

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

Rulemaking 19-11-009
(Filed November 7, 2019)

**OPENING COMMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA EFFICIENCY + DEMAND
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING
REQUESTING COMMENTS ON REFRESHED EFFECTIVE LOAD CARRYING
CAPABILITY STUDY**

Dated: July 19, 2021

Greg Wikler
Executive Director
California Efficiency + Demand
Management Council
1111 Broadway, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: 925-286-1710
E-mail: policy@cedmc.org

Luke Tougas
Consultant for
California Efficiency + Demand
Management Council
1111 Broadway, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: 510-326-1931
E-mail:
l.tougas@cleanenergyresearch.com

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

Rulemaking 19-11-009
(Filed November 7, 2019)

**OPENING COMMENTS OF THE CALIFORNIA EFFICIENCY + DEMAND
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING
REQUESTING COMMENTS ON REFRESHED EFFECTIVE LOAD CARRYING
CAPABILITY STUDY**

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Efficiency + Demand Management Council¹ (“the Council”) respectfully submits these Opening Comments on the Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Requesting Comments on Refreshed Effective Load Carrying Capability Study, submitted in this resource adequacy (“RA”) proceeding on July 9, 2021 (“ALJ Ruling”). These Opening Comments are timely filed and served pursuant to the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and the instructions contained in the ALJ Ruling.

On July 1, 2021, the California Independent System Operator (“CAISO”), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”), Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (“SDG&E”) submitted a Joint Compliance Filing on Refreshed Effective Load Carrying Capability (“ELCC”) Study Results (“ELCC Study Results”). On July 9, 2021, ALJ Chiv issued the ALJ Ruling Requesting Comments on the Refreshed ELCC Study Results.

II. OPENING COMMENTS OF THE COUNCIL

The Council refrains from providing opening comments on the merits of the analysis other than to say that this silence should not be interpreted as support for the ELCC Study Results or for a demand response (“DR”) ELCC Qualifying Capacity (“QC”) methodology in general. The Council has made clear that it is open to an ELCC-based methodology, but it should be considered equally alongside other options and not pushed through the approval process without proper vetting. Decision (“D.”) 21-06-029 states that “there is insufficient basis

¹ The views expressed by the California Efficiency + Demand Management Council are not necessarily those of its individual members.

to adopt the ELCC methodology or [CAISO] proposed ELCC study with refreshed results”, so regardless of how the Commission treats the ELCC Study Results for the IOUs’ 2022 DR programs, it should not be precedential in any way either in the California Energy Commission-led process to develop a DR QC methodology or in any other context in a Commission proceeding.²

The Council continues to have concerns regarding the transparency of the ELCC Study Results and the associated comments process. Despite the CAISO’s June 24 workshop at which E3 presented the refreshed study results, it remains unclear exactly how the analysis is meant to be applied. As the Council stated in its comments following the workshop, the CAISO has made it clear that it is up to the Energy Division to decide how to use the ELCC Study Results.³ Furthermore, E3’s RECAP model, which was used to perform the study, is not available to the public. Consequently, the only basis that parties (and apparently the Commission) have to assess the ELCC Study Results are the materials provided by the CAISO which leave many critical questions unanswered. For instance, will an ELCC factor be applied at the state-, investor-owned utility- (“IOU-“), or program-level? Also, how can IOUs and DR providers test the sensitivity of the analysis to determine the optimal program design to achieve the highest ELCC factor? The process for incorporating the ELCC Study Results into the IOUs’ 2022 DR QC values is missing a step because parties should know in advance of providing comments exactly how the ELCC Study Results will be applied. Otherwise, parties are left to simply comment based on their own interpretation of how they could be applied.

The Council would also like to note that the CAISO did not comply with the process set forth in the June 3 Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling on Submission of Refreshed Effective Load Carrying Capability Study Results (“June 3 ACR”). In it, the Commission directed that parties would have “a minimum of 10 days’ notice to provide written comments to CAISO and the IOUs on the study results.”⁴ Instead, the CAISO required stakeholders to submit comments on June 28, providing only four calendar days (two business days) rather than the required ten days. The Council understands the CAISO was striving to meet the Ruling’s July 1 deadline but stakeholders’ opportunity to provide feedback should not have been compromised.

² D.21-06-029, at p. 37.

³ ELCC Study Results, Attachment D.

⁴ June 3 ACR, at p. 3.

III. CONCLUSION

The Council thanks the Commission for this opportunity to provide feedback on the ELCC Study Results.

Respectfully submitted

July 19, 2021

/s/ GREG WIKLER

Greg Wikler
California Efficiency + Demand
Management Council
1111 Broadway, Suite 300
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: 925-286-1710
E-mail: policy@cedmc.org