

Application No.: 16-10-012  
Exhibit No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Witness: Nebiyu Yimer  
ALJ: MacDonald  
Commissioner: Randolph

In the Matter of the Application of DCR  
TRANSMISSION, LLC for a Certificate of  
Public Convenience and Necessity for the  
Ten West Link Project

Application 16-10-012

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION**

June 18, 2020

## **Table of Contents**

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	The Caiso’s Benefits Analysis is Both Reasonable and Conservative. ....	3
III.	Cal Advocates’ Alternative Benefits Analysis is Flawed. ....	22
IV.	Cal Advocates Incorrectly Discounts the Proposed Project’s Reliability Benefits. ....	27
V.	Conclusion .....	31

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q1. Have you previously provided testimony in this proceeding?**

3 **A1.** Yes, on December 20, 2019, I provided opening testimony supporting the need for  
4 Delaney-Colorado River Transmission, LLC's (DCRT's) Ten West Link 500 kV  
5 transmission project (Proposed Project). My educational and professional background  
6 and job responsibilities are detailed in my opening testimony.

7 **Q2. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

8 **A2.** The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to certain assertions made by the  
9 California Public Advocates Office (Cal Advocates) in its opening testimony.  
10 Specifically, I address the following issues:

11 (1) The reasonableness of the CAISO's assumptions in assessing the Proposed Project's  
12 economic benefits;

13 (2) The validity of Cal Advocates' assumptions in assessing the Proposed Project's  
14 economic benefits as an alternative to the CAISO's analyses; and

15 (3) The reliability benefits associated with the Proposed Project.

16 **Q3: Please summarize your testimony.**

17 **A3:** My rebuttal testimony describes the basis for the CAISO's benefits analysis in this  
18 proceeding. Specifically, I provide details regarding how the CAISO developed the  
19 underlying resource portfolio for its production cost modeling and capacity benefits  
20 analyses. Importantly, the CAISO developed the resource portfolio based on the most  
21 up-to-date version of Commission's existing resource optimization tool (RESOLVE) that  
22 was available at the time the CAISO filed its opening testimony. The resource portfolio  
23 that the CAISO used for its benefits analysis is consistent with the 2017-2018 Preferred  
24 System Portfolio, with corrections the CAISO made to enable Arizona solar resources  
25 inside the CAISO balancing authority area. The 2017-2018 Preferred System Portfolio  
26 remains the base case for reliability and policy-driven analysis in the CAISO's  
27 transmission planning process per the Commission's recent Decision 20-03-028, as Mr.  
28 Millar's concurrently filed testimony details.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 I also explain the CAISO’s expectation that the Commission’s 2019-2020 Reference  
2 System Portfolio, which is only a sensitivity portfolio for the purposes of the 2020-2021  
3 TPP, would not materially change the economic value of the capacity benefits  
4 attributable to the Proposed Project.

5 My testimony also explains how the CAISO assessed the Proposed Project’s capacity  
6 benefits. I show that the capacity value attributed to Arizona solar resources is  
7 conservative, given the Commission’s instructions to load serving entities. I show that  
8 the CAISO used reasonable energy storage capacity costs to calculate the avoided costs  
9 of battery storage. In addition, I provide an alternative capacity benefit calculation based  
10 on a lower battery storage cost. Dr. Zhang’s testimony uses this alternative capacity  
11 benefit calculation show that the Proposed Project maintains a positive benefit-to-cost  
12 ratio even with the lower batter storage costs.

13 I also assess Cal Advocates’ alternative to the CAISO’s benefit analysis. I show that Cal  
14 Advocates’ resource portfolio is arbitrary, and costly compared to the CAISO’s  
15 RESOLVE-optimized portfolio. I also demonstrate that Cal Advocates’ resource  
16 portfolio is consistent with neither the Commission’s RESOLVE resource optimization  
17 not any portfolios developed in the Commission’s IRP. In addition, I show that Cal  
18 Advocates renewable resource allocations are both internally inconsistent and  
19 inconsistent with California Energy Commission mapping efforts. In summary, Cal  
20 Advocates alternative resource portfolio and its assumptions are invalid for transmission  
21 planning purposes.

