

Comments Received During the CTPG Stakeholder Meeting on December 17, 2009

Name	Company Representing	Comment	CTPG Response
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Website: Are all members listed? Are any missing? Was the Aug. 11th SH meeting noticed?	Yes, the CTPG membership shown in the CTPG.us is the full list of membership. Yes, the August 11, 2009 CTPG First Stakeholder Meeting was noticed through the RETI and the WECC TEPPCC mail serve lists and the CAISO Market Note.
Armie Perez	Zglobal	What is the CTPG website address?	www.ctpg.us
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Study Scope: How does CTPG reconcile transmission needs (MW) with RPS energy (GWh)? Thinks we should do a 8760 scenario and needs to include all the transmission needed. How is CTPG addressing off-peak and operational needs? Concerned that only peak cases are included in study plan.	The identification of grid needs starts with snapshot analysis of grid performance under system conditions which, based on experience, can result in reliability criteria violations. Contingencies occurring during peak load periods is one such condition and the condition studied in the A, B and C cases. The CTPG recognizes that other system conditions need to be studied and some of these are already in progress (e.g., light load conditions). The initial phase of the CTPG's analysis is focusing on transmission upgrade alternatives, remedial action schemes and generation redispatch options that address the identified reliability criteria violations. Future phases of the CTPG's work may consider other alternatives and are expected to initiate the detailed economic evaluations needed to demonstrate which of the identified alternatives are best for consumers. These economic evaluations will, in some way, account for the life-cycle economic impact of the alternatives. This may involve hourly grid simulation studies to capture the full range of performance across expected system conditions. For the initial phase of the CTPG's work, the on- and off-peak studies discussed at the December 17, 2009 stakeholder conference call will help frame the needs of the system with increased renewable resource development.
Dariush Shirmohammadi	California Wind Energy Association	Study Methodology and Inputs: Issue that the renewable generation is picked by the utility. May end up with transmission that is not needed. Thinks we should have multiple scenarios and allow RETI to come forward to develop the scenarios, to make sure the transmission plan developed wont have stranded assets, etc. Then thinks we should select the common elements. Thinks only a few scenarios is making our life easier and is not sufficient enough. Thinks it will come out as being a theoretical report and believes we need more of a concrete plan. There is a flaw with the proposed approach by the LSE's. Suggest that RETI produce resource scenarios for CTPG. This would assure that stranded assets are not developed while needed lines are not built. Biggest concern is that the "single scenario" methodology is based on utility not developer's plans. Suggests utilization of RETI scenarios with a element selection based on commonality.	Maximizing the use of the existing grid should be a starting point for any evaluation of new transmission needed to meet California's 33% RPS goal. This will reduce the risk that additional transfer capability provided by new transmission will turn out to be unneeded (i.e., "stranded"). Case C was designed to test the capability of the existing grid (plus certain planned transmission upgrades) to accommodate increased levels of renewable resource development and additional sensitivities around Case C are planned. CTPG agrees that an analysis of different "scenarios" -- beyond those already in progress -- would be useful in examining the range of potential transmission necessary to satisfy California's various environmental objectives (33% RPS, greenhouse gas emission reduction, elimination of coastal fossil-fired once-through cooling units). However, CTPG does not agree that the renewable resource allocation selected is flawed. CTPG believes "developers' plans" are best captured through Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs) with load serving entities and through new generator interconnection requests for which developers have made material financial commitments. This is the renewable resource development basis for the initial phase of the CTPG studies. Finally, while "scenarios" are useful for defining a range of system conditions, it is also necessary to have an understanding of the likelihood that those scenarios will actually come to pass. Less weight should be given to the transmission upgrades identified in scenarios with a low probability of occurrence, more weight to the transmission upgrades identified in those scenarios that are more probable.
Anne Gillette	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	Study Methodology and Inputs: Interested in the assumptions. The assumptions are very important now because we want transmission plans to be approved, if they come out of CTPG, it is critical we understand and there is sufficient stakeholder input of the renewable assumptions. What generation technology are you assuming and how many mw for each? SH involvement is critical to success. SH must have an opportunity to vet beforehand and align with CPUC plans.	CTPG agrees that stakeholder support is important in developing a constructive environment for review and consideration of proposed transmission additions by applicable approval authorities, and understands the importance of obtaining stakeholder input on key assumptions upon which proposed transmission additions are identified. To the extent practicable, CTPG will post those assumptions on its website. We also request that stakeholders provide comments on CTPG's assumptions. CTPG also believes it is important to begin detailing transmission plans that will provide near-term grid access for those renewable generation projects that are closest to development. These plans could involve new substations within or near CREZs with substantial development activity that can be looped-into existing transmission lines, and utility-financed radial "trunk lines" that connect areas with substational development activity to existing or new substations.

