



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

March 25th, 2016, 11:00 – 12:30

Natural Resources building, 1416 9th St., Sacramento,

CAL FIRE Large Conference Room, 15th floor (east end of hallway)

Conference Call Line: 916-324-6897 (no passcode required)

I. Roll call of Working Group Members (Kim)

a.

Lead	Supports	Agency
Kim Carr	Glenn Barley	Cal Fire
Le-Huy Ngyuen	Aleecia Gutierrez	California Energy Commission
Maria Sotero	Judith Ikle, Marc Monbouquette	CPUC
Julia Levin		Bioenergy Association of California
Angie Lottes		Watershed Research and Training Center
Matt Plummer	Niel Fischer, Chris Digiovanni, Jessica Hilgart, David Corziliou	PG&E
Larry Swan	Jason Ko	US Forest Service Region 5
Brett Storey		Placer County
Clair Jahns		Natural Resources Agency
Sandy Goldberg		OPR
Christa Darlington		CAPCOA
Brittany Dyer		Madera County Supervisor's Office
Skip		Delano facility
Barwick(guest)		West Biofuels
Matt Hart		Northern California Community Loan Fund
Dan McDonald (guest)		Sierra Institute for Community and Environment
Jonathan Kusel (guest)		Sierra Pacific Industries
Scott Peterson		Independent Energy Producers
Steve Kelly		

b. Note that to attend meetings, persons must be officially approved as members to working group by task force chairs.



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

- II. Approval of Agenda
- a. No requests for additions to the agenda
 - b. Request to move item 6 to become item 4 and move each following item down one spot; will discuss biomass estimate topic before CPUC updates.
 - c. **Judith (CPUC) requests add update on the Natural Working Lands scoping plan to the next agenda**
- III. High hazard zone (HHZ) designation status (Kim)
- Website for following along with this discussion: www.treetaskforce.org. The data that we have available is outdated (from fall aerial surveys) in comparison to the mortality that Cal Fire ground workers are reporting. More data will be available following an aerial flight in April 2016. Cal Fire expects the HHZ to be expanded when the new data comes in. The zones will then be held (not contracted) for 5 years following the RAM and BioMAT Programs such that the definition will not complicate fuel availability for bioenergy facilities.
- a. Question from Matt Plummer: is the process outlined in a formal document? Answer: we don't have that yet but it has been requested by others and is expected to be made available. **CAL FIRE will send letter to CPUC stating HHZ complete for now and referencing website link.**
 - b. Question from Brett Storey: How does the USFS flyover information cover Cal Fire lands? Also, there are areas designated here that are not part of the 6 Counties- will this information change the amount of attention that non-Emergency Counties get? Answer: The USFS aerial detection survey data includes state lands. The Proclamation does not refer at all to the designation of the 6 Counties, it refers to high hazard zone areas. This map reflects those zones- there is no limitation to the work of the TMTF to any particular Counties. They were a place to start, anchor counties that were good to begin with. We will see at the next full TMTF meeting information about how to bring other Counties more broadly into the process.
 - c. Question: Is the language that is used to designate these zones clear enough that facilities can reliably purchase fuel that is HHZ certified? In the RAM process today, there is no formal language on this and we should define this sooner rather than later so that it doesn't delay contracting or become something that each facility has to negotiate with the utility. PG&E answer: agrees that the regulations and mapping group has information about tracking HHZs but it would be good to link the rules on removing HHZ fuel to the designation that it is from an HHZ. Sandy: The Secretary of Resources lawyers state that removal of HHZ trees in tier 1 and tier 2 is exempt from CEQA if they are removed because they threaten a structure. Christa: There may be other CEQA exemptions outside of the Emergency Proclamation that will apply for this type of activity and county counsels are planning to use them.
 - d. Skip (formerly with SJAPCD) PM10 is also a big issue in regards to Tier 1 and Tier 2- a major forest fire in Kern County or anything in the Southern end of the SJ Valley will seriously affect people in that area. Kim: there are also some NEPA designations, or Categorical Exclusions, which shortens the NEPA process. This applies more to the work that will be done in Tier 2 zones more than CEQA.



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

- e. Christa: The standard RAM contract form may need to be updated. Is the CPUC planning to create a new contract? Judith: Resolution E-4770 states that the utilities will turn in a standard contract with a rider within 21 days. CPUC thinks the fuel attestation process will be part of the rider, which is filed at that time. The CPUC has a fuel attestation process in place for emissions and expects the form for HHZ to be similar. In terms of the CEQA, the CPUC has a question about the equipment that might be used in the emergency which would otherwise not be allowed because of emissions.
- f. HHZ map icon review- the map includes existing and planned biomass power facilities with contract status

IV. Framework to compile biomass volume estimates from wood owners/managers (Kim)

This work will support planning and prioritization. PG&E requested this work during our full TMTF meeting on March 15. We will be working in this working group to get data from the landowners and the mapping and monitoring group will coordinate the data. The distinction here is that there are a lot of dead trees on the landscape but we need to determine which trees will be cut and transported out of the HHZs. We can expect that many of the trees in Tier 1 will be removed, but those trees in Tier 2 are not as likely to be removed because of costs and market situation.

