Pursuant to Rule 213 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213 (2010), the California Independent System Operator Corporation (ISO) hereby files an answer to comments submitted by California Department of Water Resources, State Water Project (SWP) in response to the ISO’s Motion for Extension of Time to Implement Disaggregation of Default Load Aggregation Points (LAPs) filed on February 16, 2011 (Motion) in the above-captioned docket. No intervener, including SWP, opposes the ISO’s Motion and all support the extension of time requested by the ISO.\footnote{A number of parties also filed interventions and comments in support of the ISO’s motion: Alliance for Retail Energy Markets; The Bay Area Municipal Transmission Group; Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; Pacific Gas and Electric Company; Northern California Power Agency; Southern California Edison; and Pacific Gas and Electric Company.} As explained below, the Commission should grant the ISO’s Motion, without further conditions.

I. BACKGROUND

Since April 1, 2009, the ISO has been operating under its new locational marginal price (LMP)-based markets. The ISO commenced operations under it’s new market design clearing demand at three major default LAPs as approved by
the Commission in its September 21, 2006 Order in the above captioned proceeding.\textsuperscript{2} The Commission’s acceptance of this initial design was conditional on the ISO’s development of more disaggregated demand settlement three years after the start of its new market design.\textsuperscript{3} On February 16, 2011, the ISO submitted a motion for an extension of time to further disaggregate the LAPs. Based on its preliminary analysis of locational pricing trends during the first 16 months of its new market design and in anticipation of significant market enhancements likely to further alter these trends, the ISO concluded that insufficient data exists to support redefining the default LAPs at a more granular level at this time. Further, the ISO’s recent stakeholder process has revealed a near consensus opposing implementation of more granular LAPs in 2012, and that this opposition rests, in part, on the value of forging greater alignment between ongoing retail rate and wholesale market design. As such, the ISO requested an extension of time, which will provide the ISO and stakeholders additional time to incorporate the potential changes to pricing patterns anticipated from pending ISO market enhancements into more refined technical studies and, ultimately, a proposal for more granular demand clearing and settlement in the ISO markets. The ISO requested that the Commission grant its motion for an extension of time to the last quarter of 2014 for the ISO to implement greater LAP disaggregation.


\textsuperscript{3} The new ISO market went into effect on the April 1, 2009, trading day. The Commission’s prior orders approving the ISO’s market design called for the implementation of LAP disaggregation by three years after the start of the ISO’s new market design, which would be April 1, 2012.
II. ANSWER

A number of parties submitted comments in support of the ISO’s motion and no party objected to the ISO’s motion.\textsuperscript{4} SWP also did not object to the motion, but requests that the Commission ensure that the ISO and the Commission continue to resolve a number of issues in the interim.\textsuperscript{5} SWP recognizes the need for further assessment of default LAP disaggregation but also cautions that it is important to avoid delay beyond that proposed in the ISO’s Motion and notes its expectation that the ISO and the Commission continue to address problems that would have been solved through greater load granularity.

The ISO submits that SWP’s comments should not be read to suggest that the Commission should condition any extension of time on the ISO and Commission’s resolution of the issues listed by SWP before it moves to more disaggregate LAPs. While SWP requests that the ISO and the Commission continue to address their issues, SWP appropriately does not state an extension should be conditioned on resolution of the stated issues. First, SWP has not established that its issues are all caused by the current LAP definitions. Secondly, it is not clear how the ISO would engage in any process to address the totality of SWP’s issues in the intervening time given that, under the ISO’s stakeholder plan, the ISO and stakeholders will, before long, be focusing their efforts towards further disaggregation of the LAPs. Therefore, the Commission should grant the extension

\textsuperscript{4} See fn 1.

\textsuperscript{5} SWP states that the Commission and the ISO should continue to focus on solving the following problems: optimize use of market resources to improve reliability; reduce the existing financial burden to market participants due to lack of granular prices; revise the Proxy Demand Response (PDR) program; encourage price-responsive demand; devise additional means of localized demand response and market mitigation.
and allow the ISO and stakeholders additional time to develop an appropriate proposal to address whatever market issues that may exist as a result of the current degree of aggregation.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons provided herein, the Commission should grant the ISO’s motion for an extension of time without further conditions.
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