

Rulemaking (R.) 20-07-013: Phase II

Technical Working Group Meeting #3

June 2, 2022

10:00 AM - 4:00 PM



California Public
Utilities Commission

AGENDA ITEM	TIME
Introductions, Purpose, and Expected Outcomes	10:00 – 10:15am
Party Comments Regarding “MAVF 3”* Recommendation	10:15 – 11:00 am
Break	11:00 – 11:15 am
Block 1: Discussion of “MAVF 3”*	11:15 am – 12:00 pm
Lunch	12:00 – 1:00 pm
Block 2: Discussion of “MAVF 3”*	1:00 – 2:00 pm
Break	2:00 – 2:15 pm
Block 3: Discussion of “MAVF 3”*	2:15 – 3:45 pm
CPUC Close	3:45 – 4:00 pm

PURPOSE & EXPECTED OUTCOMES OF THE WORKSHOP

Purpose of Meeting & Expected Outcomes

Purpose:

The purpose of this Technical Working Group (TWG) session is to develop the details of implementation for the Level 4 Recommendation identified as “MAVF 3,” which states, “With input from the parties involved, the CPUC should adopt standard metrics for electric and gas reliability, possibly adjusted for regional characteristics, and all IOUs should then use those metrics when estimating MAVF scores.”

Expected Outcome:

TWG attendees will identify and discuss the merits of adopting standard metrics for electric and gas reliability, possibly adjusted for regional characteristics, which will support development of the CPUC Staff proposal in the Rulemaking.

Related Scoping Memo Issues

Scoping Memo Issue #1:

Should the Commission consider revising the RDF adopted in D.18-12-014? What principles or factors could guide consideration of revisions, refinements or clarifications?

Related Scoping Memo Issues

Scoping Memo Issue #2:

Should the Commission consider revising or refining the RDF methodology for valuing services, mitigations and/or impacts (such as those related to reliability and safety)? If so, should the Commission consider:

(a) defining and requiring the use of a consistent value of statistical life (VSL);

(b) whether the dollar value of attributes should be explicitly addressed; and

(c) the valuation of the costs and impacts of public safety power shutoff (PSPS) events as both risks and risk mitigations? Discussion and consideration of PSPS related issues in this proceeding should avoid duplicating work on PSPS issues being addressed in other proceedings or as undertaken by the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety (Energy Safety) in the context of its review of utility Wildfire Mitigation Plans.

Break

11:00 – 11:15 am

Standard Metrics for Electric and Gas Reliability

1. Assuming that there are three categories of improvements, what standards would you include in the following categories?

- a. Bronze: This category represents a set of standards that would create some incremental improvement upon the current estimated value of electric and gas reliability and would be realistically achievable within the Phase II timeframe.
- b. Silver: This category represents a set of standards that would be a bit harder to achieve within the Phase II timeframe than those of the Bronze category, but would lead to a more satisfactory representation of the value of electric and gas reliability in the RDF.
- c. Gold: This category represents the aspirational set of standards, regardless of whether or not they can be achieved within the Phase II timeframe, that would represent the best realistically achievable modeling to represent the value of electric and gas reliability in the RDF.

Standard Metrics for Electric and Gas Reliability

2. For each of the standard measures in the categories above, consider how the dollar value of these reliability sub-attributes should be defined.
3. For each of the standard measures in the categories above, what data sources are available now and which may need to be developed via commissioned studies and surveys. If studies are commissioned, how would these studies be administered and funded?
4. For each of the standard measures in the categories above, what test cases/scenarios should be used to validate/demonstrate that the developed standard is producing model results that are appropriate?

Lunch

12:00 – 1:00 pm

Standard Metrics for Electric and Gas Reliability (cont.)

5. Which of the above categories of standardization do you consider to be a reasonable goal for Phase II – Bronze, Silver, or Gold.
6. What are the unique circumstances of each IOU (e.g. regional characteristics; customer class, etc.)? What are the negative consequences if the unique circumstances are not taken into account?
7. What are the general guidelines for how reliability should be incorporated into the RDF?
8. With Value of Reliability, and other Value of Attributes expressed in dollars, what are the benefits and downsides of keeping Attribute Weights and Ranges?

Break

2:00 – 2:15 pm

Standard Metrics for Electric and Gas Reliability (cont.)

9. What are the benefits and disadvantages of expressing risk in dollars versus Scaled Units? If it is decided that risk should be expressed in dollars, how should decision-makers use the dollar figures that come out of the risk assessments?
10. With Value of Reliability, and other Value of Attributes expressed in dollars, what other changes are required in the RDF?
11. The Settlement Agreement allows IOUs to express risk neutrality/tolerance/aversion in the MAVF Scaling Function. Are there any changes required to the MAVF to preserve this feature should the Commission decide that dollars are an appropriate (but perhaps not the only) measure of risk?
12. Other related considerations.

CPUC Close