

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 10/31/2011 9:19:46 AM
To: Clanon, Paul (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov) (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject:

Some feedback on Sutter:

- 1) The ISO was supposed to perform an analysis demonstrating the need for Sutter. We have contacted ISO staff and have not been able to find a person at the ISO who is aware of such a study being underway.

- 2) We will be holding an intermediate term RFO in Q1 2012, most likely for just system resource adequacy (RA). Sutter has been an unsuccessful bidder in our past intermediate term RFOs. Winning bidders in recent RFOs have offered RA for \$4/kw-month for the summer and \$1/kw-month for the other months, or less. We only have a need for RA for several months each year going forward.

- 3) We will have many fast ramp energy resources in our portfolio by 2013 capable of facilitating renewables integration. We have the 10 year, 500+ MW Calpine peaker deal that the CPUC approved last year, along with the 10 year, 289 MW Calpine Los Esteros and 299 MW GWF peaker to combine cycle conversions, both to be completed before the summer of 2013. In addition, we recently filed for approval of a 10 year, 190 MW GWF peaker contract. The 600 MW Russell City combined cycle, the 719 MW Marsh Landing peakers and the 184 MW Mariposa peakers are all expected on line in 2013. We also have the 657 MW Colusa combined cycle and the 560 MW Gateway combined cycle already in our portfolio.

- 4) Since Sutter is a 520 MW "system" RA resource (not local RA), perhaps Edison can better fit it into their portfolio and utilize the combined cycle resource for both energy and renewable integration. I am not aware that they have as many combined cycles in their portfolio as we will have.