22 Lastly, I provide details regarding the significant reliability benefits that the Proposed  
23 Project provides. Specifically, the Proposed Project mitigates the Path 46  
24 Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit, which, if violated, could lead to widespread  
25 instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading outages that adversely impact the  
26 reliability of the Bulk Electric System in certain contingency conditions.

27

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 **II. THE CAISO’S BENEFITS ANALYSIS IS BOTH REASONABLE AND**  
2 **CONSERVATIVE.**

3 **Q4: Please explain how the CAISO developed the resource portfolio it used for assessing**  
4 **the Proposed Project’s economic benefits.**

5 **A4:** The CAISO used the latest version of the Commission’s integrated resource planning  
6 (IRP) resource optimization model, *i.e.*, RESOLVE, to determine the amount of Arizona  
7 solar inside the CAISO balancing authority area (Arizona Solar) that can be economically  
8 selected to achieve emissions and resource adequacy targets. This involved enabling  
9 Arizona Solar as a candidate resource because it was incorrectly disabled in the model.  
10 The CAISO also removed the transmission cost adder for delivery to the California  
11 boarder associated with the Arizona Solar resource, which is inapplicable because the  
12 resource is inside the CAISO balancing authority area.<sup>1</sup>

13 The correction in RESOLVE resulted in more than 3,000 MW of Arizona Solar being  
14 selected, causing a reduction of \$977 million in present value of the portfolio cost in 2016  
15 dollars. In the case modeled with the Proposed Project, the CAISO allocated the  
16 economically-selected Arizona Solar to the Delaney, Hassayampa, and Hoodoo Wash  
17 substations based on commercial interest (*i.e.*, consistent with the distribution of  
18 proposed generation at those substations in the CAISO’s interconnection queue). In the  
19 case modeled without the Proposed Project, the Delaney substation share of Arizona  
20 Solar was allocated to the Hassayampa and Hoodoo Wash substations based on  
21 commercial interest. This is necessary because Delaney substation will be outside the  
22 CAISO balancing area authority without the Proposed Project. The CAISO used the  
23 resulting RESOLVE portfolio to assess the Proposed Project’s economic benefits.

24 **Q5. Please respond to Cal Advocates’ assertion that the CAISO’s economic benefit**  
25 **analysis are outdated and would likely yield dramatically different results if the**  
26 **CAISO used the Commission’s 2019-2020 Reference System Portfolio, which was**  
27 **issued after the CAISO filed its opening testimony.**

---

<sup>1</sup> The CPUC made the same corrections to the RESOLVE model used in the 2019-2020 IRP.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 **A5.** First, as explained in Mr. Millar’s testimony, the 2017-2018 Preferred System Portfolio  
2 (2017-2018 PSP) remains the base case for reliability and policy-driven analysis. In  
3 Decision 20-03-028, the Commission requested that the CAISO use the 2017-2018 PSP  
4 as the reliability and policy-driven base case for the purposes of the CAISO 2020-2021  
5 transmission planning process (TPP). In that same decision, the Commission requested  
6 that the CAISO use the 2019-2020 Reference System Plan (2019-2020 RSP) only as a  
7 policy-driven sensitivity in the CAISO 2020-21 TPP.<sup>2</sup> This means the transmission  
8 planning analysis presented in the CAISO’s opening testimony, which is based on the  
9 2017-2018 PSP, with corrections to include economically-selected Arizona Solar as  
10 described above, is still current, and Cal Advocates’ claim that it is outdated has no merit.

11 Second, the CAISO notes that the 2019-2020 RSP itself would not be the same without  
12 the Proposed Project because the resource optimization uses transmission capacity  
13 estimates provided by the CAISO that were developed assuming the Proposed Project is  
14 in service. The CAISO models all CAISO-approved transmission projects in the studies it  
15 performs to develop its transmission capacity estimates. In calculating transmission  
16 capacity estimates provided for the Southern CA Desert & Southern NV transmission  
17 zone and sub-zones, CAISO assumed that the Proposed Project would be in service. The  
18 optimized resource buildout in the 2019-2020 RSP fully utilized this available FCDS  
19 transmission capability estimate for the Southern CA Desert & Southern NV transmission  
20 zone. Because transmission capacity estimates limit the amount of the economic FCDS  
21 and energy only resources that RESOLVE can select, the resulting RSP would likely  
22 have been significantly different and would have had higher overall resource costs had  
23 the transmission capacity estimates not included CAISO-approved projects that increase  
24 transmission capacity, including the Proposed Project.

