

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.

Rulemaking 12-03-014

(Filed March 22, 2012)

CLEAN COALITION REPLY COMMENTS ON DECISION AUTHORIZING LONG-
TERM PROCUREMENT FOR LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

Dyana Delfin-Polk
Kenneth Sahm White
Clean Coalition
2 Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 500
Palo Alto, CA 94306
209-658-5837
831-425-5866
dyana@clean-coalition.org
sahm@clean-coalition.org

January 22nd, 2013

CLEAN COALITION REPLY COMMENTS ON DECISION AUTHORIZING LONG-TERM PROCUREMENT FOR LOCAL CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

The Clean Coalition submits these reply comments pursuant to the Proposed Decision of ALJ Gamson, dated December 21st, 2012.

I. Summary of Recommendations

- a. The 50 MW of energy storage (ES) procurement target should remain in the Final Decision in the interest of demonstrating ES cost effectiveness and reliability value to the Southern California region and, contrary to the comments of several parties, SCE comply with this target;
- b. The 400 MW (excluding the 50 MW for ES) is a relatively low procurement target for renewable resources (including DG) that have substantial potential in the Southern California region in ensuring that there is no shortfall in meeting LCR needs in Southern California, therefore procurement levels for renewables should be as high as possible;
- c. The Commission should eliminate the procurement target of 1,000 MW for fossil fuel conventional generation, as this is not compliant with the State's established Loading Order, established goals such as GHG reduction mandated by AB 32, the RPS goals or the Governor's 12 GW of Distributed Generation (DG) goals, as noted in the opening comments of numerous parties;
- d. The Commission should give greater consideration to Demand Response in meeting LCR requirements, as noted in opening comments by DRA and CEJA in addition to our own.

II. Discussion

The Clean Coalition would like to reiterate its general support for the Proposed Decision and its importance in the long term planning process. However, as also addressed by a number of other parties, the PD still requires some modification, with specific regard to preferred resources and procurement targets.

- a. The 50 MW of energy storage (ES) procurement target should remain in the Final Decision

The Clean Coalition wishes to emphasize that the inclusion of the 50 MW of energy storage (ES) procurement in the PD is an important positive step forward for ES in the state. Several parties in

Opening Comments (including PG&E and SCE) recommend that the Commission disregard the procurement target set for ES. The Clean Coalition disagrees. ES is a greatly underappreciated resource in the state and due to the possibility that SONGS may not return (as addressed by the ISO), we need to ensure that any shortfall can be made up with preferred resources in the interest of long-term planning. While PG&E stated that "...creating a set-aside for storage will only increase customer costs to the extent that storage is not competitive relative to available alternatives,"¹ the Clean Coalition respectfully disagrees with PG&E. Creating a set-aside for ES will both develop and demonstrate cost effective installation of ES and its ability to perform well in the Southern California region. Without establishing both market and operational experience with ES, development of cost effective applications will be greatly delayed.

DRA recommends that the 50 MW of ES be designed as a pilot program.² The Clean Coalition does not necessarily oppose this, but we emphasize that a pilot program may not be needed, as ES is quickly dispatchable and available now. Benefits of ES include: improved efficiency and reliability from generation to customer, lowered capital investments requirements, and lowered emissions.³ While SCE claims that "...[the PD] indicate[s] the considerable uncertainty regarding the cost effectiveness of energy storage resources to meet the LCR need in SCE's service territory,"⁴ the Clean Coalition believes that SCE should comply with this procurement target in consideration of cost effective LCR needs as well as meeting and exceeding established State goals.

The ES proceeding on AB 2514 has established the variety of direct and ancillary functions storage can provide. The Governor's Clean Energy Jobs Plan also "envisions, accelerated development of energy storage capacity to support integration of renewable resources into the California grid. "In addition, storage has been found to be more effective than conventional peaking generation, and may provide greater than one-to-one benefits relative to conventional capacity, particularly as it can provide the equivalent of both generation or load as required. A report by SCE found that CAISO's "control area may require ... additional regulation /ramping services from fast (5-10 MW per second) resources. . . Fast (defined as 10 MW per second) storage

¹ PG&E at 4

² DRA at 8

³ *Updating the Electric Grid: An Introduction to Non-Transmission Alternatives for Policymakers*, US Department of Energy, September 2009, pg. 13

⁴ SCE at 3

is two to three times more effective than conventional generation in meeting ramping requirements. Consequently, 30-50 MW of storage is equivalent to 100 MW of conventional generation.”⁵

Advanced inverters for distributed renewable energy and battery storage have advanced features that can actively control real and reactive power outputs to support distribution grid reliability and power quality. These advanced functionalities transform distributed renewables from simply reducing load into highly flexible “grid assets” that facilitate much higher penetrations of distributed generation in utility distribution networks. ES and DG resources utilizing these advanced features are the most cost-effective way to enhance grid stability and resilience while integrating high levels of renewable energy, a key enabling technology for the creation of smarter, more efficient, and more reliable local energy systems.

