

Enhanced Use Lease Energy Industry Forum
Questions and Answers from Presenters

Wednesday, September 26, 1330, Industry Panel Discussion	
Several questions were posed to the panel members regarding transmission costs associated with renewable energy development.	Hal Romanowitz of Oak Creek Energy Systems indicated that more than his company and others have invested \$2B in transmission at Tehachapi Pass. These investments are part of the expansion of Path 26, a major California transmission corridor.
Wednesday, September 26, 1500, Paul Macpherson, AFRPA	
Several conference participants required detailed information about the project time line, RFQ response time, and related issues.	Mr. Macpherson indicated that next steps for AFRPA involved creating a Business Case Analysis (BCA) for the development opportunities. Final RFQs will be issued thereafter followed by source selection. Eugene DeRamus noted that his presentation on Thursday, September 27 at 1030 would address these issues in more detail.
Wednesday, September 26, 1600, Jim Snook, AFCESA	
Several conference participants from the Air Force and the energy industry expressed interest in learning more about renewable energy credits. For example, many individuals wanted to know if credits would accrue to the Air Force if development occurred on the base. Others wanted to know if the Air Force would/could accept RECs as an in-kind contribution.	There was no consensus regarding whether credits would accrue to the Air Force for on base development. Katharine Halvorson, AFRPA, noted that these questions and others would be addressed on the conference website.
Thursday, September 27, 0800, Mission Brief Panel Discussion	
Developers inquired about the locations of substations relative to the proposed development site.	Air Force base representatives provided information on transmission line proximity, but did not provide information on substation proximity. Maps featuring transmission line proximity are featured in the draft RFQs published on the conference registration website.
Developers inquired about land use restrictions - including height restrictions – in effect on the bases.	Height restrictions are variable within the proposed parcels. They will depend on the scale and location of the proposed development.
A developer from PPM Energy inquired about the availability of water at Edwards AFB.	Representatives from Edwards AFB indicated that water was available, but that they would prefer that non water-intensive technologies were employed such as PV or Stirling dish technology.
Several developers had questions about the potential impacts of sonic booms on Concentrating Solar Power (CSP) technology.	Representatives from Edwards AFB noted that there was little mission impact associated with the CSP development near their installation. Heat signatures did not adversely impact radar operations nor did sonic booms adversely effect the CSP development.