





























### SCP Guiding Principles As Applied to an SCP FIT

PRINCIPLE	SCP FIT
JPA Five Core Concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WILL reduce GHG in Sonoma County and neighboring regions – the renewable energy produced under the FIT will offset fossil fueled generation.</li> <li>• COULD produce cost competitive energy – if priced properly, the renewable energy produced under the FIT could be competitive with very similar resources (e.g. North Bay small solar), and may even be competitive with local, large scale renewable generation such as the Geysers. Another aspect of cost competitiveness is PG&amp;E’s pricing for similar resources. If PG&amp;E offers a better deal, an SCP FIT will likely have little uptake.</li> <li>• Does NOT reduce energy consumption – this is strictly a generation procurement program and thus does not contain an energy efficiency element.</li> <li>• COULD help the local economy and develop local jobs in renewable energy – if made a requirement under the FIT, a verifiable demonstration of local benefits would provide a boost to the local economy and jobs, although the benefit should be considered concurrent with cost competitiveness.</li> <li>• SHOULD contribute to rate stability, energy security and reliability through local control of resources – notwithstanding price competitiveness, FIT generally have a fairly long term ranging from 10 to 20 years. Assuming adequate FIT uptake, the resulting long term power supply contracts promote longer term rate stability, generation diversity from SCP’s current portfolio, and lessens dependence on transmission grid access.</li> </ul>



PRINCIPLE	SCP FIT
Fiduciary and Regulatory Compliance	<p>The program MUST comply with fiduciary and regulatory compliance. Such compliance includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FITs are recognized by the CPUC, the CAISO and FERC as appropriate sources of wholesale power.</li> <li>• All FIT project interconnection must be conducted pursuant to the rigorous mechanical and policy standards inherent in CPUC and CAISO interconnection tariffs.</li> <li>• SCP FIT producers must meet minimum industry experience and credit-worthiness standards.</li> <li>• Standard terms and conditions can provide for SCP assumption of control of FIT projects under indicated circumstances.</li> </ul>
Open & Receptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public support for an SCP FIT is generally strong and FIT was one of the reasons initially advanced for creating SCP.</li> <li>• If an SCP FIT is launched, built-in off-ramps and the ability to modify the tariff should be considered.</li> </ul>
Balanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If properly designed, competing elements of cost vs. greater renewable energy COULD be addressed.</li> <li>• If properly designed, SHOULD provide portfolio diversity.</li> </ul>
Flexible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If properly designed, SHOULD provide throttle control on scaling up or down procurement amounts, and/or discontinuing or modifying the tariff.</li> </ul>



PRINCIPLE	SCP FIT
Efficient & Prepared	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial FIT development requires only moderate resource commitment. The most difficult challenge in creating a successful FIT is balancing the need to incentivize development against automated and cost effective controls.</li> <li>• Once developed, the resources required to administer the FIT can be kept to a minimum, but again, balance here is critical.</li> </ul>

### Possible SCP FIT Approaches

CONCEPT	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
Setting FIT eligibility consistent with SCP's current resource capabilities	<p>A number of factors must be considered in determining tariff sunset dates and/or capacity caps. To secure financing, developers need to demonstrate that their projects, once built, will be eligible under the SCP FIT. Due to the often long time scale involved in project development, developers need certainty that once a project is undertaken, that FIT pricing, terms and conditions will remain available. This can be achieved through a number of mechanisms, each of which comes with both benefits and burdens. An example is the use of a capacity reservation system (CRS). A CRS provides developers with the much needed certainty, but opens the FIT to queue gaming and SCP to higher levels of resource commitment. Another approach is to guarantee that any projects meeting specified milestones by a particular date will be guaranteed a FIT contract. This deadline based approach is less resource intensive but could result in larger than expected FIT procurement.</p>