In testimony last year before the CPUC it was noted that: “Many [storage] technologies are approaching commercial availability. These have been tested for viability, are actively looking for partnerships, and are beginning to sign substantial contracts with customers. Energy storage companies are actively targeting the utility storage market and have established strong external support and momentum.

- b. 400 MW (excluding the 50 MW for ES) is a relatively low procurement target for renewable resources

The California Environmental Council claims that only 250 MW is set aside for procurement of preferred resources (excluding the 50 MW for ES)⁶ which may be a missed opportunity for this Commission to fill LCR shortfall with renewables (which includes DG). Distributed generation has massive capacity especially in Southern California with the aforementioned transmission constraints and procurement for this resource should be as high as possible. While only several hundred MW are set aside for preferred resources⁷, the Energy Action Plan and procurement order requires preferred resources to be given priority where cost effective. Since the proportion of the overall portfolio will include an increasingly smaller share of conventional resources, care should be taken to avoid procuring capacity or encouraging investment in facilities that will

⁵Southern California Edison, Moving Energy Storage from Concept to Reality (May 20, 2011) p. 14

⁶SBCEC at 5

⁷The PD (at 2) states that up to 450 MW of preferred resources can be procured

become redundant. The Clean Coalition has every reason to believe that DG can fill up to at least 100 MW of capacity in SDG&E territory alone, with much greater potential for neighboring areas with additional resources.⁸ The Commission should ensure that the overall procurement target for preferred resources should not merely match current RPS targets, but contribute toward improving the overall portfolio; if only 33% of all new procurement were renewable, California would not meet the RPS until all existing generation was retired and would never exceed this minimum.

- c. The Commission should eliminate the procurement target of 1,000 MW for fossil fuel conventional generation

As addressed in our joint Opening Comments with NRDC and the SBCEC, the Clean Coalition joins in support of CEJA and DRA in opposing the minimum procurement level of fossil fuel conventional generation. This is wholly inconsistent with the Loading Order and in GHG reduction goals. This PD makes important strides for preferred resources and the minimum procurement level of 1,000 MW for conventional generation contradicts this progress.

Our support for DRA, CEJA and other parties in opposing any and all procurement target set aside for fossil fuel conventional generation is made in the interest of moving this Commission towards a realistic and achievable renewable future, made more possible by the procurement targets set in this PD. All additional resources beyond the minimum preferred procurement should be considered without implicit or explicit exclusion to avoid undue reductions in the procurement of any preferred resource.

- d. The Commission should give greater consideration to Demand Response in meeting LCR requirements

DR is an important resource and its examination by the Commission, utilities and the ISO is important, as its benefits are often not fully appreciated (especially by SCE or the ISO). As mentioned in our Opening Comments, PJM has had success with DR programs in their capacity and their success should be a clear example of best practices for this resource. We support the recommendation of DRA to study DR programs that would reduce LCR need in Southern California and look to best practices and success with this program (such as PJM) and the exhibit

⁸ SDG&E has over 1,500 MW of commercial rooftop PV potential and twice as much ground based and residential rooftop. SDG&E CSI projects alone are on track to provide over 100 MW by 2016. SCE has over 100 MW of commercial rooftop PV online by the end of 2012. LADWP announced an initial 150 MW program. SCE projects that it will have 1,900 MW of DR by 2014

submitted into the record by CEJA (which identifies differing DR programs in the LA Basin). CEJA identifies over 1,000 MW of DR value in the LA Basin: this should be heeded by the Commission.

The Clean Coalition estimates (based on information from the 2010 LTPP) that 2,842 MW of DR resources would be available in the SCE territory in 2020⁹, much of which can be made available by the 2013 and 2014 peak demand periods. The Clean Coalition also estimates 100 MW of additional DR in the next year for SDG&E, and we predict much greater potential for DR in the following years and neighboring areas. SCE projects that it will have 1,900 MW of DR by 2014, a corresponding 250,000 MWh per year of energy savings by 2014, and an additional 1,000 MW of AMI-enabled DR by 2017¹⁰; these timetables could be advanced. All of these projections demonstrate that DR is a viable option and should be reflected in the Final Decision.

The Clean Coalition is in complete agreement with EnerNOC in expressing concern that the Commission's adoption of CAISO's view that "demand response resources cannot now meet or reduce local capacity requirements."¹¹ To discount DR the way that the Commission does in this PD is to disregard existing policy in DR from the RA proceeding. In addition, this policy is not consistent with the Loading Order, which prioritizes DR at the top with EE. The Final Decision in this proceeding should heed all recommendations to include DR procurement targets and to recognize its ability to provide decreased local capacity requirements, consistent with the RA proceeding and existing Commission policy.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dyana Delfin Polk

Dyana Delfin-Polk

Clean Coalition

2 Palo Alto Square

3000 El Camino Real, Suite 500

Palo Alto, CA 94306

/s/ Kenneth Sahm White

Kenneth Sahm White

Dated: January 22, 2013

⁹. CPUC, R.10-05-006, December 2010 Scoping Memo, Appendix 1 at p. 60

¹⁰ CPUC, Commission Decision 12-04-045, (Apr. 19, 2012), at p. 13.

¹¹ EnerNOC at 5