Key Technical Questions for Parties in Response to Energy Division Proposed Scenarios for Use in 2012 LTPP (R.12-03-014)

Introduction:

Energy Division staff requests technical comments on the proposed scenarios and sensitivities (collectively, "proposed scenarios") discussed during the 8/24 workshop. These technical comments will not be in the record of the proceeding, but will be used to inform a revised staff proposal. The comments should be emailed to the service list on or before 9/7 and should be limited to two pages of text, not counting any supporting spreadsheets or tables. Staff anticipates that the revised staff proposal will be published on approximately 9/14. Policy comments, on the record, are due on 10/1.

Questions:

1. Are there any technical errors in the proposed scenarios, scenario tool, or 33% RPS Calculator? For any alleged errors, please be very specific in your comments including the location of the error and the correct value, including the source for the revised value. If appropriate, please provide a revised spreadsheet showing any corrected values. Some example questions to consider in identifying factual errors are:
    a. Are any resources double counted or inappropriately left out of the analysis?
    b. Are any numbers cited in the proposed scenarios or spreadsheets inaccurate relative to the intended sources?
    c. Are there any errors in the renewable generation project data in the 33% RPS Calculator?
2. Staff has assumed a resource with no current COD estimate in the Energy Commission's list of siting cases (http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/ALL_PROJECTS.XLS), but meeting other criteria, would be online by 2017. Is this a reasonable assumption? If not, please provide a year and justification.
3. If Staff could not locate a COD for an existing resource, Staff assumes a COD of 1/1/1980. Is this a reasonable assumption? If not, please provide a year and justification from a public source.
4. Is it appropriate to group renewable resources such as geothermal or biomass in with conventional generators for purposes of estimating resource retirements?
5. Is a 19% conversion from nameplate small PV capacity to peak production appropriate? If not, what data source and method publically available should be used for this calculation?
6. Please provide a prioritization of staff's proposed scenarios and portfolios, and briefly (no more than 1 page) explain the rational for this prioritization.