

Docket: : A.15-08-027  
Exhibit Number : \_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner : Liane Randolph  
Admin. Law Judge : Colette Kersten  
ORA Analyst : Charles Mee  
:



**ORA**  
OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES



**OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES**  
**California Public Utilities Commission**

**PREPARED TESTIMONY**  
**OF THE**  
**APPLICATION OF NEXTERA ENERGY**  
**TRANSMISSION WEST, LLC**  
**FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC**  
**CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY**  
**FOR THE SUNCREST DYNAMIC REACTIVE**  
**POWER SUPPORT PROJECT**

**A.15-08-027**

San Francisco, California  
May 16, 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b> .....	1
<b>II. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	5
<b>III. THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION ALTERNATIVE, THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE, IS FEASIBLE.</b> .....	6
A. THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION ALTERNATIVE IS TECHNOLOGICALLY FEASIBLE. ....	7
1. Safety concerns do not make the Suncrest Substation Alternative technologically infeasible. ....	8
B. THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION ALTERNATIVE IS FEASIBLE UNDER CURRENT LAWS AND REGULATIONS.....	10
1. The Commission has siting authority over transmission facilities.....	10
2. CAISO’s APSA does not have bearing on the site of the SVC facility. ....	11
3. FERC Order 1000 did not remove this Commission’s siting authority. ....	13
4. ORA recommends the Commission require NEET West to construct the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation. ....	15
C. THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION ALTERNATIVE IS ECONOMICALLY FEASIBLE.....	17
<b>IV. SINCE THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE OBVIATES THE NEED FOR CERTAIN PROJECT COMPONENTS, THE REASONABLE COST MUST BE LESS THAN THE COST OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.</b> .....	19
<b>V. IF THE COMMISSION CHOOSES NOT TO EXERCISE ITS AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE THE PROJECT TO BE SITED WITHIN THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION, ORA SUPPORTS THE PROJECT AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED BY NEET WEST.</b> ....	19
<b>VI. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND COMMISSION RULES, REGULATIONS AND OTHER APPLICABLE STANDARDS GOVERNING SAFETY, RELIABILITY AND COMPETITION.</b> .....	20
A. THE COMMISSION SHOULD NOT GRANT NEET WEST EXEMPTIONS FROM REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.....	20
<b>VII. CONCLUSION</b> .....	20
STATEMENT AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CHARLES MEE .....	24

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

2 The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) submits this testimony pursuant  
3 to the Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Ruling (Ruling) issued on February 24, 2017 in  
4 regards to NextEra Energy Transmission West, LCC’s (NEET West) Application  
5 (A.) 15-08-027 (Application), seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity  
6 (CPCN) for the Suncrest Static Volt-Ampere Reactive Compensator project (Suncrest  
7 SVC Project). ORA analyzes and makes recommendations on the feasibility of the  
8 environmentally superior alternative; cost and cost cap; and adherence to applicable  
9 federal, state, and the California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) rules,  
10 which were identified as within the scope of this proceeding in the Ruling.<sup>1</sup>

11 The Suncrest SVC Project arose from the California Independent System  
12 Operator’s (CAISO) 2013/ 2014 Transmission Planning Process (TPP) where it was  
13 studied as a policy-driven upgrade to facilitate delivery of renewable electricity  
14 generating capacity located in the Imperial Valley area.<sup>2</sup> Under CAISO Tariff 24<sup>3</sup> and  
15 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Order 1000,<sup>4</sup> a policy driven project is  
16 subject to competitive solicitation.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, CAISO released a description and  
17 functional specifications for a 300 Mega Volt-Ampere Reactive (MVAR) Dynamic  
18 Reactive Power Support facility connecting at the Suncrest Substation’s 230 kilovolt  
19 (kV) bus for competitive solicitation.<sup>6</sup> CAISO awarded the Suncrest SVC Project to

---

<sup>1</sup> Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Ruling, February 24, 2017, pp. 6-7.

<sup>2</sup> CAISO, 2013-2014 Transmission Plan, pp. 189-191, [https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Board-Approved2013-2014TransmissionPlan\\_July162014.pdf](https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Board-Approved2013-2014TransmissionPlan_July162014.pdf).

<sup>3</sup> CAISO Tariff 24 is the CAISO’s Comprehensive Transmission Planning Process. [http://caiso.com/Documents/Section24\\_ComprehensiveTransmissionPlanningProcess\\_Oct1\\_2013.pdf](http://caiso.com/Documents/Section24_ComprehensiveTransmissionPlanningProcess_Oct1_2013.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> FERC Order 1000 is FERC’s Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities. FERC 1000 provides transmission planning and cost allocation requirements. <https://www.ferc.gov/industries/electric/indus-act/trans-plan.asp>.

<sup>5</sup> CAISO Tariff 24.4.10; 24.5.1; FERC Order 1000, para. 284.

<sup>6</sup> CAISO, Suncrest 230 kV 300 MVAR Dynamic Reactive Power Support Description and Functional Specifications for Competitive Solicitation, April 15, 2014, <https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Description-FunctionalSpecificationsSuncrest230ReactivePowerSupport.pdf>.

1 NEET West after considering one other bid from San Diego Gas & Electric Company  
2 (SDG&E).<sup>7</sup> CAISO selected NEET West as the project sponsor primarily because (1) its  
3 binding cost containment measures were more robust and (2) it assumed more of the risk  
4 for cost increases.<sup>8</sup> NEET West agreed to build the Suncrest SVC Project under a  
5 binding cost of \$42,288,000 and included a cap on all costs associated with the  
6 construction period, including direct costs, allocated overhead costs, capital costs, and  
7 allowance for funds used during construction.<sup>9</sup>

8 On August 31, 2015, after CAISO selected NEET West as the project sponsor,  
9 NEET West filed its Application with the Commission, seeking a CPCN for the Suncrest  
10 SVC Project and to implement the Approved Project Sponsor Agreement (APSA) with  
11 CAISO.<sup>10</sup> The Suncrest SVC Project will provide dynamic reactive power support to the  
12 230 kV bus of the existing Suncrest Substation owned by SDG&E.<sup>11</sup> The Suncrest SVC  
13 Project will include a static volt-ampere reactive (VAR) compensator and related  
14 equipment as well as an approximately one-mile underground 230 kV transmission line  
15 that will connect the SVC to the Suncrest Substation.<sup>12</sup>

16 ORA filed a response to NEET West's Application on October 5, 2015, raising  
17 several issues which might result in ORA protesting the Suncrest SVC Project.<sup>13</sup> These  
18 issues included whether the Suncrest SVC Project serves a present or future convenience  
19 and necessity; whether the CAISO can terminate or revise the APSA if the Commission

---

<sup>7</sup> Suncrest Reactive Power Project: Project Sponsor Selection Report, January 6, 2015, p. 46.  
<http://www.caiso.com/Documents/SuncrestProjectSponsorSelectionReport.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> Application, p. 32.