25 Third, in opening testimony, the CAISO demonstrated the Proposed Project’s economic  
26 benefits based on (1) capacity benefits arising from the increased amount of out-of-state

---

<sup>2</sup> *Decision 20-03-028, 2019-2020 Electric Resource Portfolios to Inform Integrated Resource Plans and Transmission Planning*, R.16-02-007, March 26, 2020, Ordering Paragraph No. 14, p. 108.  
<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M331/K772/331772681.PDF>

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 resources in the Southwest that the Proposed Project enables to count for resource  
2 adequacy and (2) production cost benefits that arise from the Proposed Project’s ability to  
3 reduce the CAISO net ratepayer payments. The CAISO’s deliverability assessment  
4 indicated that much of the capacity benefits of the Proposed Project arise from its ability  
5 to divert flows from the congested Sunrise/SWPL corridor. The production simulation  
6 results also demonstrated that the Proposed Project helps to mitigate congestion on  
7 Sunrise/SWPL corridor and the downstream system inside San Diego area.<sup>3</sup> Neither the  
8 CAISO nor Cal Advocates have performed studies using the 2019-2020 RSP, which is  
9 only a sensitivity case in the CAISO 2020-2021 TPP and only became available in March  
10 of 2020, after the CAISO filed opening testimony. In any event, the CAISO does not  
11 expect that using the 2019-2020 RSP portfolio is likely to yield dramatically different  
12 results in either the capacity or production benefits—as claimed by Cal Advocates—for  
13 the reasons explained in detail below.

14 **Q6. Please provide the CAISO’s assessment of the impact of the 2019-2020 RSP on the**  
15 **Proposed Project’s benefits.**

16 **A6.** The CAISO’s analysis included 3,364 MW of Arizona Solar resources based on the  
17 RESOLVE-optimized portfolio. In opening testimony, the CAISO demonstrated that the  
18 Proposed Project would increase the resource adequacy-eligible quantity of these Arizona  
19 Solar resources by 969 MW—from 1,180 MW to 2,149 MW. The CAISO determined  
20 capacity benefits of the Proposed Project based on this increase in resource-adequacy  
21 eligible Arizona Solar resources.

22 The 2019-2020 RSP<sup>4</sup> includes 1,196 MW of economically-selected FCDS (*i.e.*, resource  
23 adequacy eligible) Arizona Solar resources in the SCADSNV-Riverside\_Palm\_Springs  
24 Transmission Sub-zone, and a total of 2,658 MW of FCDS solar and wind resources in  
25 the greater Southern CA Desert & Southern NV Transmission Zone. Because the  
26 transmission capacity estimates used in RESOLVE were developed assuming the

---

<sup>3</sup> *Testimony of Yi Zhang on Behalf of the California Independent System Operator Corporation*, A.16-10-012, December 20, 2019, Figure 1, p. 5. (CAISO – Zhang Opening Testimony)

<sup>4</sup> <https://caenergy.databasin.org/documents/documents/b90faf47be4045a398171a5cfac51b87/>

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Proposed Project is in place, as noted in Q&A 5, the amount of economically selected  
2 FCDS capacity in Southern CA Desert & Southern NV Transmission Zone in the 2019  
3 RSP would likely decrease by 969 MW without the Proposed Project. This means that  
4 additional, more expensive capacity resources—such as battery storage or less economic  
5 renewables—would be needed to meet the resource adequacy target without the Proposed  
6 Project. For this reason, the CAISO would not expect the new RSP to materially change  
7 the Proposed Project’s capacity benefits (in MW).

8 In opening testimony, the CAISO used two alternative methodologies to calculate the  
9 economic value of the Proposed Project’s capacity benefits. These two methods of  
10 calculating the capacity benefits were based on (1) the avoided cost of battery storage and  
11 (2) the locational renewables cost savings from RESOLVE. Because the later method  
12 involves running RESOLVE to produce a new resource portfolio with and without  
13 Arizona Solar enabled, the CAISO focuses on the former method to assess the impact of  
14 the 2019-2020 RSP on the economic value of the Proposed Project’s capacity benefits.