<b>CONCEPT</b>	<b>EXPLANATION/RATIONALE</b>
Size limited to under 1 MW or CAISO scheduling must be provided by developer at no additional cost	Projects under 1 MW are forecasted as reduction to load and thus have very minimal ongoing overhead. Projects 1 MW or larger require scheduling by CAISO and are thus present an ongoing resource impact to SCP. By requiring that all FIT generation conform to a rule of no additional scheduling burden on SCP, the additional pricing and other terms and conditions of two tiers of generation are avoided.
Only California Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) Eligible Technologies	Ensures consistency with California law, while outsourcing certification burden to the California Energy Commission.
Interconnected only within SCP jurisdiction	Ensures that the generation is sited locally. Renewable energy outside of the local region can likely be procured more cost effectively at larger scales under RFP or bilateral negotiations.
Market pricing with escalation only upon review	Many FITs start at a relatively high price point and reduce the price as capacity reservations are filled. The downsides to this declining price approach are the possibility of paying well over market prices and the administrative burden of overseeing a complex structure. The use of an escalation approach could eliminate these downsides but presents the possibility of low or zero initial response. For this reason, setting an initial price consistent with market signals and SCP procurement needs is critical. Because PG&E is our only direct competitor, market signals should include PG&E FIT (aka ReMAT) pricing.





<b>CONCEPT</b>	<b>EXPLANATION/RATIONALE</b>
Require minimum local benefits using an existing verification program	Allowing only projects interconnected within SCP jurisdiction ensures direct benefits from the actual renewable generation, but additional validation is required to ensure other local benefits such as job creation. Use of an existing program to validate these benefits leverages outside resources and further ensure transparency.

# SCP FEED-IN TARIFF DEVELOPMENT

March 26, 2014

Business Operations Committee

# Feed-In Tariff (FIT) Overview

- Provides an opportunity for owners of small-scale, locally situated renewable generators to sell electricity to the local utility or CCA
- Promotes resource “localization” – generating resources are located in closer proximity to end users
- Standardized contracting process (i.e., “standard offer”) eliminates negotiation efforts – all sellers are offered the same terms/conditions and execute the same Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) form
- May provide above market financial incentives to advance broader policy goals/objectives, such as increased renewable energy procurement and/or GHG reduction
- May be confused with Net Energy Metering - FIT energy output is sold directly to the utility (wholesale transaction) rather than netted against individual customer energy use (retail transaction)

# FIT Overview (Continued)

- Pertinent terms and conditions are described in a publicly available tariff
- Utility/CCA typically requires longer-term contract relationship (10-20+years) to support project financing and ongoing O&M
- Utility/CCA may limit project eligibility through one or more of the following criteria/requirements:
  - Fuel source
  - Delivery profile (peak, baseload, etc.)
  - Location
  - Individual project generating capacity (individual project participatory limit)
  - Aggregate FIT program generating capacity (overall program participatory limit)
  - Price (which typically declines over time)
- PG&E and/or the CAISO administers the generator interconnection process.

# FIT Models

Tariff models vary widely by location (both foreign and domestic)

- Primary program differentiator tends to be price
- Domestic FIT programs tend to offer prices that account for a broad range of factors: avoided cost of energy, local development costs and policy goals (including RPS)
- Certain European-based FIT programs have offered significant financial incentives/subsidies (for example, over 30 c€/kWh for solar technologies); some programs have been suspended due to concerns focused on sustainability
- Effective July 2013, California's investor-owned utilities (IOUs) implemented a new FIT program (consistent with SB 32) – the Renewable Marketing Adjusting Tariff (ReMAT)
  - ReMAT prescribes a statewide FIT procurement target of 750 MW
  - Each IOU was allocated a share of the statewide target (PG&E's share ≈ 219 MW\*)
  - Three product types: As-Available Peaking, As-Available Non-Peaking and Baseload
  - FIT starting price = \$89.23/MWh (as of November 1, 2013; subject to adjustments)
  - Price to be periodically adjusted (generally, downward) based on participation levels
  - Beginning March 3, 2014, As-Available Peaking (e.g., solar) is now \$77.23 (based on reductions resulting from relatively high participation levels)

# Key Considerations for SCP

- Budgetary/Rate impacts
  - High participatory cap (+ relatively high price) may put upwards pressure on budget/rates
  - High FIT price (+ relatively high participatory cap) may result in similar consequences
- Achievement of policy goals/objectives
  - FIT participation should increase overall renewable energy procurement percentage
  - Additional renewable energy deliveries will reduce SCP GHG emissions
  - FIT project development should promote local economic development opportunities
- Administrative burdens/workload
  - Standard offer will minimize/eliminate contract negotiations (following PPA development)
  - Application/capacity reservation process would require staff support
- Implication to planning and procurement processes
  - Actual and expected FIT deliveries will need to be considered during periodic resource planning and procurement efforts
  - Incremental FIT deliveries will reduce/offset other renewable energy needs
- Competitiveness with PG&E's ReMAT

