

AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 3, 2004  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 26, 2004  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2003–04 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 2643**

---

---

**Introduced by Assembly Member Canciamilla**

February 20, 2004

---

---

An act to add Section 25314 to the Public Resources Code, relating to energy.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2643, as amended, Canciamilla. Energy: natural gas.

Existing law requires the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission to perform certain planning functions relating to the siting and design of electric power generating and related facilities. Existing law requires the commission to adopt an integrated energy policy report, beginning November 1, 2003, and every 2 years thereafter.

This bill would require the commission, in consultation with the Public Utilities Commission, to prepare, as a component of the 2005 integrated energy policy report, an assessment regarding the costs and benefits of siting liquefied natural gas facilities within the state. *The bill would specify the information that is required to be included in the assessment.*

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.



*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1 SECTION 1. Section 25314 is added to the Public Resources  
2 Code, to read:  
3 25314. (a) The commission, in consultation with the Public  
4 Utilities Commission, shall prepare , as a component of the 2005  
5 integrated energy policy report adopted pursuant to Section  
6 25302, an assessment regarding the costs and benefits of siting  
7 liquefied natural gas facilities within the state.  
8 (b) *The assessment prepared pursuant to subdivision (a) shall*  
9 *include all of the following:*  
10 (1) *An evaluation of differences in safety risks, public*  
11 *acceptance, costs, and other issues associated with placing*  
12 *liquefied natural gas terminals onshore, compared to placing them*  
13 *offshore.*  
14 (2) *An evaluation of differences in safety risks, public*  
15 *acceptance, and other issues associated with connecting new*  
16 *liquefied natural gas terminals to the state’s existing natural gas*  
17 *infrastructure, compared to expanding current pipelines to*  
18 *increase natural gas imported from outside the state. This*  
19 *evaluation shall address whether sufficient natural gas from*  
20 *outside the state will be available if the pipelines are expanded.*  
21 (3) *An evaluation of the additional natural gas pipeline*  
22 *capacity that is necessary to move liquefied natural gas from west*  
23 *to east.*  
24 (4) (A) *An evaluation of the impact on performance, safety,*  
25 *and emissions of natural gas fired processes resulting from using*  
26 *liquefied natural gas that is shipped from other countries,*  
27 *compared to using natural gas from current sources.*  
28 (B) *For purposes of this paragraph, “natural gas fired*  
29 *processes” includes residential, commercial, and industrial*  
30 *processes.*  
31 (5) *An evaluation of the impact that siting a liquefied natural*  
32 *gas terminal has on local property values.*  
33 (6) *An evaluation of the impact that siting a liquefied natural*  
34 *gas terminal has on local public safety agencies.*  
35 (7) *A list of proposed liquefied natural gas projects and their*  
36 *status.*



- 1 (8) *A bibliography of available information associated with the*
- 2 *costs and benefits of siting liquefied natural gas terminals in the*
- 3 *state.*

O

