

# Transmission Planning at the California ISO

Neil Millar

Executive Director, Infrastructure Development

Energy Committee of the Western Regional Partnership Webinar April 23, 2015



#### The California ISO service area:



- 58,698 MW of power plant capacity
- **50,270** MW record peak demand (July 24, 2006)
- 26,500 market transactions per day
- **25,627** circuit-miles of transmission lines
- 30 million people served



## Transmission planning is coordinated with state processes:



#### What are the...

### Demand forecast & resource needs

#### The demand forecast

**(CEC)** projects peak-hour & annual energy demand 20 years forward, adjusted for energy efficiency, rooftop solar and demand response

#### **Resource needs (CPUC)**

reflect RPS mandates, plus system adequacy, local area reliability and flexible capacity needs

### Transmission plan

#### The transmission plan

(ISO) specifies the set of new transmission lines, upgrades to existing lines or non-transmission alternatives needed to support the resource needs and demand forecast

### Procurement plan

The procurement plan (CPUC) tells each IOU what it is authorized to procure to meet the demand forecast and resource needs, given the projects approved in the transmission plan

The procurement plan includes renewable & conventional resources, plus demand response, energy efficiency and distributed resources



The ISO "regional" annual transmission planning process results in approval of necessary projects each March.



transmission plan

Iterative process repeats annually



## The ISO planning process considers all aspects of transmission system needs:





Less than half of the gas-fired generation retiring in the LA Basin / San Diego area is being replaced with new gas generation – despite 3,000 MW of projected net load growth\* and SONGS retirement.



\* The 2012 net load forecast growth in the LA Basin and San Diego already relies on approximately 2400 MW of incremental energy efficiency from approved programs and standards.



#### Transmission underway to meet 33% RPS in 2020



California ISO

|                | Trepensienien un grode   | Approval status                        |   | Opling                                  |
|----------------|--|--|---|---|
|                |  | ISO                                    | CPUC  | Online                                  |
| 1              | Carrizo-Midway   | LGIA                                   | NOC effective   | energized                               |
| 2              | Sunrise Powerlink  | Approved                               | Approved  | energized                               |
|                | Suncrest dynamic reactive  | Approved                               | Not needed  | 2017                                    |
| 3              | Eldorado-Ivanpah   | LGIA                                   | Approved  | energized                               |
| 4              | Valley-Colorado River  | Approved                               | Approved  | energized                               |
| 5              | West of Devers   | LGIA                                   | Pending   | 2019                                    |
| 6              | Tehachapi (segments 1, 2<br>& 3a of 11 completed)  | Approved                               | Approved  | 2015                                    |
| 7              | Cool Water-Lugo  | LGIA                                   | Pending   | <del>2018</del>                         |
| 8              | South Contra Costa   | LGIA                                   | Not yet filed   | 2015                                    |
| 9              | Borden-Gregg   | LGIA                                   | Not yet filed   | 2015                                    |
| 10             | Path 42 reconductoring<br>Imperial Valley C Station  | Approved<br>Approved                   | Not needed<br>Not needed  | 2014<br>2015                            |
| 11             | Sycamore-Penasquitos   | Approved                               | Not yet filed   | 2017                                    |
| 12             | Lugo-Eldorado line reroute   | Approved                               | Not yet filed   | 2015                                    |
| 13             | Lugo-Eldorado and Lugo-<br>Mohave series caps  | Approved                               | Not needed  | 2016                                    |
| 14             | Warnerville-Bellota recond.  | Approved                               | Not yet filed   | 2017                                    |
| 15             | Wilson-Le Grand recond   | Approved<br>Ba                         | Not yet filed<br>ased on 2013/14 Tra                                | 2020<br>ansmission Plan                 |
| 13<br>14<br>15 | Lugo-Eldorado and Lugo-<br>Mohave series caps<br>Warnerville-Bellota recond.<br>Wilson-Le Grand recond | Approved<br>Approved<br>Approved<br>Ba | Not needed<br>Not yet filed<br>Not yet filed<br>ased on 2013/14 Tra | 2016<br>2017<br>2020<br>ansmission Plar |

#### Future Challenge – impact of 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard build-out through 2020







#### New tools and new approaches will be need to address potential over generation and ramping challenges





#### The 2014-2015 planning cycle was challenging:

- Further enhancements to the coordination with state energy agencies
- Continued emphasis on preferred resources, and increased maturity of study processes
- Continued analysis and contingency planning in the LA Basin and San Diego area
- Restoration of deliverability in Imperial area to pre-SONGS retirement levels
- Sensitivity analysis of Imperial area deliverability and the interaction with LA Basin/San Diego reliability needs.
- San Francisco Peninsula extreme event analysis
- "Over Generation" frequency response assessment
- Finalizing projects in the 2013-2014 cycle requiring further study :
  - Delany-Colorado River
  - Harry Allen Eldorado (2013-2014 further study)



