

# ATTACHMENT A

**BEFORE  
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate  
and Refine Procurement Policies and  
Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans.**

**R.12-03-014**

**RESPONSE OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
TO THE FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS OF THE SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA**

Below are responses to the First Set of Data Requests served by Sierra Club California.

**RESPONSE**

**Request No. 1.**

1. Please provide all discovery responses and the corresponding discovery requests from all parties in the above captioned case as well as all future responses to data requests from all other parties.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 1**

The ISO responses to the first data request of the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and the first data request of the California Environmental Justice Alliance are attached.

**Request No. 2.**

2. Confirm that there is no local capacity requirement ("LCR") need in the PG&E Territory.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 2**

There are several local capacity areas in the PG&E area which require the procurement of local capacity. However, the Once Through Cooling (OTC) study documented in Chapter 3 of the 2011-2012 ISO Transmission Plan studied the potential retirement of all of the remaining OTC generation in the PG&E area. The study found that with the assumed addition of several new generation projects currently under development, the retirement of the remaining OTC units in the PG&E area did not result in projected installed capacity deficiencies in the local areas within PG&E in the year 2021.

**Request No. 3.**

3. If Oakley Generating Station were removed from the baseline of available units, would there still be no LCR need in the PG&E Territory? Please explain.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 3**

The ISO has not performed this particular analysis.

**Request No. 4**

4. Provide the amount of distributed generation capacity used as an input for each of the following LCR grid areas: Greater Bay Area; Big Creek/Ventura (Moorpark Subarea); LA Basin; Western LA Basin; and El Nido.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 4**

Please see Chapter 3 of the 2011-2012 ISO Transmission Plan.

- Please see Table 3.3-7: Loads and resource summary in GBA
- Please see Table 3.3-11: Loads and resource summary in LA Basin area
- Please see Table 3.3-21 through Table 3.3-24 for Western LA Basin and El Nido Subareas
- Please see Table 3.3-26: Loads and Resource summary in Big Creek/Ventura area
- Please see Table 3.3-36 through Table 3.3-39 for Moorpark Subarea

**Request No. 5**

5. Provide the amount of energy storage capacity, if any, used as an input for each of the following LCR grid areas: Greater Bay Area; Big Creek/Ventura (Moorpark Subarea); LA Basin; Western LA Basin; and El Nido.
- a.) During the workshop, Robert Sparks stated that there were no energy storage projects in the LA Basin LCR area? Confirm the accuracy.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 5 (a)**

There were no new energy storage projects assumed in any of these areas.

- b.) If there are projects known to CAISO, list each project and its capacity.

**ISO RESPONSE TO No. 5 (b)**

Please see response to 5a.