**R.21-10-002: RA Reform Workshop Chat**

**8/17/2022**

[9:49 AM]

9:49 AM Meeting started

[9:59 AM] Jessica Melms

Just as a participant I did not receive the agenda!

[10:00 AM] Alexander, Maggie (she/her)

Thanks for joining today's RA Reform workshop. Friendly reminders:

* This meeting is being recorded.
* Please mute yourself. If necessary, your line will get muted if there's excessive background noise.
* Next workshop: Resource Counting, TUESDAY 8/23.
* If you are interested in presenting at the following workshop, please contact the co-facilitators by COB today (8/17) and send presentation materials to the co-facilitators by Monday morning 8/22.
* If you need to find the call-in information, schedule, or contact information for these workshops, they are included in the emails sent to the service list.
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[10:03 AM] Nick Pappas

Hi Barbara and Jaime - apologies if I missed this (joined late) - could you share the order / timing for today?

[10:04 AM] Nick Pappas

NVM saw on service list. Thanks!

[10:04 AM] Gannon, Jaime Rose

10 am - 11:10 am Energy Division  
11:10 am to 11:30 am NRDC  
11:30 am to 12:15 pm SCE  
12:15 to 12:45 pm lunch  
12:45 pm to 1 pm MRP  
1 pm to 2 pm general dscuss PRM/LOLE  
2-3 pm IEP UCAP-lite

like 3

[10:33 AM] Colbert, Cathleen

Can you please clarify if the coming online resources are Level 1 resources in the TPP planning year 1 cases?

[10:39 AM] Christian Lambert (Cal Adv) (Guest)

On the 5th bullet on slide 21, the IRP modeling had also included Sutter and Intermountain coal as specified imports (or in RESOLVE, as in-CAISO resources, paired with a reduction in maximum import capability) IIRC.  The 5th bullet lists Hoover and PV.  Is this a change in how the Sutter intertie and the replacement Intermountain gas will be treated?

[10:39 AM] Tom Beach (Guest)

Why does your LOLE analysis remove CTs and CHP?  Don't they provide capacity?

[10:43 AM] Gannon, Jaime Rose

To surface LOLE to .1

[10:43 AM] Brent Buffington

CPUC slide 4 answers a different question than we're interested in. This answers the question: "If the entire portfolio needed for September reliability was required in each month, what would the PRM be?"
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[10:44 AM] Brent Buffington

Slide 24\*

[10:48 AM] Doug Karpa (Peninsula Clean Energy)) (Guest)

So that's why there are eye popping numbers outside of the September values for which the portfolio is calculated?

[10:48 AM] Brent Buffington

PCAP PRM was 13.8 and equivalent slice-of-day PRM is 15%.

[10:49 AM] Brent Buffington

Is that right?

[10:49 AM] Nuo Tang

15% for September, under a 70% Exceedance?

[10:50 AM] Nuo Tang

but if you set all months to 15% PRM, then would more LOLE surface in shoulder months

[10:50 AM] Brent Buffington

**Nuo Tang**

but if you set all months to 15% PRM, then would more LOLE surface in shoulder months

Maybe. Would be a good test.

[10:51 AM] Nuo Tang

we need a test

[10:51 AM] Colbert, Cathleen

Nick Pappas and Donald (Guest)  CB Hall (Guest) It would be really helpful for the interaction between local and system RA that the new resources being included in the generation set for both this modeling and to set the Local Capacity Requirement are the same. Really appreciate diving into that in the right venue at some point with CPUC/CAISO together.

[10:52 AM] Nick Pappas

Gannon, Jaime Rose great point - should consider whether BTM resources are shown / deducted from the PRM prior to allocating obligations to LSEs

[10:52 AM] Olson, Scott

This result showing a 15% PRM needed in slice of day to meet a 0.1 LOLE would lead to a very different planning basis and LSE requirement than the PCAP study that shows 19-23% PRM need.

[10:53 AM] Nuo Tang

actually I think I heard donald say that this isn't the portfolio for SOD PRM
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[10:53 AM] Brent Buffington

**Nuo Tang**

we need a test

Instead of single annual "PCAP" could shape PCAP monthly. If 14% is PRM set in Capacity Expansion, apply is against monthly peak instead of annual.

[10:53 AM] Colbert, Cathleen

**Nuo Tang**

actually I think I heard donald say that this isn't the portfolio for SOD PRM

I heard the same.

[10:53 AM] Olson, Scott

I thought that was the point of backing out the CTs and CHP--to be consistent with what was backed out with the 0.1 LOLE case?

[10:56 AM] Nuo Tang

the PCAP LOLE excludes certain resources and add more perfect capacity. ED is proposing to use a more realistic portfolio of existing resources and either adding or removing capacity to surface the 0.1 LOLE. so we will need to wait for that portfolio to determine if it ends up w/ 15% PRM for SOD that we're focused on. That's my understanding
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[11:15 AM] Nick Pappas

<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/energy-division/documents/resource-adequacy-homepage/workshop-6-nrdc_2021_12_01_np-energy_nrdc_need-determination-and-allocation.pdf>

[11:16 AM] Paul Nelson (CLECA) (Guest)

The version of the presentation by ED is different than the one circulated yesterday.  Will ED distribute the updated version or is it available on the CPUC website?  thank you.
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[11:16 AM] Gannon, Jaime Rose

Yes.