<sup>10</sup> NEET West will construct, operate, own, and maintain the Suncrest SVC Project pursuant to the Project Sponsor Agreement with the CAISO. The APSA is an agreement between an Approved Project Sponsor and the CAISO establishing the terms and conditions under which the Approved Project Sponsor will complete the siting and construction of the transmission facilities that the Approved Project Sponsor was selected to construct and own under CAISO Tariff 24.

<sup>11</sup> Application, p. 4.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> ORA Response to NEET West Application, October 5, 2015, pp. 4-5.

1 finds that NEET West should construct the Suncrest SVC Project within the Suncrest  
2 Substation; significant environmental impacts associated with the Suncrest SVC Project;  
3 project alternatives; and cost.<sup>14</sup>

4 A draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was published on November 23,  
5 2016.<sup>15</sup> The DEIR identified a number of impacts resulting from the Proposed Project  
6 that NEET West could mitigate to a level of less-than-significant.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, the  
7 DEIR determined that the Suncrest Substation Alternative would “avoid virtually all of  
8 the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.”<sup>17</sup> Therefore, it identified the  
9 Suncrest Substation Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative rather than  
10 the project currently proposed by NEET West.<sup>18</sup> This alternative sites the SVC facility  
11 within the existing Suncrest Substation footprint, eliminates the need for the Proposed  
12 Project’s one-mile underground transmission line and other related components, and  
13 eliminates land disturbance at the remote site and within the right of way of the one-mile  
14 transmission line.<sup>19</sup> The DEIR finds that the Suncrest Substation Alternative, or the  
15 environmentally superior alternative, would meet all project objectives while avoiding  
16 the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.<sup>20</sup>

17 ORA submitted comments on the DEIR on January 10, 2017 and supported the  
18 Suncrest Substation Alternative as the most reasonable, as well as the most cost effective  
19 and environmentally superior, option of those studied within the DEIR.<sup>21</sup> CAISO, NEET  
20 West, and SDG&E also filed comments and asserted it would be infeasible for NEET

---

<sup>14</sup> ORA Response to NEET West Application, October 5, 2015, pp. 4-5.

<sup>15</sup> California Public Utilities Commission, Draft EIR, November 23, 2016 (DEIR).

<sup>16</sup> DEIR, p. ES-8.

<sup>17</sup> DEIR, pp. ES-9-ES-10.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*

<sup>21</sup> Letter to Robert Petersen re: ORA Comments on the Draft EIR for the Suncrest Reactive Power Support Project, Proposed by NEET West A.15-08-027, January 10, 2017 (ORA DEIR Comments).

1 West to construct, own, and operate the SVC facility within the existing Suncrest  
2 Substation footprint citing mostly legal arguments.<sup>22</sup> A prehearing conference was held  
3 on February 7, 2017 where parties asserted similar arguments.<sup>23</sup>

4 The Ruling issued after the prehearing conference included the following issues as  
5 within the scope of opening testimony:

- 6 1. Does the Proposed Project serve a present or future  
7 public convenience and necessity? (California Public Utilities  
8 (Cal. Pub. Util.) Code § 1001.)
- 9 2. Is there no substantial evidence that the project will  
10 have a significant effect on the environment? In the  
11 alternative, if there is substantial evidence to that effect: Are  
12 the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible?
- 13 4. Is the Proposed Project and/or project alternative  
14 designed in compliance with the Commission's policies  
15 governing the mitigation of EMF effects using low-cost and  
16 no-cost measures?
- 17 5. What is the maximum prudent and reasonable cost of  
18 the Proposed Project and environmentally superior alternative,  
19 if approved?
- 20 6. Does the Proposed Project comport with federal, state,  
21 and Commission's rules, regulations and other applicable  
22 standards governing safety, reliability, and competition?
  - 23 a. If the certificate is granted, should the  
24 exemptions from certain affiliate transaction rules and  
25 reporting requirements set forth in the Commission's  
26 General Orders be granted, as requested by NEET West  
27 in its application?<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Letter to Robert Petersen re: CAISO Comments on the Draft EIR for the Suncrest Reactive Power Support Project, Proposed by NEET West A.15-08-027, January 10, 2017 (CAISO DEIR Comments); Letter to Robert Petersen re: SDG&E Comments on the Draft EIR for the Suncrest Reactive Power Support Project, Proposed by NEET West A.15-08-027, January 10, 2017 (SDG&E DEIR Comments); Letter to Robert Petersen re: NEET West Comments on the Draft EIR for the Suncrest Reactive Power Support Project, Proposed by NEET West A.15-08-027, January 10, 2017 (NEET West DEIR Comments).

<sup>23</sup> Prehearing Conference Transcript. pp. 23-39.

<sup>24</sup> Ruling, pp. 6-7.

1 **II. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

2 ORA recommends the Commission approve the Suncrest Substation Alternative,  
3 which is the environmentally superior alternative.<sup>25</sup> Since this alternative would site the  
4 SVC facility within the existing Suncrest Substation footprint, it would avoid most  
5 environmental impacts at a potentially lower cost.<sup>26</sup> Additionally, the Commission can,  
6 on its own motion, require construction of the SVC facility within the Suncrest  
7 Substation.<sup>27</sup>

8 In order to proceed with siting the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation,  
9 ORA recommends that the Commission bifurcate the proceeding to first consider the  
10 issue of whether it should require NEET West to site the project within the Suncrest  
11 Substation. This sequencing will also ensure expeditious consideration of this issue.  
12 ORA anticipates that similar projects proposed by non-incumbent transmission owners  
13 may raise this siting issue again and urges the Commission to determine its role as the  
14 siting authority within the context of FERC Order 1000. ORA notes that the  
15 Administrative Law Judge has appropriately designated this issue as both a factual and  
16 legal issue. Therefore, parties should have the ability to brief these legal issues as well.