# Establishing FIT Requirements

- Participatory Limit – aggregate FIT capacity, as measured by all projects under contract, could not exceed specified MW total
  - Improves resource planning efforts
  - Limits potential budgetary/rate impacts related to the FIT program
  - *Discussion item: consider establishing an initial participatory cap  $\leq 5$  MW*
- Eligible Service Territory – only projects located/interconnected within the specified geographic area would be eligible for FIT participation
  - Ensures proximity to SCP customers
  - Promotes local economic development
  - *Discussion item: consider defining eligible service territory as Sonoma County*
- Project-specific Capacity Limitations – limits eligibility to projects at or below a specified MW total
  - Promotes small-scale (distributed) resource development
  - Limits costs associated with resource scheduling for generators  $< 1$  MW
  - *Discussion item: consider that PG&E currently allows FIT projects up to 3 MW (and participatory limit to be established by SCP)*

# Establishing FIT Requirements (Cont.)

- Contract Delivery Term – the number of years during which SCP would receive renewable energy deliveries from FIT generators
  - Longer-term lengths are generally preferred by FIT developers (improved support for asset financing)
  - Long-term contracts may simplify resource planning and budgeting efforts
  - Over long term, fixed energy pricing may diverge from current market
  - *Discussion item: consider that PG&E offers 10-, 15- and 20-year term options*
- Price – the rate paid by SCP for FIT energy deliveries
  - Fixed vs. Time of Delivery (TOD) adjusted
  - Inclusion of local development incentives
  - Frequency of pricing review/reset (predetermined or as-necessary)
  - Competitiveness/comparability to PG&E
  - *Discussion item: consider that PG&E's current solar price approximates \$90/MWh (\$77.23 + TOD adjustments); \$89.23/MWh base price for Non-Peaking and Baseload*



# Establishing FIT Requirements (Cont.)

- Product Differentiation – the manner in which SCP may choose to indicate preference for certain FIT product types
  - Certain fuel sources/delivery profiles may better align with SCP's load curve
  - Certain energy delivery profiles may have a higher relative value than others
  - Development costs vary by fuel source – will this be considered when establishing SCP's FIT price schedule?
  - *Discussion item: consider if/how SCP will indicate preference for certain energy products by establishing price differentiation*
- Local Economic Development Impacts – utilization of local workforce and materials when developing, constructing, operating and maintaining each FIT project
  - Measuring/quantifying impact (jobs and dollars)
  - Indicating preference for projects with highest possible local economic development impact
  - Collecting/evaluating economic development projections
  - *Discussion item: consider the manner in which SCP may be able to promote local economic development impacts through its FIT program*

# Establishing FIT Requirements (Cont.)

- FIT Administration – procedural rigor, time and expense required to administer SCP's FIT
  - Project registration/application
  - Development queue/capacity reservation
  - Key milestone identification and verification of completion
  - Development deposits
  - *Discussion item: consider tradeoffs (cost/time) between administrative rigor and tariff effectiveness; FIT administration/procedures may evolve with time*

# FIT Next Steps

- Develop & finalize FIT requirements (estimated one month for completion)
- Draft & publish SCP's initial Feed-In Tariff (estimated two months for completion – mid/late May 2014 launch)
  - Designation of staff/consultant responsibilities
  - Development of application/registration materials
  - Preparation of development milestone checklist (used to qualify interested FIT applicants for PPA readiness)
  - Development of initial FIT PPA

# SCP FIT

## Questions & Discussion



Local. Renewable. Ours.

50 Old Courthouse Square, Suite 605  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

## Staff Report

---

To: Sonoma Clean Power Authority Business Operations Committee

From: Geof Syphers, CEO

Item: Resource Planning Timeline (Item 3)

Date: March 26, 2014

---

The purpose of this item is to review and provide feedback on the calendar for resource planning activities.

### Background

At the last Sonoma Clean Power (SCP) Business Operations Committee (BOC) meeting, Staff presented a high level, conceptual approach to Resource Planning. In this follow up, Staff provides an overview of Resource Planning timing and the elements that drive the timing.

