

CAISO proposal for local capacity use-limited resource characteristics CPUC Workshop to Discuss Resource Adequacy Proposals

Delphine Hou Manager, State Regulatory Affairs

February 23, 2018

ISO PUBLIC

Background

- "Slow response" resources are energy-limited resources, such as some demand response resources, that cannot be dispatched within 20 minutes following a contingency event and don't have sufficient availability to be frequently dispatched.
- The CAISO cannot rely on such resources for local capacity requirements given need to timely reposition the system after a contingency event.
- In 2016, the CAISO and CPUC agreed to find a pathway for slow response resources to count towards meeting local capacity requirements.
- As part of that effort, CAISO conducted a transmission planning analysis in collaboration with participating transmission owners (PTOs).

ISO PUBLIC



Page 2

October 2017 transmission planning analysis study assumptions

- At a joint CPUC-CAISO workshop in October 2017, CAISO presented its transmission planning analysis which:
 - Focused on outlining the reliability needs in the local capacity areas and how demand response programs could meet those needs if all technical, regulatory, and market barriers were removed.
 - Assessed the availability requirements for slow response resources to determine (1) annual, monthly and daily event hours; and (2) number of events per month, day and consecutive days.



October 2017 transmission planning analysis study assumptions (cont'd)

- The study assumed:
 - Slow response resources would be dispatched in anticipation of loading conditions that would be problematic if contingencies occurred;
 - 2. No emergency declaration would be required for the CAISO to dispatch pre-contingency the slow response resources;
 - 3. The slow response resources are called last and therefore have the lightest possible duty;
 - 4. An idealized "perfect" forecast and dispatch capabilities; and
 - 5. Demand response capacity values would be constant throughout every hour of the year (not variable).



October 2017 transmission planning analysis methodology

• Step 1 is based on a load comparison while Step 2 is based on detailed engineering analysis:

| Study Sponsor | Areas Studied | Resource Amounts | |
|------------------|---|--|--------|
| SCE | - All LCAs, - All sub-areas | Existing DR (Slow Response) | Ctop 4 |
| PG&E | - All LCAs, | - 2% of study area load | Step 1 |
| SDG&E | - San Diego subarea | - 5% of study area load - 10% of study area load | |
| CAISO | - Voltage stability limited areas in southern California | Existing DR (Slow Response) 5% of study area load | Step 2 |



Impact of treating resources as "light duty" on different load shapes

• Transmission planning analysis found daily duration hours were a limiting factor in some local and sub-areas



Numeric example from October 2017 Presentation

Slow response resource (MW) at different penetration levels compared to forecasted 2017 area peak load

| Area (peak load, MW) | 2% | 2.1% | 3.1% | 5% | 10% |
|------------------------------|-------|------------------|-------------------|-------|---------|
| El Nido (1,659) | 33.2 | 34.3 existing | n/a | 83.0 | 165.9 |
| Western LA Basin (11,501) | 230.0 | n/a | 354.9 existing | 575.1 | 1,150.1 |

Notes: See October 2017 Presentation. Page 17 for area peak load; page 16 for all other information. Step 2 analysis only conducted on existing and 5%.

| Slow response max event duration for forecasted 2017 load (hours) | | | | | |
|---|----|-------------------|-------------------|--------|-----|
| Area | 2% | 2.1% | 3.1% | 5% | 10% |
| El Nido | 6 | 6 (6) Existing | n/a | 7 (10) | 11 |
| Western LA Basin | 3 | n/a | 4 (5) existing | 5 (9) | 9 |

Note: See October 2017 Presentation, page 21. 2017 forecasted hourly load profile derived from 3 years historical load profiles. Step 2 analysis only conducted on existing and 5%. Results for Step 2 are provided in parenthesis.



Transmission planning analysis uncovered two important developments

- As the penetration of slow response resources increase, these resources will be relied upon more often, serving load during more hours and for longer durations; and
- 2. This analysis applies equally to all use-limited resources.



Local vs. system RA

 Based on feedback at joint CPUC-CAISO workshop and in written comments, slow response RDRR cannot be predispatched because of settlement agreement provisions. Therefore:

| System RA | Local RA | |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| Slow response RDRR Other system resources | Fast response RDRR Fast response PDR Slow response PDR* Storage Other use-limited resources Non-use-limited resources | Use-limited resources |
| | *CAISO stakeholder process for "pre-disp | atch" |
| 🤣 California ISO | ISO PUBLIC | Page 9 |
| | | |

Existing use-limited resources in local and sub-areas

| | [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Area | Existing slow response (MW) | Existing fast DR (MW) | Procured DR & Storage* (MW) | Total DR & Storage (MW) |
| El Nido | 34 | 8 | 17 | 60 |
| Western LA Basin | 355 | 113 | 271 | 739 |

Notes: See October 2017 Presentation. Page 22. *Excludes hybrid gas/battery storage projects.

[1] This amount will be reduced by slow response RDRR capacity.

- [2] Can count as local capacity.
- [3] Procured DR amount will be reduced by slow response RDRR capacity.
- [4] New total will be used to calculate the peak load penetration level.



ISO PUBLIC

Page 10

CAISO has a 2020 and beyond 2020 proposal, starting with Track 1 approval for RA year 2020 changes

- In Track 1 CAISO proposes CPUC adopt CAISO's methodology.
 - CAISO to conduct analysis in 2019 for 2020 RA year to identify the maximum level of use-limited capacity in each local capacity area and sub-area based on the CPUC's existing four-hour minimum duration.
 - Adopting in Track 1 for 2020 allows for adequate opportunity to conduct appropriate procurement of needed technical and operational characteristics and CAISO market rule changes.



Track 1 proposed timing and activity establishing maximum use-limited local capacity in local areas

• Compare

| Time | Activity |
|----------------|--|
| Q2 2018 | CPUC adopts CAISO methodology for establishing maximum use-limited capacity in local capacity areas |
| Q4 2018 | CAISO works with PTOs to set up the analysisand compile necessary data |
| Q1 2019 | Single forecast set is adopted by the CEC Unified Inputs & Assumptions document is transmitted to CAISO CAISO performs analysis and conducts stakeholder process |
| Q2 2019 | CAISO submits analysis into the CPUC's resource adequacy proceeding with the Local Capacity Technical Study for the 2020 compliance year |
| California ISO | ISO PUBLIC Page 12 |

Beyond 2020, CAISO to refine analysis to provide more flexibility

- 1. In Track 2 CAISO proposes CPUC develop a framework to accommodate an increasing amount of use-limited resources being used to meet local capacity requirements.
 - Each local area has unique needs based on load profiles, the amount of use-limited resources in the area, and the operational characteristics of existing resources.
 - CAISO will continue to refine its transmission planning analysis to help the CPUC balance policy implications of increased penetration and complexity of the RA program.
 - CAISO analysis will provide an early indication of changing local reliability conditions.



THANK YOU

Stay connected



@California_ISO



Download ISO Today mobile app



Sign up for the Daily Briefing at www.caiso.com



ISO PUBLIC

Page 14