Key Technical Question for Parties in Response to December 18th, 2013 Workshop on Planning Assumptions and Scenarios for use in the CPUC 2014 Long Term Procurement Plan Proceeding and the CAISO 2014-2015 Transmission Planning Process

Questions

1. Is the current range of scenarios sufficient to cover current policy issues facing the CPUC?

2. Are there any technical errors in the proposed scenarios, scenario tool, or RPS Calculator? For any identified 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 counted twice 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?

3. Should Diablo Canyon be assumed online or retired in the Trajectory case?

4. Is the treatment of energy storage for capacity value reasonable?

5. For existing resources that do not have announced retirement dates, Staff may assume a resource retires based on facility age. Facility age is calculated from Commercial Online Date, but the COD may not be available for some resources. If no COD is available, is it reasonable to assume the resource does not retire within the planning horizon? If not, please provide an alternate methodology and justification from a public data source as needed.

6. How should the capacity value of energy storage, demand response, and demand side resources (PV, CHP) be allocated to small geographic regions and/or busbars and how should the capacity value be adjusted to account for locational and operational characteristics uncertainty?

7. Decision (D.13-10-040) established storage goals for each of three categories – transmission, distribution, and customer-side of the meter, but does not specify the function(s) to be provided. Should storage modeling be focused on deep multi-hour cycling to support operational flexibility or rapid cycling for ancillary services? How should the production profile of each category of storage identified in the CPUC Storage Target Decision be modeled – as a fixed profile or as a dispatchable resource?

8. Should incremental small PV and small CHP on the customer side of the meter be modeled as demand-side load reduction or supply side generation? How should the production profile of each resource type by modeled? Should the same modeling convention be used in all 2014 LTPP and 2014-15 TPP studies or may specific studies make this decision in a manner best suited to the topic being studied?

9. Is the forecast of incremental small PV (beyond what is embedded within the IEPR forecast) on the demand side reasonable? If not, please provide an alternate forecast and justification from a public data source as needed.

10. Is the forecast of incremental CHP on the demand side and the supply side reasonable for the scenarios that include those forecasts? If not, please provide an alternate forecast and justification from a public data source as needed.