

New Energy Industry Task Force (NEITF)
Subcommittee on Business Case and Scenarios
(Development of Key Metrics, Draft RFP and Manage Business Case)

March 29, 2012
3:30 P.M.

The meeting was held via telephone conference call.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call. *Ian Rogoff Chairperson.*

Mr. Rogoff opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. and opened this agenda item.

<u>Member Names</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Stacey Crowley	x	
Ellen Allman	x	
Tom Morley		x
Ian Rogoff, Co-Chair	x	
John Candelaria	x	
Alex Gamboa		x
Dan Jacobsen	x	
Paul Thomsen	x	
Jason Geddes, Co-Chair	x	
Joni Eastley		x
Kathleen Drakulich		x
James Settelmeyer	x	
Jim Baak		x

2. Public comments and discussion.

Members of the public in attendance: Jack McGinley, Karen Davis, Chris McKenzie, Janet Hogan, Wendy Ellis, Carl Linvill, Jim Croce, Dagney Stapelton, Luke Busby.

Wendy Ellis challenged the \$6.80 price for gas as a given.

3. Establish Key Metrics for Business Case.

- Jason suggested a range of gas prices for three different cases, Jack M. asked if it was NYMEX or delivered?
- Ellen questioned the change from a specific project with tens of MW's to cases with 1000's of MW's, that party of the study was to be locational and not overly broad. Stacey answered that with input from Carl and Jim and the SubC chairs, along with the results of the NEAC report that it only made sense to look at a sufficient amount of MW's to support transmission and interest by California.
- Carl noted that the RFP focus changed from less a focus on electrical design issues to economic development

- It was suggested to remove the wind in Scenario #1 but leave in #5, add 100MW's in #4 and reduce the geothermal by 100MW to leave the same total.
- Ian asked that the transmission costs be made clear in assumptions, looking to both the NEAC report and the Renewable Transmission Initiative (RTI)
- The Method of Payment was discussed – all four should remain, including POU and Independent AND ratepayer burden vs. offtaker
- Jim Croce reviewed the Metrics – agreed to drop off the 100% NV Trades
- Dan J requested a change to “Impact” to economy, either positive or negative
- Jim C suggested that NV ratepayer impact needs to be addressed, but there is not enough time in the scope to model it so it should be an assumption
- John C wants the Respondent to add other benefits to CA that it believes relevant, like increased use of transmission lines.
- Plan forward:
 - Continue to review the RFP draft from Carl

4. New business, future agenda items and announcements.

None

5. Set time and date of next meeting.

Monday April 2 2:00

6. Public comments and discussion.

Wendy Ellis talked about the metrics and possible modifications to the RPS as concerns – she suggests that Nevada already has more than it needs, so will the outcome be to increase or decrease the RPS? Also with respect to jobs – she asks will they be filled by people from out of state that will come in and just send money home? She asks if we are importing from China or what will the environmental impacts be?

Luke Busby expressed concern that the proportion of resources might impact the outcome because they each have different costs.

7. Adjournment.