### Key Resource Planning Timing Elements

- 1) Ramping up to full roll out
- 2) Budgeting process
- 3) Power markets

**Ramping up to full roll out:** Beginning May 1, 2014, SCP will begin serving approximately 22,000 accounts. For the energy needed to serve these accounts, in accordance with SCP Risk Management Policy, SCP is 100% forward-procured



through June 30, 2015, 85% for FY 2015/16, and 75% for the remainder of calendar year 2016. The outstanding procurement is referred to as an “open position.” SCP must begin another round of procurement to fill the open positions, as well as to forward-procure for the energy needed to serve Phase 2 customers. This upcoming procurement is foundational to SCP’s success and thus must dictate our near-term planning schedule. The launch of more sophisticated programs will naturally follow these procurement efforts because of the time and staff needed for procurement. Also, information about customer retention, actual load, and current market conditions are valuable to make informed decisions regarding additional procurement.

***Budgeting process:*** As discussed in Agenda Item 1, FY 2014/15 budgeting is underway and will be a significant effort until the new budget is adopted by the Board of Directors in June. Later budgets will likely take somewhat less effort because the FY2014-15 budget year is the first time a full operational budget with income will be developed.

***Power markets:*** Energy sources can be roughly grouped into three categories: spot market, contracted for and owned.

Spot market power is used most frequently to fill open positions and to make up for real-time differences between forecasted and actual load demand (i.e. imbalance energy). SCP, through our CAISO Scheduling Coordinator, can purchase spot market power through the CAISO energy market. Spot market power is essentially a commodity with great exposure to price fluctuation based on a myriad of influences, including but not limited to: weather (e.g. droughts make hydro power scarce and expensive), power plant outages (e.g. decommission of SONGS), changes in load and natural hazards.

Contracted for power is procured through forward contracts, often referred to as bilateral contracts and/or power purchase agreements (PPAs). These contracts generally provide for a set price or prices for power to be provided over a period of time. Contracted for power provides price certainty, but can lock in unfavorable prices during times of cheap spot market power.



Owned power is generated from facilities under actual or virtual ownership. Financing, and operations and maintenance present two ownership burdens shared by all types of owned power. Generators using non-renewable fuel are also exposed to fuel price risk, while some renewable generators are exposed to risks of variation in output.

The risks and rewards of each type of power vary widely and can thus be combined in one portfolio to hedge against risk. Both SCP and PG&E are exposed to all of these risks and rewards, and both organizations are likely to utilize a portfolio approach. SCP must carefully consider the trade-offs between each type of energy source and how acquisition of any particular type of energy source will impact our core principals, and our ability to remain flexible and responsive over time.

### **Calendar of Resource Planning Activities**

Based on customer load phase in needs, the upcoming FY 2014/15 budget and the availability and desirability of energy sources, Staff proposes the following Resource Planning Timeline:

April 2014	Continued Development of SCP FIT
May 2014	SCP Begins Service to First Phase Customers Proposed SCP FY 2014/15 Budget Presented Draft FIT Considered for Adoption
June 2014	Adopt SCP FY 2014/15 Budget Adopt SCP FIT
July 2014	Begin Power Procurement for Phase 2 Customers Launch SCP FIT Develop Open Season Proposal Initiate SCP Programming Expansion (includes demand side)
Fall 2014	Hold Open Season



Local. Renewable. Ours.

50 Old Courthouse Square, Suite 605  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

## ***SONOMA CLEAN POWER -- BUSINESS OPERATIONS COMMITTEE (BOC)***

### **Record of Proceedings for February 26, 2014**

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER:**

Meeting called to order at 9:00 A.M. by Chair Briski.

#### **Attendance:**

Susan Briski, Harry Davitian, Michael Gogna, Bill Mattinson, Paul Brophy, CEO Geof Syphers, SCPA Regulatory Director Kelly Foley, SCP Executive Assistant Stephanie Reynolds, SCP staff and over twenty members of the public present.

#### **Key Points from this Meeting:**

- BOC encourages educating the public of net metering limitations that could become more problematic if statewide rules are changed.
- Budget review/financial planning: Staff provide info such that the BOC can understand how the business is performing as well as funds available for energy efficiency and other programs.
- Post formal response to public input from three workshops.
- Expand outreach presentation team.
- Bilateral agreements vs. RFPs: Discuss appropriate use of each at relevant times in decision-making. Ensure transparency and avoid favoritism.
- Feed-in Tariff (FIT): Test this against the resource planning philosophy and criteria, including the JPA goals and proposed metrics.
- Resource planning criteria: Continue to develop and articulate concepts, philosophy, and criteria to be used in resource planning decisions.
- Adjust resource planning philosophy diagram to include fiduciary and regulatory responsibilities.
- Provide preliminary costs on possible programs.