Comments Received During the CTPG Stakeholder Meeting on December 17, 2009

Name	Company Representing	Comment	CTPG Response
Barry Flynn	Flynn, RCI	Study Methodology and Inputs: Under the criteria, are you assuming controlled loss of generation as long as you don't have to drop load? Appreciate the work that CTPG has done to move the state study effort forward. A step forward from the previous shift factor analysis. Definitely support additional resource scenarios. Recommend the development of "normal basecases" with stakeholder input. Need to provide basecases to stakeholders to accomplish this. Also, does the CTPG study methodology include the dropping of generation as long as load is not dropped?	It is true that we are assuming that controlled loss of generation as long as you don't have to drop load meets WECC criteria. As we move forward, we are considering making the CTPG power flow cases available to those stakeholders holding appropriate non-disclosure agreements with the WECC. Also, regarding "resource scenarios," see CTPG's response to comments made by the California Wind Energy Association.
Robert Jenkins	First Solar	Study Methodology and Inputs: Slide 15 and 16 – expect numbers in CTPG column will be less but in some they are greater than in RETI, what is the process that was developed these higher numbers? Appreciate the CTPG/RETI resource comparison chart. Noticed that some CREZ totals in the CTPG resource group are significantly larger than those evaluated by RETI. The RETI resources identified environmental factors the might limit development in these areas. Slides 15 -16 shows comparison of RETI and CTPG - Some areas show more dispatch from CTPG than RETI. What was the thought process?	RETI assumed capacity is heavily discounted because of uncertainty. CTPG assumed capacity is based on actual development and procurement contract. CTPG, however, will continue to review this and will provide some specific explanation in the draft and final reports.
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Study Methodology and Inputs: Important on slide 15 and 16 that if you want this to be credible you explain why these numbers were different than the RETI numbers, when the RETI numbers have had stakeholder review and input? RETI was an open process. CTPG may lose credibility if it does not follow RETI or at least demonstrate how we got here.	Same response as above.
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Study Methodology and Inputs: Can you give some explanation as to how you did the split between North and South? It is important to vet the resources better. Is CTPG going to produce a north versus south split methodology?	The split of renewable resources between northern and southern California was dictated by the renewable procurement plans submitted by Load Serving Entities in the CTPG.
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Study Methodology and Inputs: How open are you with stakeholder input on this? Seems like this is already determined, will you change your assumptions based on the stakeholder comments you receive?	CTPG remains open to stakeholder input. This is the 2nd stakeholder meeting that CTPG has conducted. The current study plan for this first phase of studies was shaped by the key discussion of the 1st stakeholder meeting in August 09. Stakeholder input to the study process going forward, is welcome and encouraged as further study phases are developed.

Comments Received During the CTPG Stakeholder Meeting on December 17, 2009

Name	Company Representing	Comment	CTPG Response
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Methodology: Why did you choose the 70/30 split? Is it historical? Why did we put backdown PV rooftop? Doesn't understand why this would be included? What is the basis for the 70/30 split for in-state and out-of-state resources?	The 70/30 split for in-state versus out-of-state fossil-fired generation decrements was judged by the 2009 CTPG Study Team to be a reasonable scenario as to how the effects of significant renewable resource additions over the next ten years will affect fossil-fired generation levels throughout the WECC during on-peak periods. CTPG requests that stakeholders submit suggestions as to what other scenarios could be considered in the studies. Note also that the grid simulations discussed in CTPG's response to the comments of the Phoenix Consulting Group -- which are driven by the variable operating costs of each generator in the WECC -- would be useful in evaluating how increases in renewable generation will affect the output of fossil-fired generation throughout the WECC.
Dariush Shirmohammadi	California Wind Energy Association	Methodology: A lot of effort is going in to the numbers, losing the big picture and focusing too much on the detail. As far as distributed generations, do you have any assumption on the weekend? Concerned with the level of detail in this study plan. Believe that more effort on bigger picture items should be addressed over increased study detail. In regards to Distributed Generation is the off peak load for these units accounted for in the study cases?	Since the emphasis was on peak cases, weekend scenarios for Distributed Generation was not considered in the studies. This will be the focus in future studies.
Dariush Shirmohammadi	California Wind Energy Association	Next Steps: Submitted comments in the 33% effort, lots of technical comments, should we resubmit them to CTPG or do you have a process that will take the 33% comments into consideration?	All comments must be submitted to the CTPG separately. Please submit comments through the CTPG website.
Susan Schneider	Phoenix Consulting Group	Next Steps: Process question, are we issuing a final study plan with revisions based on stakeholder input? Is CTPG planning to issue a revised study plan with study comments? Will there be an opportunity for comments after this and other stakeholder meetings? Like to suggest a comment period after stakeholder meetings.	The CTPG will review all comments received and, to the extent useful and practical considering the time frame for issuing study results, incorporate those comments into the final study report. CTPG is extending the comment period after the January 20, 2010 Stakeholder meeting but encourages stakeholders to submit comments as soon as possible.
Robert Jenkins	First Solar	Next Steps: Wants to be on the CTPG distribution list. Is CTPG going to prepare a separate stakeholder mailing list?	Please go to the CTPG.us website and register to receive CTPG announcements. CTPG will post study reports and documents on the CTPG.us.
Barry Flynn	Flynn, RCI	Next Steps: He asked if the results are posted? When will the study results be available?	A report of study results is expected to be available on January 5, 2010.