted facilities but no extensions are confirmed.
 - c. Gap between expiring contracts and RAM program (Kim)
 - i. Cal Fire : We are expecting a train wreck to occur by October when 6 facilities lose their pricing agreements due to expiration and even with the 50 MW RAM purchase requirement, there will be a large net loss of capacity. If the minimum requirement of 50 MW is purchased, we will still lose about 140 MW by the end of this year, and the majority of MWs are in proximity to help manage tree mortality.
 - ii. PG&E : What is the gap? We are talking with all the facilities, but we still don't have a sense of how facilities see themselves as a part of the mortality solution.
 - iii. Cal Fire: Do we also want to facilitate a conversation about the clawback and performance security issues? PG&E : let's wait for the utilities to offer reply comments to the comments made here and then consider whether we need to do more on this issue. Reply comments are due May 4th.
 - iv. SCE : We had included an eligibility criteria that facilities have to have an expiration date negotiated into their existing contracts in order to reply to the RFO. There were useful comments made by CBEA on this issue, and we expect to adjust our criteria to address those concerns.
- IV. BioMAT
- a. BioMAT decision status (CPUC)
No decision made by the ALJ to date
- V. Biomass volume estimates to determine MW capacity needed (Kim)
- a. Status:
There is a group working on determining an estimate of what volume of tree mortality material will be available to go to a bioenergy plant. We are coordinating with the Mapping and Monitoring working group using Cal Mapper and other tools they have. We began with an effort of data collection, which was led off by PG&E, but have since stepped back because we were not getting the data we needed from other wood managers. That information will be very useful



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

for Mapping and Monitoring Working Group but now we are using higher level data and applying criteria like budgetary considerations, trees going to other markets, etc.

- i. PG&E: are we estimating 10,000 trees per County from County lands? Cal Fire: Tuolumne estimates 9,000 trees, but we don't know if that will come out in one year or how additional mortality will affect the rate
- ii. Natural Resources: How many BDT are stranded when a MW goes offline? How much does it cost to send that BDT to a power plant versus other disposal methods?

b. Next steps

- i. Biomass estimates will be made public after they are vetted by agencies
- ii. CAL FIRE will continue to update this group as estimates change, after the May aerial survey.

VI. VI. Facility status (Participants)

This standing item helps CAL FIRE and Forest Service keep updated websites:

- a. No updates

VII. CPUC: update on Fire Risk Map Proposed Decision

- a. We are coordinating to put language relative to Emergency Proclamation into the process so the judge would know that the Fire Risk Map is different from the HHZ map
- b. We also flagged this issue for the judge so that the next proceeding would include HHZ considerations. This proceeding has considered turning off distribution lines when there are drought conditions and high winds and other events that provide hazard to lines.

VIII. EPIC solicitations anticipated to be released in May or June, website has been updated to reflect this

- a. \$23 million total: \$5 million for Applied Research, \$18 million for Technology Demonstration and Deployment

IX. Review Action Items (Angie)

- a. Megha and Kim to circulate comments on BioRAM rider
- b. Biomass estimates will be made public after they are vetted by agencies
- c. CAL FIRE will continue to update this group as estimates change, after the May aerial survey.
- d. Cal Fire, OPR, CBEA, PG&E, SCE, WRTC and USFS to discuss concerns with RAM riders
- e. Next meeting to be moved to Monday, May 23, 1-2:30 pm. Location to be confirmed.

X. Closing Comments/Adjournment

Note: Working Group Leaders to present current workgroup priorities and accomplishments at full Task Force Meetings.

Note: Our next meeting will be held on May 23rd at 1 pm