#### Summary of Needed Reliability Driven Transmission Projects

| Service Territory                       | Number of Projects | Cost (in millions) |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E)           | 2                  | \$254              |
| Southern California Edison Co.<br>(SCE) | 1                  | \$5                |
| San Diego Gas & Electric Co.<br>(SDG&E) | 4                  | \$93               |
| Valley Electric Association<br>(VEA)    | 0                  | 0                  |
| Total                                   | 7                  | \$352              |



Policy and Economic driven solutions:

- There were no policy-driven solutions identified
- One economically driven element has been identified:
  - Lodi-Eight Mile 230 kV Line
- Note that the Harry Allen-Eldorado and Delaney-Colorado River Projects were approved during 2014 based on further study in the 2013-2014 planning process



Transmission approvals over the last 5 years – over 30 projects a year until 2014-2015:



The CAISO's 2015-2016 transmission planning process is currently underway

- Transmission Planning Process Unified Planning Assumptions and Study Plan was finalized on March 31
- Study plan can be found at:

http://www.caiso.com/Documents/StakeholderInputfor2015-2016UnifiedPlanningAssumptions.htm



#### 2015-2016 Plan challenges

- Monitor LA Basin and San Diego depending on transmission, new conventional generation <u>and</u> preferred resources
- Confirm path for 33% Renewables Portfolio Standard
- Over generation, frequency response, voltage control
- New interregional transmission planning process
- New mandatory planning standards TPL-001-4 in particular!
- Preparatory "informational" work on 50% Renewable Energy Goal for 2030



### Governor Brown's announcement of a 50% renewable energy goal for California:

- The 50% renewable energy goal target date is 2030
- Considerable detail about the goal and how it will be assessed remains to be resolved
- It is not yet a formal state approved policy requirement, so in accordance with the ISO tariff, the ISO cannot use it as a basis for approving policy-driven transmission
- The ISO and the state energy agencies want to explore informational analysis to understand potential transmission implications of increased grid connected renewable generation – to the extent the goal ultimately calls for such generation



The ISO is therefore coordinating with the CPUC to perform a special study in the 2015-2016 TPP:

- The special study will:
  - be for information purposes only will not be used to support a need for policy-driven transmission in the 2015-2016 planning cycle;
  - provide information regarding the potential need for public policydriven transmission additions or upgrades to support a state 50% renewable energy goal; and
  - will help inform the state's procurement processes about the cost impacts of achieving 50% renewable energy goal
- The CPUC raised this study and discussed underlying issues in the recent February 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> RPS Calculator workshop



The Special Study will build on the 33% RPS work, but explore different approaches:

- Purely as a "boundary" study assumption, the ISO anticipates receiving a sensitivity portfolio based on a 50% RPS
- Transmission needs for 33% RPS have been based on providing full capacity deliverability status, which reduced but did not preclude possible curtailment
- In going beyond 33%, the special study will explore a new approach and assume the incremental renewable generation to be energy-only.
  - The study will estimate the expected amount of congestionrelated curtailment of renewables that would likely result.
  - The study will also consider what transmission could then be rationalized based on cost effectively reducing renewables curtailment (from a customer perspective)



## The ISO and our neighbors have an interregional coordination framework approved by FERC:

- Interregional coordination
  - Annual exchange of information
  - Annual public interregional coordination meeting
- Joint evaluation of interregional transmission projects
  - Biennial cycle; projects must be submitted no later than March 31<sup>st</sup> of any even-numbered year
- Interregional cost allocation
  - Each region determines (1) if project meets any regional needs and (2) if project is more cost effective or efficient than regional solution(s)
  - Costs shared in proportion to each region's share of total benefits





The ISO and other Western Planning Regions are currently planning under Order 1000 regional processes

- FERC Regional Orders have been issued for the California ISO and NTTG
- FERC Interregional Orders were issued on December 18, 2014
- Regions submitted compliance filings February 18, 2015
  No comments were filed with FERC
- Regions are currently developing the process details for planning coordination
  - Details will be vetted through an *open stakeholder process* prior to west-wide Order 1000 IR implementation on October 1, 2015



## Interregional Order 1000 Implementation Timeline & Stakeholder Input



\* IO1K = Interregional Order 1000





### Thank you

Neil Millar Executive Director California ISO