17 What is not at issue in this proceeding is which entity should construct this project.  
18 The CAISO's bid request was for a project which could provide 300 MVARs at the  
19 230 kV bus at the Suncrest Substation. NEET West won that bid over SDG&E.<sup>28</sup>  
20 SDG&E refused to cooperate with NEET West to construct this project at the Suncrest  
21 Substation and therefore, NEET West was required to propose its project one mile away  
22 from the substation.<sup>29</sup> Despite this fact, NEET West's project was selected as the most  
23 cost competitive bid and the Commission should reject any attempt by SDG&E to obtain

---

<sup>25</sup> DEIR, pp. ES-9-ES-10.

<sup>26</sup> *Id.*

<sup>27</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§762, 762.5.

<sup>28</sup> CAISO, Sunset Reactive Power Project: Project Sponsor Selection Report, January 6, 2015, p. 1,  
<http://www.caiso.com/Documents/SuncrestProjectSponsorSelectionReport.pdf>.

<sup>29</sup>NEET West DEIR Comments, p.11; Prehearing Conference Transcript 25:9-10, 37-38:28-3.

1 approval for its losing and more expensive bid. Furthermore, it is reasonable to locate a  
2 project which regulates the operating voltage of a substation within that substation, rather  
3 than requiring the project proponent to build a one-mile transmission line to connect that  
4 project to the substation. Additionally, since the issue in this proceeding is one of siting,  
5 which is within the Commission’s purview, it should reject any attempts by other parties  
6 to undermine this siting authority.

7         If the Commission adopts the Suncrest Substation Alternative, the environmentally  
8 superior alternative, the maximum prudent and reasonable cost of the project should be  
9 the cost of the Proposed Project less the cost required to construct the one-mile  
10 transmission line and for other project components that would no longer be needed.<sup>30</sup>  
11 However, if the Proposed Project is approved, ORA supports NEET West’s bid price as  
12 the maximum prudent and reasonable cost of the project. ORA does not support  
13 exempting NEET West from the reporting requirements associated with affiliate  
14 transactions. The issues related to the rules on affiliate transactions are legal issues which  
15 parties should also have the opportunity to brief.

16 **III. THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION ALTERNATIVE, THE**  
17 **ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE, IS FEASIBLE.**

18         The Commission is the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental  
19 Quality Act (CEQA) and is responsible for preparing the EIR in compliance with CEQA.  
20 CEQA prohibits public agencies from approving projects as proposed if there are feasible  
21 alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen  
22 the significant environmental effects of the project.<sup>31</sup> In analyzing alternatives, the  
23 purpose is to determine whether there is a feasible way to achieve the basic objectives of

---

<sup>30</sup> There may be additional costs to place the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation, which NEET West cannot determine at this time because SDG&E has not provided NEET West with the necessary information to do so. The Commission should require SDG&E to provide NEET West with the information necessary to make an estimate so that the Commission can make an objective and independent determination of the economic feasibility of the environmentally superior alternative.

<sup>31</sup> 14 CCR (CEQA Guidelines) §15126.6.



1 the project, while avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts.<sup>32</sup> Feasibility is defined  
2 as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of  
3 time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological  
4 factors.”<sup>33</sup> The DEIR found that the Suncrest Substation Alternative would “avoid  
5 virtually all of the environmental impacts of the Proposed Project” and that it would meet  
6 all of the project objectives.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, the Commission should approve this alternative  
7 rather than NEET West’s Proposed Project.

8         Additionally, CEQA requires that the lead agency “independently participate,  
9 review, analyze and discuss the alternatives in good faith.”<sup>35</sup> Thus, it is the responsibility  
10 of the Commission, not the applicant, to determine whether alternatives are feasible and  
11 “the circumstances that led the applicant in the planning stage to select the project for  
12 which approval is sought and to reject alternatives cannot be determinative of their  
13 feasibility.”<sup>36</sup> Also, this Commission has held that as the lead agency, it cannot delegate  
14 meeting CEQA requirements to any other agency, despite any other related jurisdiction  
15 by another agency, such as CAISO.<sup>37</sup> The Commission should consider all the evidence  
16 presented regarding feasibility of the Suncrest Substation Alternative to come to its own  
17 independent conclusion about the appropriate site for the project.

18         **A. The Suncrest Substation Alternative is technologically**  
19         **feasible.**

20         The Suncrest Substation Alternative is feasible from an electrical/technical  
21 standpoint according to both SDG&E and CAISO. SDG&E’s bid for this project under  
22 Phase 3 of CAISO’s TPP proposed construction of the SVC facility within the Suncrest

---

<sup>32</sup> Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21002.1.

<sup>33</sup> CEQA Guidelines §15364.

<sup>34</sup> DEIR, pp. 20-12 -20 -16.

<sup>35</sup> *Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford* (1990) 221 Cal.App.3d 692, 736.

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> CEQA Guidelines § 15025; § 15025; *In Re Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*, D. 02-10-066, 2002 WL 31470378 (Oct. 24, 2002), Section II.B.1.b.

1 Substation.<sup>38</sup> Additionally, in CAISO’s data request response to Energy Division,  
2 CAISO stated in regards to the environmentally superior alternative that it “has no basis  
3 to conclude that it is infeasible from an electrical/technical standpoint for NEET West to  
4 design and build the SVC inside the boundaries of the Suncrest Substation.”<sup>39</sup> Therefore,  
5 it is feasible, from an electrical and technical standpoint to construct the environmentally  
6 superior alternative, which is located within the Suncrest Substation footprint.

7 **1. Safety concerns do not make the Suncrest**  
8 **Substation Alternative technologically infeasible.**

9 SDGE&E and CAISO raise safety concerns as a reason that the Commission  
10 should not approve the Suncrest Substation Alternative.<sup>40</sup> However, any legitimate  
11 concerns can be addressed through coordination between SDG&E and NEET West.  
12 CAISO argues that it would generally be “impractical to allow an entity to construct and  
13 own facilities within another utility’s existing substation because it could lead to  
14 significant safety issues and questions regarding accountability.” However, CAISO fails  
15 to cite any evidence which would make coordination between NEET West and SDG&E  
16 to mitigate safety issues or develop plans regarding accountability impossible.

