

**R.12-03-014: 2012 LTPP
Energy Division**

Request for Informal Comments in Response to CAISO presentation on LTPP Base Case preliminary results

In response to the April 24, 2013 workshop where the California ISO presented their preliminary results on the 2012 LTPP Base Case scenario, Energy Division staff is requesting informal comments by **May 9th**. These comments are to help clarify any areas of concern to improve the modeling process and results. While Energy Division is posing specific questions for parties herein, parties may ask other questions.

Note: Assumptions determined in D.12-12-010 will not be changed. The purpose of seeking these informal comments is to help clarify any areas where further information is needed or to assist in dialogue around ancillary assumptions such as the breakdown of out of state resource imports or new inputs such as the recent local capacity authorizations for SDG&E and SCE.

1. What assumptions should be used for recently authorized resources in Southern California Edison's service area (D.13-02-015) and San Diego Gas & Electric's service area (D.13-03-029)? *See slide 16 for the current assumptions and recommendation by CEC and CPUC staff.*
 - a. Should the current assumption (900 MW CCGT, 100 MW GT, 50 MW storage in the LA Basin, 343 MW of GT in San Diego; up to 697 MW of additional resources¹ available to meet any residual flexibility need) be maintained or changed? If changed, what is the recommendation?
 - b. What influence the modeling results would the proposed change have? For example, adding baseload resources may increase overgeneration in non-summer months.
 - c. Is this a change that should be handled in this LTPP or the 2014 LTPP?
2. What assumptions are appropriate for new out of state RPS resources in terms of dynamic scheduling, intra-hour scheduling, hourly scheduling and unbundled RECs? *See slide 20 for the current assumptions.*
 - a. Should each of these categories be additionally classified within the different RPS "buckets" for procurement for better clarity?
 - b. Is this a change that should be handled in this LTPP or the 2014 LTPP?
3. For deeper analysis of any overgeneration assessments:
 - a. How should exports be considered?
 - i. Is a limit appropriate? If so, at what level?
 - ii. What would the implications of this change be?
 - b. Which scenarios/sensitivities from D.12-12-010 should be explored for overgeneration given limited time in this proceeding?
 - c. Is this a change that should be handled in this LTPP or the 2014 LTPP?

For any other comments, staff requests that the following items be identified.

- Overall comment or question
- If the comment or question impacts all modeling runs or only specific runs
- What the expected impact of the change would have on the modeling results
- If the comment should be addressed for this LTPP cycle or can be addressed in the 2014 LTPP.

¹ 1400-1800 MW were authorized for the LA Basin local capacity needs; 215-290 MW were authorized for Big Creek / Ventura local capacity needs; and 343 MW for San Diego local capacity needs.