#### **II. REGULAR CALENDAR**

#### **Report and discussion of public workshops, program ideas and early feedback and criteria for assessing program options.**

CEO Syphers announced locations and times for next BOC meetings, with a note that the April meeting will be held in the afternoon and at a different location in response to public requests for later meetings. Dates and times had been posted on the SCP website.





Current status of opt-out and EverGreen accounts reviewed. Data was reviewed by SCP staff and Noble Americas representatives to compare responses to Noble's experiences with other programs. As of the meeting date, about 5.1% (1220 individual) of accounts had opted out. Those numbers representing about 3% of load and 3% of unique customers. SCP has a goal of approximately 80% of the load of Phase 1 staying in the SCP program.

The origin of the forecast that 20% load would ultimately opt out is from experience by Marin Clean Energy. Kelly Foley noted that the 20% estimate is also a well-known metric used by utilities.

EverGreen sign ups at 153 accounts, with outreach solely by word of mouth. CEO Syphers thanked the Climate Protection Campaign and others for continued outreach on behalf of SCP and the EverGreen program.

SCP's intention is to hold off on paid EverGreen marketing until a baseline of the load to be served is established. Current EverGreen signups are split between residential and commercial accounts.

Report out on public workshops. Two of three workshops had been held by the BOC meeting date. The City of Sonoma meeting had over 50 present. Questions were relevant and informative. The Santa Rosa workshop had over 70 present. The Sebastopol meeting is to be held on 3/1 from 10A.M. - Noon. Attendees at the first two workshops were primarily residential customers with good information and helpful questions, concerned about environmental issues, SCP goals, and interested in increased solar production.

The phasing is still requiring explanation, and can be confusing. Customers opting out say they are doing so for a variety of reasons, including concerns over system reliability (which will not change under SCP) and a general dislike of the opt-out nature of the program.

Questions about power content label and greenhouse gas emissions factor by Chair Briski. Is there information on adjusted greenhouse gas emissions to provide to businesses? CEO Syphers responded that we have information on our website on the power sources page. Kelly Foley is working on a method of reporting power sources that complies with regulations. Because SCP has no historical power deliveries to verify, state regulations are unclear on how to report emissions.

Discussion on EverGreen for commercial accounts. CEO Syphers noted that the premium is \$0.035 per kilowatt-hour is for all customers. He also noted that EverGreen customers pay the full additional cost for local renewable power, meaning that there is no subsidy from other SCP customers. EverGreen customers may be polled in the future to learn what next steps interest them most.



Net metering discussion held. Detailed questions that come up at the public meetings are normally taken off-line to dedicate time to the responses.

CM Davitian expressed concern on informing the public on how long the program will be provided and what the future of the NEM program will be. CEO Syphers responded that there is a fiscal reality in that SCP could not support the entire county if most of the customers were to sign up on the net metering program, but noted that there is still a lot of room to add significant volumes of solar power before that is a problem.

Discussion on the State of California's current cap on net metering. PG&E is providing what it considers to be a subsidy on the distribution side of NEM accounts. It was noted that transparency to customers will be critical if SCP reaches the point where the program would be limited or discontinued. PG&E, CPUC and CAISO will be involved in establishing a new cap on NEM participation in the future. SCP will be tracking the data on the cost of its NEM customers to the program and make any adjustments in the future, if necessary.

One other interesting idea received from the meeting included on-bill repayment programs (for retrofits, solar installations, electric cars, etc.), unfortunately there are no current programs with good track records to study yet. Idea to be revisited and research to be done.

A number of attendees at the workshops were interested in electric vehicles and an increase in charging stations for the County. Electric vehicle use is one of the few areas available that would add load and income for SCP and also provide a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. Question by CM Davitian whether SCP has the ability to become involved in these types of programs and if there would be a benefit. CEO Syphers stated SCP is in discussion with PG&E, SCTA/RCPA, SCEIP and others on shared programs that would mutually benefit.

Bill Mattinson expressed the need to know how much SCP has to spend before planning of new programs. More rough cost estimates of potential programs is needed.

Chair Briski requested that staff prepare a response to input received at the workshops in memo form or similar and distribute the information and post to the website. CEO Syphers acknowledged that staff will be preparing a response after the last workshop.