17 SDG&E argues that national standards related to safety and cyber security renders  
18 the Suncrest Substation Alternative infeasible.<sup>41</sup> In support of this argument SDG&E  
19 cites to the National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) and North American Cyber and  
20 Physical Security Standards.<sup>42</sup> The NESC standards which SDG&E has cited, Section 11  
21 (Protective arrangements in electric supply stations) Subdivision 110 (General  
22 requirements) Part A (Enclosure of equipment) Chapters 1 (Types of enclosures) and 2  
23 (Safety clearance zone), discusses industry standards related to safety clearance zones.

---

<sup>38</sup> CAISO, Sunset Reactive Power Project: Project Sponsor Selection Report, January 6, 2015, p. 11,  
<http://www.caiso.com/Documents/SuncrestProjectSponsorSelectionReport.pdf>.

<sup>39</sup> CAISO Response to Energy Division Data Request February 24, 2017, p. 2.

<sup>40</sup> SDG&E DEIR Comment Letter, p. 5; CAISO DEIR Comment Letter, p. 2.

<sup>41</sup> SDG&E DEIR Comment Letter, pp. 4-5; SDG&E Response to Data Request of ORA Set 1, Question 2,  
March 31, 2017.

<sup>42</sup> SDG&E Response to Data Request of ORA Set 2, Questions 1-3, May 5, 2017.

1 Based on those rules, SDG&E argues that an SVC facility operated by NEET West  
2 would require a fence and a clearance of 15 feet 4 inches around that fence. According to  
3 SDG&E, there is not enough space in the Suncrest Substation for this additional  
4 clearance; therefore, SDG&E argues that this alternative is infeasible. However, the  
5 NESC includes an exception which states that the safety clearance zone requirement is  
6 not applicable to internal fences within an electric supply station perimeter.<sup>43</sup> In other  
7 words, the NESC does not require additional clearance to separate the two entities'  
8 facilities.

9 Additionally, SDG&E argues that the North American Cyber and Physical Security  
10 Standards require a separately enclosed and monitored facility and control center and that  
11 NEET West and SDG&E would need to develop a new compliance plan related to these  
12 standards.<sup>44</sup> However, the North American Cyber and Physical Security Standards that  
13 SDG&E cites do not prescribe specific actions that a utility must take or structures that  
14 must be built to meet these standards.<sup>45</sup> Rather, most of these standards are process  
15 driven, requiring a utility to show that processes are in place to address security  
16 concerns.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, SDG&E does not state that it would be infeasible to create a  
17 new compliance plan with a NEET West SVC facility in the Suncrest Substation.  
18 Instead, SDG&E states that "any joint access to a NEET West device within SDG&E's  
19 facility would violate SDG&E['s] internal security policy for [the] Suncrest  
20 Substation."<sup>47</sup> While the current internal security policy may not permit joint access, it  
21 does not foreclose the possibility that a new policy could permit joint access in a manner  
22 that would comply with applicable North American Cyber and Physical Security  
23 Standards. To the extent that the Commission requires coordination between the two

---

<sup>43</sup> National Electrical Safety Code 2011, Section 11 Protective Arrangements in Electric Supply Stations, p. 32.

<sup>44</sup> SDG&E Response to Data Request of ORA Set 2, Question 2, May 5, 2017.

<sup>45</sup> CIP -004-06; CIP -005-06; CIP -006-06.

<sup>46</sup> CIP -005-06 requires an Electronic Safety Perimeter, but this is not a physical perimeter, but relates to online network security, [http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Cyber%20Security%20Permanent/Cyber\\_Security\\_FAQ.pdf](http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Cyber%20Security%20Permanent/Cyber_Security_FAQ.pdf).

<sup>47</sup> SDG&E Response to Data Request of ORA Set 2, Question 2, May 5, 2017.

1 utilities to construct the Suncrest Substation Alternative, as recommended in  
2 Section (B)(4) below, it may also require coordination to ensure any safety concerns are  
3 addressed.

4 **B. The Suncrest Substation Alternative is feasible under**  
5 **current laws and regulations.**

6 **1. The Commission has siting authority over**  
7 **transmission facilities.**

8 Under federal law, states have siting authority over transmission facilities. In  
9 1935 when Congress enacted the Federal Power Act (FPA), it maintained transmission  
10 planning and expansion within the purview of state regulatory agencies. Specifically,  
11 under § 201(b) of the FPA, states have jurisdiction over electric generation facilities and  
12 facilities used in the transmission of electric energy in intrastate commerce.<sup>48</sup> In *New*  
13 *York v. FERC*, the Court reaffirmed this authority, stating that “among other things,  
14 Congress left to the States authority to regulate generation and transmission siting.”<sup>49</sup>

15 Although the “Commission and CAISO share concurrent jurisdiction over  
16 elements of the transmission system and transmission reliability,” the Commission retains  
17 its “extensive jurisdiction over transmission and reliability pursuant to provisions of the  
18 public utilities code.”<sup>50</sup> Only where the Legislature has given CAISO specific authority  
19 and responsibility must the Commission share that jurisdiction with CAISO.<sup>51</sup> In this  
20 instance, the Legislature has specifically granted siting authority to the Commission by  
21 stating that, “no electrical corporation ... shall begin the construction of a ...line, plant or  
22 system, or any extension thereof without having first obtained from the Commission a  
23 certificate that the present or future convenience and necessity require or will require  
24 such construction.”<sup>52</sup> Additionally, as a basis for granting a CPCN pursuant to Cal. Pub.

---

<sup>48</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 824.

<sup>49</sup> *New York v. FERC* (2001) 535 U.S. 1, 24.

<sup>50</sup> *In Re Pac. Gas & Elec. Sys.*, D.99-09-028, 1999 WL 1036822 (Sept. 2, 1999), Conclusions of Law 10.

<sup>51</sup> *Id.*

<sup>52</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1001.

1 Util. Code §1001, Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 1002, requires the Commission to consider the  
2 following factors:(1) Community values, (2) Recreational and park areas, (3) Historical  
3 and aesthetic values, and (4) Influence on environment...<sup>53</sup> The Commission has  
4 previously concluded that Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1002 imposes a “responsibility  
5 independent of CEQA to include environmental influences and community values in its  
6 consideration of a request for a CPCN.”<sup>54</sup> CAISO also conceded this authority in regards  
7 to implementation of FERC Order 890 where it stated that it supported preserving an  
8 incumbent transmission owner’s right of first refusal in its tariff because CAISO lacked  
9 siting authority.<sup>55</sup> Therefore, this Commission has authority over the siting of the SVC  
10 facility and one factor it must consider is the influence of this project on the environment.