- a. Wood owners help identify available information on amount of trees intending to cut, location, how many years out can this be forecasted (striving for 5 year forecasts), best metrics to use
 - i. We need to know what work you're already doing and understand how many years you'll be able to forecast
 - 1. PG&E has posted the areas that they harvested this year to the TM Viewer. They expect to forecast 3-4 years out. In first year they expect to take out 120,000 trees system wide. They expect to remove more trees each year for the first 3 years and then ramp down. They will be able to project how many trees they will take out monthly or quarterly. This information is available for the 6 counties now, **will be available system wide next week.**
 - 2. As it turns out, we don't have enough of the wood owners or Counties represented on the call so we will need to coordinate this work on a subgroup call. **Angie will schedule call in next 2 weeks.**
- b. Available tools/models to support forecasting efforts - this will be continued in a subgroup
- c. Next steps and timeline - this will be continued in a subgroup

V. CPUC updates:

- a. Adopted Resolution E- 4770 (RAM and bilateral contracts); (CPUC)

In less than a week, utilities will file advice letters with the PUC. That will include the rider that addresses things specific to this auction (HHZ fuel, etc). Stakeholders will then be able to comment on specific terms in the rider. Theoretically, if there are no comments to consider, the Commissioners can approve these within 30 days. Disposition letter can be signed by staff if there is not a lot of dispute in the letters, otherwise we will have to have approval by commissioners



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

Question: Judith would like to know how the Public Utilities Districts are supporting the Tree Mortality Emergency.

Question: How soon with the program launch? Maria: 2 weeks after the program is approved, which could theoretically be late May / early June. We must also consider that there is a delay between the issuing of the program and finalizing contracts, which can be up to 6 months. After proposals come in, utilities have a limited time to offer a contract.

Question: Does the minimum fuel requirement go by calendar year? Answer: yes.

Christa: This process is really not useful because each utility only has to get one contract, so the capacity that will be sustained will not significantly address the crisis.

Judith (CPUC) will provide a process flow and timeline for RAM program. Maria (CPUC) will provide a fact sheet on the program.

- i. Concerns facilities will not meet program requirements (All) - skipped
- b. BioMAT decision status (CPUC)
 - i. The ALJ is considering the staff proposal and robust comments
 - ii. Julia: we sent a request for a meeting with Megha and Paul Douglas but have not heard from them. We represent all of the forest BioMAT projects and the more we consider the staff proposal, the more we realize that the proposal will not work for us. We are concerned that we can't even get a meeting with staff. Changes needed:
 1. Move price adjustment to every month, reduce the minimum number of bidders, and address interconnection issues
 2. There are comments on the record but we don't think there has been a serious enough response
 3. **Judith will check on whether meeting with Energy Division is possible**
 4. BAC requests meeting with PG&E and/or SCE about finding something outside of the staff proposal that could work for projects; **Matt checking with PGE staff on meeting times.**
 - iii. Interconnection
 1. Matt Plummer: is there any type of state project or loan that could back these projects? Sandy- if funds were available for a project like this it would be difficult to deal with the timing. The state could not put up money which could be spent if then there would be interconnection issues. Matt Plummer: we can't spend any of the money until construction begins.
 2. Christa, Judith, Matt Hart: We need to fix the BioMAT/Interconnection queue conflict in the BioMAT proceeding, will not use Interconnection proceeding because we do not want to make changes to Rule 21. Marc: Rule 21 is supposed to be technology agnostic and to amend it to allow the BioMAT program to work would not be technology agnostic.
 3. Question: Is there any substitute that could be pointed to in the BioMAT which would achieve the same thing as showing financial security? David: financial security is partially to show project viability but is also for ensuring that PG&E can be sure that they can access funds after doing work



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

4. Sandy- we need you to change the requirements for getting into the BioMAT queue, not look for government down payments. Judith- suggests that we communicate with the ALJ.
 5. We could change BioMAT to state that projects have to simply initiate the Rule 21 process. The utilities can then use spaces in the Rule 21 process to cause delays, allowing projects to remain in BioMAT queue through several price offerings.
 - c. AB 2861 – establish an expedited interconnection dispute resolution process (Christa); **move item to next meeting agenda.**
 - d. Next steps
- VI. CEC update on EPIC solicitations (Aleecia Gutierrez)
- a. Issuing a revised announcement next week – they have heard through multiple forums in response to the last announcement that the solicitation should not be limited to 6 Counties
 - b. Website has been updated to show that the solicitation will be released in May/June timeframe.
 - c. **Aleecia email solicitation announcement when available.**
- VII. Review Action Items
- a. Add update on Natural and Working Lands Scoping Plan work to April agenda (Angie)
 - b. Check to see if HFRA layer is the CE area – Confirmed by Claire to be correct during meeting
 - c. Get clarification from Judith on whether they need to know about the equipment that might be used in the emergency which would otherwise not be allowed because of emissions. (Angie)
 - d. CPUC needs a letter from CAL FIRE declaring where the HHZ material is located. (Kim and Glenn)
 - e. Review whether Burney Mountain Power and other facilities and status should be added to Tree Mortality Viewer (Kim)
 - f. Share link to the comments Commissioners made from the dias during March 17 meeting (Angie)
 - g. CPUC to provide schedule of steps between RAM offering and online dates and a fact sheet in advance of April meeting
 - h. BioMAT subgroup meeting to be held last week of March (Angie to schedule)
 - i. Potentially start interconnection subgroup to discuss changes to BioMAT program to allow projects in BioMAT queue, otherwise include topic in BioMAT subgroup meeting (Angie to schedule)
 - j. Establish a biomass volumes sub-working group for all wood owners and managers, CEC and Mapping and Monitoring Working Group representative; schedule call in next two weeks; PGE provide biomass volumes in next week.
 - k. CEC circulate bioenergy solicitation when available.
 - l. Move AB 2861 overview to April agenda; Christa lead



Cal OES
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE
OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

VIII. 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 Friday, April 29th