Public Comment: Dick Dowd, Bob Williamson, Ken Wells, Woody Hastings, Alan Strachan, John Rosenblum, Barbara Oldershaw, Duane Hartley, Bill Skoonberg, Mark Landman

Notice to group on 3/1 forum to be held at Shomrei Torah in Santa Rosa between CEO Syphers and a PGE representative. RSVP required and information available on SCP website.

Question on the possibility of using outreach teams in place of SCP staff to help attend more events and increase outreach to the public. CEO Syphers suggested that staff has been able to



attend any meeting that SCP had been invited to. Many of the events are not posted as they are professional organizations or individual groups and SCP is invited but not hosting the event.

**Break: 10:25 A.M.**

**Reconvene from Break: 10:36 A.M.**

### **Staff presentation and discussion on approach to procurement and programs**

Presentation by Regulatory Director Kelly Foley.

Suggestion by CM Davitian on graphic of pyramid to include other factors needed during resources planning, such as fiduciary responsibilities and regulatory requirements.

Resource planning progression described by Kelly Foley with a graphic and descriptions of bilateral contracts, leveraged programs, feed-in tariffs, “open season” and sole-sourced resources were given.

Explanation on time frame for open season and what circumstances would need to be for SCP to prepare and RFP for energy service providers.

CM Brophy discussed the future plans for purchasing power from ESPs. CEO Syphers responded that the long-term goal may be to purchase more power locally, but market conditions and other factors, such as SCP’s credit rating, will be factors involved in that decision. Redefining the JPA was also discussed, but CEO Syphers stated it was not an urgent issue.

Chair Briski suggests to staff reintroducing the idea of a mission statement or concise goal, the definition of a bilateral contract, and asks about timing on open season. CEO Syphers responded that Fall would be the time frame desired, but not set as of the meeting date.

CM Gogna suggests further criteria be set for planning. CEO Syphers agreed and stated that criteria will be different for each future program, depending on what is needed to launch the programs.

CM Davitian would like to see a more cost-effective and transparent approach in procurement. Asks if RFPs are costly, would it be possible to coordinate efforts with other agencies. Kelly Foley stated that municipal utilities procure their own energy. Using Marin as a co-negotiator for procurement was mentioned.

Public Comment: Peter Renfro, Bob Williamson, Woody Hastings, Alan Strachan, June Brashares



## **Approve the January 21, 2014 minutes of the Sonoma Clean Power Business Operations Committee**

Approval of the January 21, 2014 BOC meeting minutes was requested. Format of the minutes was discussed, a change in the minutes made, and draft minutes were amended.

Public comment: None

Motion to approve as amended by CM Gogna  
Motion Seconded by CM Brophy

Action approved on a 5-0-0 vote

## **Agenda Items and Ideas for Future Meetings:**

From Previous Meeting(s):

- Consideration of issues relating to customer service functions, particularly a local or internally-staffed customer call center, including the timing of a transition from contracted service.
- Consider formation of an ad hoc committee (2 members) to review contract negotiations.
- Discuss and have presentations on energy efficiency strategies, portfolio elements and the need to have flexibility to purchase more or less local power based on need.
- Resource planning. If an ad-hoc committee is formed to handle this topic, CM Davitian volunteered to be on the committee.
- Updates on status of non-participating cities (info only).
- Any information needed to make the launch successful.

From February 26, 2014 Meeting:

- Notifying public of potential future limitations of NEM program, including potential financial limits to NEM program.
- Financial planning for programs and research, how much is available to spend.
- Have a “big audacious goal.”
- Discussion on bilateral agreements v. RFP process
- Feed-in Tariff or FIT, needs to be tested against philosophical criteria.
- Planning concepts v. philosophy.
- Preliminary costs on possible programs, may be part of RFP process.

CM Briski suggests prioritization of the items at the next meeting. CM Gogna suggested that the chair and CEO meet to prioritize prior to the next meeting.



**Future Meeting Dates:**

March 26, 2014 - 9:00 A.M. – Noon, SCTA Conference Room

April 23, 2014 - 1:00-4:00 P.M., Sonoma County Water Agency, Redwood Conference Rooms

**Public Comment on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda:**

Public Comments by: June Brashares, Bob Williamson, John Parry.

**Adjournment:**

Meeting adjourned by Chair Briski at 12:10 P.M.