11 **2. CAISO’s APSA does not have bearing on the site of**  
12 **the SVC facility.**

13 The APSA should not determine the appropriate site for the SVC facility. The  
14 APSA, which was signed by CAISO and NEET West, does not require the CAISO to  
15 terminate their agreement if the Commission approves an alternative other than NEET  
16 West’s Proposed Project. Rather, the APSA states that if an unreasonable delay occurs,  
17 the CAISO shall consult with the Approved Project Sponsor.<sup>56</sup> If, after that consultation,  
18 CAISO determines that “the Approved Project Sponsor cannot secure necessary  
19 approvals or property rights ... or the Approved Project Sponsor is otherwise unable to  
20 timely construct the project,” the CAISO shall take action it determines to be necessary,  
21 including termination of the APSA.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, in implementing Order 1000, CAISO  
22 specifically stated that where a project is delayed because of the permitting process, it  
23 will take steps to address potential reliability concerns and *only if* this concern cannot be

---

<sup>53</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1002(a).

<sup>54</sup> *Application of Southern California Edison for CPCN for Kramer-Victor Transmission Line*, (1990) 37 CPUC 2d 413, 453.

<sup>55</sup> CAISO, June 10, 2014 Implementation Letter, FERC Docket ER 10-1401-000, p. 70.

<sup>56</sup> Approved Project Sponsor Agreement, §5.8.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.*

1 addressed would CAISO *consider* reassigning the transmission project.<sup>58</sup> (Italics added.)  
2 In this case, there are no or minimal reliability concerns related to this policy-driven  
3 project.<sup>59</sup> Therefore, CAISO has discretion to determine whether it should terminate the  
4 APSA.<sup>60</sup> And in fact, this project has already been delayed, but CAISO did not terminate  
5 the APSA.<sup>61</sup>

6 Additionally, the Commission has modified projects after they received CAISO's  
7 approval despite any delay associated with the modification. For example, in the  
8 Commission's grant of a CPCN to Southern California Edison Company (SCE) for the  
9 Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (segments 4-11), it approved various  
10 segments which the environmental impact report (EIR) determined was the  
11 environmentally superior alternative, rather than approving the entire route as  
12 proposed.<sup>62</sup> Despite these required changes, CAISO did not terminate the project and the  
13 project was energized in 2016.<sup>63</sup>

14 Lastly, the fact that CAISO and NEET West signed the APSA cannot preclude the  
15 Commission from considering all possible alternatives. **Contracts or agreements entered**  
16 **into by the proponent of an EIR on a Proposed Project prior to completion of the**  
17 **environmental review process cannot be used to avoid the scrutiny envisioned by**

---

<sup>58</sup> FERC Order on Compliance Filing, Docket Nos. ER13-103-000, ER12-2709-000, ER13-87-000, 143, para. 260.

<sup>59</sup> CAISO, 2013-2014 Transmission Plan, pp. 189-191, [https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Board-Approved2013-2014TransmissionPlan\\_July162014.pdf](https://www.caiso.com/Documents/Board-Approved2013-2014TransmissionPlan_July162014.pdf).

<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, the APSA also states, in deference to this Commission's authority over siting, that "any modifications to the Project's facilities ordered by a siting agency are not subject to CAISO approval." Approved Project Sponsor Agreement, §5.9.3.

<sup>61</sup> NEET West First Supplement to Response to Data Request Response of CURE Set 1, Question 3, May 4, 2017, NW-217.

<sup>62</sup> *Decision Granting a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (Segments 4-11)* (D.09-12-044), December 17, 2009, p. 41.

<sup>63</sup> SCE, Tehachapi Transmission Project, [https://www.sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability/upgrading-transmission/TRTP-4-11!/ut/p/b1/hdCxDoIwEAbgp2Glhy2KbiWYWmJUgonQxYDBggFKAOH1RcNConLbf\\_n-4Q4JFCBRR10mozZTZSS\\_s1heDYvRHfeBg28T4LYLnmWcDO6YAwgHAD-Gwlz\\_gsSUsDMxB7JYYWZzfGbmf-C4MAMIGcGawXbnHt\\_Aw8CxBwefUgywHMGfK1wkZK7iz0dCWsbYkkjUyT2pk1p\\_1sM6bduq2WigQd\\_3ulR K5ol-U4UG3yqpaloUTCWqiqAy\\_jDzkb9fZwJDOg!!/dl4/d5/L2dBISevZ0FBIS9nQSEh/?from=trtp](https://www.sce.com/wps/portal/home/about-us/reliability/upgrading-transmission/TRTP-4-11!/ut/p/b1/hdCxDoIwEAbgp2Glhy2KbiWYWmJUgonQxYDBggFKAOH1RcNConLbf_n-4Q4JFCBRR10mozZTZSS_s1heDYvRHfeBg28T4LYLnmWcDO6YAwgHAD-Gwlz_gsSUsDMxB7JYYWZzfGbmf-C4MAMIGcGawXbnHt_Aw8CxBwefUgywHMGfK1wkZK7iz0dCWsbYkkjUyT2pk1p_1sM6bduq2WigQd_3ulR K5ol-U4UG3yqpaloUTCWqiqAy_jDzkb9fZwJDOg!!/dl4/d5/L2dBISevZ0FBIS9nQSEh/?from=trtp).

1 CEQA.<sup>64</sup> Therefore, the fact that the CAISO and NEET West signed an agreement does  
2 not prevent the Commission from considering environmentally superior sites.

3 **3. FERC Order 1000 did not remove this**  
4 **Commission’s siting authority.**

5 FERC Order 1000 requires transmission planning at the regional level which  
6 considers and evaluates possible transmission alternatives and encourages competition in  
7 transmission project development. After the transmission projects are constructed and  
8 become operational, it also requires the fair allocation, among beneficiaries, of the cost of  
9 any transmission solution that was chosen to meet a regional transmission. Thus, FERC  
10 Order 1000’s purpose is to promote competition in regional transmission planning and to  
11 support efficient and cost effective transmission development.

12 However, in doing so, FERC Order 1000 did not remove states’ siting authority  
13 for transmission solutions. In the Order, FERC stated specifically, “we acknowledge that  
14 there is longstanding state authority over certain matters that are relevant to transmission  
15 planning and expansion, such as matters relevant to siting, permitting, and construction  
16 ... nothing in this final rule involves an exercise of siting, permitting, and construction  
17 authority.”<sup>65</sup> Additionally, FERC stated that Order 1000 “in no way involves an exercise  
18 of authority over those specific substantive matters traditionally reserved to the states,  
19 including integrated resource planning, or authority over such transmission facilities.”<sup>66</sup>  
20 Therefore, FERC concluded that Order 1000 did not create any conflicts between state  
21 and federal requirements. Thus, any requirements under FERC Order 1000 do not  
22 interfere with the Commission’s siting authority.