[11:17 AM] John Newton

When circulating, please use the latest service list... Thanks!
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[11:40 AM] Jeff Nelson

or call in

[11:54 AM] Doug Karpa (Peninsula Clean Energy)) (Guest)

I can wait

[11:55 AM] Colbert, Cathleen

Support MRP going before lunch
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[11:55 AM] CB Hall (Guest)

I will wait on my question too

[11:57 AM] Barbara Barkovich (Guest)

Thanks.

[11:58 AM] Doug Karpa (Peninsula Clean Energy)) (Guest)

If I understand correctly, there would be a single PRM for all months and hours.  Presumably we would want to use the highest PRM for the year.  Wouldn't you need to run Capacity Expansion and LOLE in each month to determine the PRM that would be needed in each month?  Or would you just use the highest EUE hours?

[11:59 AM] Nuo Tang

**Doug Karpa (Peninsula Clean Energy)) (Guest)**

If I understand correctly, there would be a single PRM for all months and hours. Presumably we would want to use the highest PRM for the year. Wouldn't you need to run Capacity Expansion and LOLE in each month to determine the PRM that would be needed in each month? Or would you just use the hig…

that would result in a 60% PRM, if you look at ED's slide deck as an example.

[12:05 PM] Doug Karpa (Peninsula Clean Energy)) (Guest)

I was envisioning something different:  unless I'm mistaken, that comes from running Capacity expansion for the whole year, and then using the September portfolio for all months.  I was thinking we do a CapEx just to meet the need in each month (e.g., there'd be a different portfolio for each month, presumably a smaller portfolio for, say, January, than for September.

[12:05 PM] Nick Pappas

Hi Barbara - confirming we are thinking lunch 12:30-1?

[12:47 PM] Alexander, Maggie (she/her)

Welcome back to the second half of today's RA Reform Workshop. As a reminder, we will be recording this meeting.

[1:01 PM] Nick Pappas

If possible, would like to speak to this thread before we move on to another topic

[1:16 PM] Moussa, Effat A

Would you please provide us with the workshop recording link

[1:17 PM] Alexander, Maggie (she/her)

All presentations and workshop recordings will be posted here:  [Resource Adequacy History (ca.gov)](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/electrical-energy/electric-power-procurement/resource-adequacy-homepage/resource-adequacy-history)
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Resource Adequacy History

Principal Resource Adequacy Decision  R.21-10-002 RA Reform Track 2 Workshop Schedule August 10, 2022 Hybrid Resource Counting Workshop Recording AM | PM  Agenda | Notes | Chat ...

[1:20 PM] Christian Lambert (Cal Adv) (Guest)

Thanks, Brett.  That's reasonable in my view.

[1:20 PM] Christian Lambert (Cal Adv) (Guest)

Brent\*

[1:39 PM] Colbert, Cathleen

Brent Buffington I heard you explain that the generation MW need for storage charging will be included in the LOLE to set that generation need. That's appropriate in my view. But then adding another storage charging MW requirement on top of that, which is how we read the decision, is additive.

[1:42 PM] Sergio Dueñas

Completely agree with Nick Pappas
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[1:48 PM] Brent Buffington

**Colbert, Cathleen**

Brent Buffington I heard you explain that the generation MW need for storage charging will be included in the LOLE to set that generation need. That's appropriate in my view. But then adding another storage charging MW requirement on top of that, which is how we read the decision, is additive.

Depends on how we construct the LOLE, determine PRM, and apply PRM. We can only leave it at the LOLE step if we set hourly PRM exactly at the resource needs (different PRMs each hour). Perhaps RA will move that way but I consider it out of scope for now.

[1:53 PM] Nick Pappas

Re: import constraint for the LOLE model:

Does allowing non-RA imports (imports >4000MW off-peak) break the energy charging constraint? e.g. permitting non-RA resources to meet some of the energy charging need?

If we are assuming the premise of RA is that the system should be reliable with **only** RA resources

[1:54 PM] Colbert, Cathleen

**Brent Buffington**

Depends on how we construct the LOLE, determine PRM, and apply PRM. We can only leave it at the LOLE step if we set hourly PRM exactly at the resource needs (different PRMs each hour). Perhaps RA will move that way but I consider it out of scope for now.

You don't need hourly PRM for a LOLE to identify an amount of generation needed to support storage charging. The PRM could still be a single value for each month. I heard you acknowledge that the LOLE capacity requirement would include an amount to support the charging needs, so we will need to be mindful the charging sufficiency requirements 1+RTE:1 for storage is not additive to any requirement that the LOLE capacity requirement may include.

[2:00 PM] Brent Buffington

**Colbert, Cathleen**

You don't need hourly PRM for a LOLE to identify an amount of generation needed to support storage charging. The PRM could still be a single value for each month. I heard you acknowledge that the LOLE capacity requirement would include an amount to support the charging needs, so we will need to be …

I think I'll refer you to Nick's presentation, slide 5. The black line represents the highest PRM the LOLE-based portfolio can support. This step needs to also respect the excess capacity - so excess capacity from the LOLE portfolio isn't in the PRM

[2:31 PM] Olson, Scott

The added hourly granularity for UCAP light is interesting but I am not sure the added complexity is needed. Per Scott's slides, for some units it won't matter and for those that it will, like Desert Star, the average UCAP light is very close to the hourly UCAP light that many LSEs will care most about (HE19-20).

[2:43 PM] Alexander, Maggie (she/her)

Thank you all for joining! Please remember to send your request to present at the next workshop (Resource Counting on TUESDAY 8/23) by COB today (8/17) and send your presentation materials to the facilitator by Monday morning 8/22.