

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the
Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program
Refinements, and Establish Annual Local
Procurement Obligations.

R.11-10-023
Filed October 20, 2011

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
ON ASSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
AND ENERGY DIVISION PROPOSALS**

Donald C. Liddell
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
2928 2nd Avenue
San Diego, California 92103
Telephone: (619) 993-9096
Facsimile: (619) 296-4662
Email: liddell@energyattorney.com

Attorney for the
CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE

March 3, 2014

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the
Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program
Refinements, and Establish Annual Local
Procurement Obligations.

R.11-10-023
Filed October 20, 2011

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE
ON ASSIGNED ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
AND ENERGY DIVISION PROPOSALS**

In accordance with the provisions of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”), and the Assigned Administrative law Judge’s Ruling and Attached Energy Division Proposals (“Proposals”), issued by Administrative Law Judge David M. Gamson on February 4, 2014 (“ALJ’s Ruling”), the California Energy Storage Alliance (“CESA”)¹ hereby submits these reply comments to opening comments of parties filed on February 18, 2014 (“Opening Comments”).

CESA encourages the Commission’s Staff to continue to work with the Staff of the California Independent System Operator’s (“CAISO”) to allow dispatchable load to count toward flexible capacity since effective flexible capacity can exceed qualifying capacity and the true pMax and pMin of a resource may exceed its resource adequacy (“RA”)-eligible pMax. In its opening comments CESA recommended that the RA-eligible pMax and pMin be labeled for their respective buckets. CESA’s review of the opening comments filed by other parties reveals some considerable divergence of views on the policy implications of the Proposals, but little, if any, disagreement on essential facts or applicable law that are being addressed by the Commission in this proceeding.

¹ The views expressed in these Comments are those of CESA, and do not necessarily reflect the views of all of the individual CESA member companies. <http://storagealliance.org>.

In view of apparent basic policy disagreement between the respective staffs of the Commission and the CAISO, and the Commission's standards set forth in its Rules of Practice and Procedure with respect to reply comments relating to factual legal or technical errors in general, the CAISO, CESA does not reply here to specific opening comments. Instead, CESA reserves the right to reply, if necessary, in a holistic manner to both the comments filed by parties on the Proposals, as well as the comments of parties filed on February 24, 2014, regarding a proposed Energy Division staff "framework" published subsequent to the Proposals.²

CESA appreciates the opportunity to submit these reply comments, and looks forward to continuing to work with the Commission and stakeholders in this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald C. Liddell
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL

Attorneys for the
CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE

March 3, 2014

² See, comments of parties filed in response to *Request for Comment on Staff Proposal on the Implementation of the Flexible Capacity Procurement Framework*, issued as an email message addressed to the service list by Administrative Law Judge David M. Gammon on February 18, 2014.