23 The right of first refusal reserved for incumbent transmission providers also does  
24 not impinge on the Commission’s siting authority. FERC Order 1000 stated that it did

---

<sup>64</sup> *Kings Cty. Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford*, (1990) 221 Cal. App. 3d 692, 737.

<sup>65</sup> FERC Order 1000, para. 107.

<sup>66</sup> FERC Order 1000, para. 186; see also FERC Order 1000, para. 188 stating “it is important to recognize that Order No. 1000’s transmission planning reforms are concerned with process; these reforms are not intended to dictate substantive outcomes, such as what transmission facilities will be built and where. We recognize that such decisions are normally made at the state level.”

1 not intend, through that order, to affect the right of an incumbent transmission provider to  
2 build, own, and recover costs for upgrades to its own transmission facilities, nor to alter  
3 an incumbent transmission provider's use and control of an existing right of way.<sup>67</sup>  
4 SDG&E, NEET West, and CAISO argue that this prevents the Commission from  
5 requiring NEET West to construct the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation  
6 footprint.<sup>68</sup> But, as stated previously, while FERC Order 1000 did not affect existing  
7 incumbent transmission providers' rights related to upgrades or control over rights of  
8 way, it also did not override Order 1000's explicit intent to preserve state's siting  
9 authority historically reserved to the states.

10 Lastly, any attempt by SDG&E to use this Commission's exercise of its siting  
11 authority as a pathway to undermine NEET West's Proposed Project is contrary to the  
12 intent of FERC Order 1000 to both preserve states' siting authority and increase  
13 competition. When FERC issued Order 1000, it removed the federal right of first refusal  
14 for transmission facilities selected in a regional transmission plan for the purposes of cost  
15 allocation and to lift restrictions on the universe of transmission developers offering  
16 potential solutions.<sup>69</sup> FERC found that the federal right of first refusal was unjust and  
17 unreasonable because it could result in the failure to consider more efficient or cost-  
18 effective solutions to regional needs.<sup>70</sup> This change to FERC Order 1000 is what enabled  
19 CAISO to put this project out for competitive solicitation during Phase 3 of CAISO's  
20 TPP and to choose the most cost competitive bid, which was NEET West's bid. It would  
21 be contrary to the intent of FERC Order 1000 if this Commission, the siting authority,  
22 could not require NEET West, the winner of a competitive bid, to site the SVC facility  
23 within the Suncrest Substation footprint, according to the environmentally superior  
24 alternative.

---

<sup>67</sup> FERC Order 1000, para. 226.

<sup>68</sup> NEET West DEIR Comment Letter, pp.9-11; CAISO DEIR Comment Letter, p. 2-3; SDG&E DEIR Comment Letter, pp. 3-4.

<sup>69</sup> FERC Order 1000, para. 225.

<sup>70</sup> FERC Order 1000 para. 284.



1                   **4.     ORA recommends the Commission require NEET**  
2                   **West to construct the SVC facility within the**  
3                   **Suncrest Substation.**

4                   The Commission has the authority to require NEET West to site the SVC facility  
5 within the existing Suncrest Substation footprint. Under Cal. Pub. Util. Code §§ 762 and  
6 762.5, the Commission, on its own motion, may hold a hearing to determine whether  
7 NEET West should build the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation. Furthermore,  
8 in considering the location of the facility, the Commission is required to consider the  
9 influence of the project on the environment.<sup>71</sup> Specifically, Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 762  
10 states that the Commission may make such an order when, after a hearing, it

11                   “finds that additions, extensions, repairs, or improvements to,  
12                   or changes in, the existing plant, equipment, apparatus,  
13                   facilities, or other physical property of any public utility or of  
14                   any two or more public utilities ought reasonably to be made,  
15                   or that new structures should be erected, to promote the  
16                   security or convenience of its employees or the public, or in  
17                   any other way to secure adequate service or facilities.”

18                   The Commission should conduct a hearing to consider whether to require NEET  
19 West to construct the SVC facility within SDG&E’s Suncrest Substation, as  
20 recommended by the DEIR.<sup>72</sup>

21                   The Commission’s authority depends on the extent to which the utility has  
22 dedicated or devoted its property to public use.<sup>73</sup> One method used to determine the  
23 territorial scope of water, gas, electric, and telephone utilities is through a franchise to  
24 operate in certain municipalities.<sup>74</sup> When a utility acquires permission to operate within  
25 the boundaries of a specific area, it is agreeing to serve all customers within that area.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762.

<sup>72</sup> The Commission may only take this action with respect to public utilities. NEET West’s current Application requests public utility status from this Commission.

<sup>73</sup> *Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Public Utilities Commission*, (1968) 68 Cal.2d 406, 414-416.

<sup>74</sup> *Id.*

<sup>75</sup> *California Water &Tel. Co. v. Public Utilities Commission*, (1959) 51 Cal. 2d 478, 493.

1 Through its CPCN, SDG&E has agreed to provide adequate service to all customers  
2 within its service territory. Additionally, SDG&E constructed its Suncrest Substation to  
3 provide electric service to the customers within its service territory. Furthermore,  
4 SDG&E’s customers have paid, through rates, for the Suncrest Substation in exchange  
5 for electric service. Therefore, SDG&E has dedicated or devoted the Suncrest Substation  
6 to public use.

7 Where a utility has voluntarily dedicated its facilities to render services to  
8 customers in a specific area, the Commission’s “power to ‘order additions, extensions,  
9 repairs, and improvements’ within the scope of dedication is extensive.”<sup>76</sup> In *Greyhound*  
10 *Lines, Inc. v. Public Utilities Commission*, the court affirmed the exercise of this power  
11 where the Commission required Greyhound to reroute its services and require additional  
12 stations along its already existing route.<sup>77</sup> Similarly here, the Commission has extensive  
13 power to order any additions, extensions, repairs, and improvements to SDG&E’s  
14 facilities because SDG&E has already dedicated its facilities, including the Suncrest  
15 Substation, for public use to render service to its customers within its service area.

