



## **CAISO Grid Planning Standards**

**September 17, 2007**

### **Stakeholder Comments**

1. Perhaps the criteria for LCR Should be incorporated in the planning standards
2. LCR should not be used as a planning standard.
3. Are CAISO planning standards too strict (I-1, G-1); driving transmission upgrades that may not be needed?
4. There is a problem with the timing of LCR studies. There is not enough time to develop plans to mitigate through transmission or operating solutions instead of procuring generation.
5. There appears to be confusion about LCR and planning studies.
6. There should be a methodology developed for determining the number of generators to be off for areas with special conditions. It should not just apply to the Bay area.
7. Does the CAISO consider projects developed for LCR reduction to be economic or reliability projects? (Catlin – could be both or either depending on the project and the problems it solves.)
8. LCR should be viewed as generation versus transmission.
9. The current planning standards do not address clearance issues or Off Peak conditions. This creates problems in obtaining clearances to work on the transmission system.
10. Is the CAISO working with or planning to work with WECC to develop a regional planning standard?
11. We are not doing integrated planning. We should be looking at more scenarios. Also we don't plan to reduce losses and we ignore the distribution systems.
12. How are we using historical data in planning? Are we using the correct resources?

13. Doesn't the CAISO have additional guidelines on the application of SPS that address the size of the over load? (Action Item – Karen Grosse to check for guidelines)
14. There is a need to separate or clearly identify what are “guidelines” versus what are “standards”. Need to be careful about limiting the usage of SPS which can be useful tools.
15. An SPS to trip generation rather than create an overload does not affect a unit's deliverability.
16. Building generation without SPS increases costs to ratepayers unnecessarily.
17. Should new wind be interruptible to address light load conditions? There have been times when there was almost more generation than load when wind came up suddenly during off peak conditions. Should this be addressed in the planning standards?
18. Who is supposed to be monitoring voltages during off peak?
19. Have SF voltage studies been done? (Answer is yes and they are updated as needed.)
20. Load modeling assumptions – should there be some language about what the load modeling mix should be for different parts of California?
21. We should look at definitions for types of outages & unavailability.
22. Should new analysis be completed looking at simplifying or eliminating the GBA Generator Outage Standard?
23. We should look criteria for what generation should be included in generation interconnection studies. We have wind plants at full output which can cause overloads in base cases that would never occur in the real world. Should be different assumptions for base load and peaking studies.
24. Action Item – Comments due in 2 week – October 1, 2007.
25. Meeting adjourned.