16 Additionally, Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762 permits the Commission to require  
17 coordination between utilities and share costs. Specifically, Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762  
18 states that if the Commission’s order requires “joint action by two or more public  
19 utilities, the Commission shall notify the public utilities and fix a reasonable time within  
20 which they may agree upon the portion or division of the cost which each shall bear.”<sup>78</sup>  
21 If they are not able to do so, the Commission may take action to determine each utility’s  
22 cost.<sup>79</sup> Thus, the Commission may order SDG&E to take joint action with NEET West  
23 to install the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation footprint and share the costs to  
24 do so.

---

<sup>76</sup> *Greyhound Lines, Inc. v. Public Utilities Commission*, (1968) 68 Cal.2d 406, 414-416.

<sup>77</sup> *Id.*; See also *In Re Pacific Tel. and Tel. Co.* 12 CPUC 2d 525 (Sept. 7, 1983), Conclusions of Law 1, requiring Pacific to sell its customer premises equipment to its customers.

<sup>78</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762.

<sup>79</sup> *Id.*

1           **C.     The Suncrest Substation Alternative is economically**  
2           **feasible.**

3           As stated previously, as a public utility, SDG&E has dedicated its property for  
4 public use within its service territory. Therefore, the Commission’s exercise of Cal. Pub.  
5 Util. Code §762 within the bounds of that service territory and for the purposes of  
6 providing electric service, is not a taking.<sup>80</sup> Without the need to exercise eminent  
7 domain, costs to implement the Suncrest Substation Alternative are substantially less.  
8 Additionally, under Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762, the Commission can order SDG&E and  
9 NEET West to take joint action and require them to agree upon the division of costs.  
10 Where the utilities are not able to come to an agreement, the Commission may fix the  
11 proportion of costs that each utility must bear.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, the Commission can ensure a  
12 fair cost sharing agreement which does not impinge on the economic feasibility of the  
13 project.

14           Furthermore, the construction of the Suncrest Substation Alternative would  
15 obviate the need for the following components<sup>82</sup>:

- 16           • The one-mile underground transmission line
- 17           • Six acres of remote land
- 18           • Signage and lighting for the remote site
- 19           • Access driveway improvements
- 20           • A storm water detention basin
- 21           • A retaining wall, storm water drainage, and conveyance system
- 22           • Chain link and barb wire security fencing approximately 7 feet in height
- 23           • 230 kV Lightning Arresters
- 24           • 230 kV Potential Measurement Transformers

25           NEET West states that there might be other unknown costs in locating the SVC  
26 facility in the Suncrest Substation. However, NEET West cannot estimate the cost of

---

<sup>80</sup> *Atchinson Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. RR. Comm’n of California*, (1931) 209 Cal. 460, 473.

<sup>81</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762.

<sup>82</sup> DEIR, ES-4 -ES-5.

1 placing the SVC facility within the Suncrest Substation because SDG&E has not  
2 provided the information necessary to make these estimates.<sup>83</sup> Proving economic  
3 infeasibility requires a showing that “the additional costs or lost profits are so severe the  
4 project would become impractical.”<sup>84</sup> While any particular economic analysis or data is  
5 not required, generally CEQA requires “‘some context’ that allows for economic  
6 comparison”<sup>85</sup> and “without any comparative numbers, it [is] not possible to determine  
7 the feasibility of ... alternatives.”<sup>86</sup> The Commission should not take NEET West’s  
8 claims of economic infeasibility at face value; rather it should require comparative  
9 numbers so that it can independently determine whether any increased costs would result  
10 and whether that increase would render the project infeasible. The Commission should  
11 also require SDG&E to provide NEET West the information it needs to give the  
12 Commission an accurate estimate on the cost to construct the SVC facility within the  
13 Suncrest Substation.

14 Additionally, that NEET West may have already expended funds in support of the  
15 Proposed Project cannot, on its own, make an alternative economically infeasible. As the  
16 lead agency, the Commission cannot “avoid an objective consideration of an alternative  
17 simply because, prior to commencing CEQA review, an applicant made substantial  
18 investments in the hope of gaining approval for a particular alternative.”<sup>87</sup> The  
19 Commission must make an objective and independent determination on the feasibility of  
20 the environmentally superior alternative, irrespective of any funds that NEET West has  
21 expended to prepare the Proposed Project for Commission approval.

---

<sup>83</sup> NEET West Response to ORA Data Request Set 1, Question 3, March 27, 2017.

<sup>84</sup> *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Bd. of Supervisors*, (1998) 197 Cal. App. 3d 1167, 1181.

<sup>85</sup> *Uphold Our Heritage v. Town of Woodside*, (2007) 147 Cal. App. 4th 587, 600–601.

<sup>86</sup> *SPRAWLDEF v. San Francisco Bay Conservation & Dev. Comm'n* (2014) 226 Cal. App. 4th 905, 919.

<sup>87</sup> *Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of Univ. of California* (1988) 47 Cal. 3d 376, 424-425.

1 **IV. SINCE THE ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE**  
2 **OBVIATES THE NEED FOR CERTAIN PROJECT COMPONENTS,**  
3 **THE REASONABLE COST MUST BE LESS THAN THE COST OF**  
4 **THE PROPOSED PROJECT.**

5 Under the Suncrest Substation Alternative, the SVC facility will be co-located  
6 within the existing Suncrest Substation; therefore, there will be no need for many of the  
7 project components listed in Section III.D. above such as, the one-mile underground  
8 transmission line and six acres of land for the project site. Thus, the reasonable cost of  
9 the environmentally superior alternative should be less than that of the Proposed Project.  
10 It is unclear whether additional costs may arise from the environmentally superior  
11 alternative because NEET West has not made these estimates. However, as stated  
12 previously, the Commission should require an accurate estimate and the utilities should  
13 take joint action to determine an appropriate sharing of costs.<sup>88</sup>

14 **V. IF THE COMMISSION CHOOSES NOT TO EXERCISE ITS**  
15 **AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE THE PROJECT TO BE SITED**  
16 **WITHIN THE SUNCREST SUBSTATION, ORA SUPPORTS THE**  
17 **PROJECT AS CURRENTLY PROPOSED BY NEET WEST.**

18 This project was subject to competitive bid under the CAISO's rules regarding  
19 policy oriented projects.<sup>89</sup> NEET West was the winner of that bid because it agreed to a  
20 cost cap of \$42,288,000, which also included a cap on all costs associated with the  
21 construction period, including direct costs, allocated overhead costs, capital costs, and  
22 allowance for funds used during construction, which benefits ratepayers.<sup>90</sup> CAISO found  
23 this bid to be superior to SDG&E's bid.<sup>91</sup> The Commission should reject any attempt by  
24 SDG&E to acquire the right to construct this project after the fact. While the  
25 Commission should consider the narrow subject of whether the project should be

---

<sup>88</sup> Cal. Pub. Util. Code §762.

<sup>89</sup> CAISO Tariff 24.4.10; 24.5.1.

<sup>90</sup> Suncrest Reactive Power Project: Project Sponsor Selection Report, January 6, 2015, p. 46.  
<http://www.aiso.com/Documents/SuncrestProjectSponsorSelectionReport.pdf>.

<sup>91</sup> SDG&E's cost cap was higher and did not include the risk of increased costs associated with changes to the scope of the Proposed Project, unforeseen issues outside of SDG&E's control, and increases in commodity costs.

1 constructed by NEET West within the Suncrest Substation, it should not consider  
2 whether SDG&E should construct the project. Since the DEIR found that the impacts of  
3 the Proposed Project could be mitigated, it should be the Commission’s next choice after  
4 the environmentally superior alternative.<sup>92</sup>

5 **VI. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL, STATE, AND COMMISSION**  
6 **RULES, REGULATIONS AND OTHER APPLICABLE**  
7 **STANDARDS GOVERNING SAFETY, RELIABILITY AND**  
8 **COMPETITION.**

9 **A. The Commission should not grant NEET West**  
10 **exemptions from reporting requirements.**

11 ORA is concerned that granting exemptions from the affiliate transaction reporting  
12 requirements will impede its ability to obtain relevant and accurate information to ensure  
13 that customer interests are protected. While NEET West emphasizes that it will not be  
14 providing service to retail customers due to its CAISO membership, California’s retail  
15 customers pay roughly 90% of the costs of transmission under CAISO’s operational  
16 control. Therefore, the Commission must ensure that NEET West provides critical  
17 information to both Commission staff and ORA without additional litigation.

18 **VII. CONCLUSION**

19 ORA recommends that the Commission bifurcate the proceeding to first consider  
20 the issue of whether it should require NEET West to site the project within the Suncrest  
21 Substation. The Suncrest Substation alternative is superior because it would avoid most  
22 environmental impacts at a potentially lower cost. Additionally, If the Commission  
23 adopts the Suncrest Substation Alternative (the environmentally superior alternative), the  
24 maximum prudent and reasonable cost of the project should be the cost of the Proposed  
25 Project less the cost required to construct the one-mile transmission line and for other  
26 project components that would no longer be needed. However, if the Proposed Project is  
27 approved, ORA supports NEET West’s bid price as the maximum prudent and reasonable

---

<sup>92</sup> DEIR, 20-14.

- 1 cost of the project. ORA does not support exempting NEET West from the reporting
- 2 requirements associated with affiliate transactions.





- 1 • Coordinated on the operation and maintenance of power transmission and  
2 power generation facilities.
- 3 • Coordinated on the planning, budgeting, engineering, building, and  
4 commissioning of new generators, power transmission lines, and power  
5 substations.

6 From 2002 to 2010, I worked for California Department of Water Resources in  
7 Sacramento, California in the capacity of Associate Hydroelectric Power Utility  
8 Engineer and Senior Hydroelectric Power Utility Engineer – Supervisor, and  
9 performed the following duties:

- 10 • Participated in the California Independent System Operator (“CAISO”)  
11 stakeholder processes including plan, design, and implementation of the  
12 Market Redesign and Technology Upgrade. Provided comments in the area  
13 of day-ahead market, real time market, energy and ancillary services co-  
14 optimization, residual unit commitment, congestion management, locational  
15 marginal pricing, market power mitigation, grid reliability, resource  
16 adequacy, and demand response.
- 17 • Participated in the CAISO transmission planning processes, generator  
18 interconnection procedures, local capacity requirement studies, transmission  
19 access charges, and grid management charges.
- 20 • Intervened in transmission owners’ tariff filings on existing transmission  
21 contracts, transmission owner tariffs, and reliability services tariffs.
- 22 • Conducted the following studies related to State Water Project (SWP)  
23 operation: transmission and interconnection planning, existing power and  
24 transmission contracts benefit cost analysis, transmission cost forecasting,  
25 SWP capabilities in providing ancillary services to the CAISO market, cost  
26 impact of the CAISO proposals to SWP power operation, SWP resource  
27 modeling, and settlement and reconciliation for the CAISO market  
28 transactions.

29 From November 2010 to February 2013, I worked for the Energy Division of  
30 the California Public Utilities Commission in San Francisco, California as a  
31 Senior Utilities Engineer – Specialist and performed the following tasks:

- 1 • Commented on the CAISO power market refinement including renewable  
2 resources integration and market power mitigation.
- 3 • Facilitated settlement on distributed resources interconnection to utilities’  
4 distribution systems.
- 5 • Drafted resolution on utilities’ tariff filings on power generators’ station  
6 power services and on utilities’ minor transmission and distribution  
7 construction and maintenance projects.

8 From February 2013 to present, I have worked for the Office of Ratepayer  
9 Advocates of the California Public Utilities Commission in San Francisco,  
10 California as a Senior Utilities Engineer – Specialist and have performed the  
11 following tasks:

- 12 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Tehachapi Reliability Transmission  
13 Project proceeding under the Commission docket number A.07-06-031.
- 14 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Alberhill System Project proceeding  
15 under the Commission docket number A.09-09-022.
- 16 • Project coordinator for ORA in the South Orange County Reliability  
17 Enhancement Project proceeding under the Commission docket number  
18 A.12-05-020.
- 19 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Coolwater – Lugo Transmission Project  
20 proceeding under the Commission docket number A.13-08-023.
- 21 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Mesa Substation Project proceeding  
22 under the Commission docket number A.15-03-003.
- 23 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Riverside Transmission Reliability  
24 Project proceeding under the Commission docket number A.15-04-013.
- 25 • Project coordinator for ORA in the Circle City Project proceeding under the  
26 Commission docket number A. 15-12-007.

27 **Q4: What is the purpose of this testimony?**

28 A4: I am the sponsor of ORA’s Prepared Testimony in this Suncrest SVC Project,  
29 under the Commission docket number A.15-08-027.

30 **Q5: Does this complete your testimony?**

31 A5: Yes, it does.