15 Using the avoided cost of storage methodology, the economic value of the Proposed  
16 Project’s capacity benefit depends on (1) the applicable effective load carrying capability  
17 (ELCC) of solar resources and (2) the cost of storage. As explained in detail in Q&A 10  
18 of this testimony, the CAISO believes the ELCC values used in its opening testimony are  
19 conservative. The battery storage cost the CAISO used in its benefit analysis is also  
20 reasonable and not outdated as discussed in detail in the same Q&A 10. Based on these  
21 considerations, the CAISO would not expect the economic value of the capacity benefits  
22 attributable to the Proposed Project to materially change with the 2019-2020 RSP  
23 portfolio.

24 Dr. Zhang’s rebuttal testimony, filed concurrently with this testimony, provides the  
25 CAISO’s assessment of the impact of the new RSP on the Proposed Project’s production  
26 cost benefits.

27 **Q7. Do you agree with Cal Advocates’ assertion that the difference between Arizona and**  
28 **California solar costs has narrowed significantly since the 2017-2018 RSP and that**



**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1           **the outdated assumption used in the CAISO’s analysis overstates the Proposed**  
2           **Project’s benefits significantly?**

3    **A7.**    No, I do not agree with the Cal Advocates’ assertions. Cal Advocates’ opening testimony  
4           incorrectly compares Arizona versus California solar resource costs.<sup>5</sup> Specifically, Cal  
5           Advocates testimony compares costs of Riverside East - Palm Springs *wind* resources  
6           with the cost of *solar* resources in Arizona. This is an incorrect, apples-to-oranges  
7           comparison that causes Cal Advocates’ to significantly overstate the differences between  
8           the CAISO’s solar resource cost assumptions, drawn from the 2017 IRP and the 2019  
9           IRP. Cal Advocates’ response to DCRT’s Data Request No. 1 confirms this error.<sup>6</sup>

10          Table 1 below corrects Cal Advocates’ error by properly comparing the actual difference  
11          between Arizona and California levelized cost of *solar* from the 2017 IRP to the 2019  
12          IRP. Cal Advocates claimed that the CAISO’s analysis had used Arizona levelized solar  
13          cost that were 35% lower than California resources. As Table 1 below shows, the actual  
14          levelized cost of energy differential is only 12%. In contrast, the 2019 IRP assumes that  
15          Arizona Solar resources have a levelized cost of energy that is 3.4% lower than  
16          California resources. Table 1 below shows both the levelized cost of energy and the  
17          capacity cost assumptions in the 2017 IRP and the 2019 IRP.

18

---

<sup>5</sup> *Opening Testimony for the Application of DCR Transmission, LLC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity for the Ten West Link Project*, A.16-10-012, May 13, 2020, Table 6, p. 2-26. (Cal Advocates Opening Testimony)

<sup>6</sup> Cal Advocates’ response to DCRT’s Data Request No. 1 at p. 2. *See* Attachment A. (“In collecting materials responsive to DCRT’s request for Table 6, Mr. Wagle found that that the Capital Cost (2016 \$/kW) and the Implied Levelized Cost of Energy (2016 \$/MWh) from the 2017 IRP in the Riverside East - Palm Springs Solar resource were reported incorrectly in Table 6. While this error does not affect any of the conclusions in Public Advocates Office testimony, it will be brought to the Administrative Law Judge’s attention”)

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

**Table 1: A comparison of Solar Resource Cost in California Riverside East versus Arizona in 2030**

	2017 IRP <sup>7</sup>		2019 IRP <sup>8</sup>	
	Capital Cost (2016\$/kW)	Levelized Cost of Energy (2016\$/MWh)	Capital Cost (2016\$/kW)	Levelized Cost of Energy (2016\$/MWh)
Arizona Solar	\$1,558	\$51	\$1,100	\$29
Riverside East - Palm Springs Solar	\$1,699	\$58	\$1,136	\$30
Percentage difference Relative to Riverside East_Palm Springs	(8.3%)	(12.1%)	(3.2%)	(3.4%)

More importantly, the 2019 IRP reduction in the differential between Arizona and California solar resource costs is not consistent with the underlying source data for the solar photovoltaic (PV) costs. NREL’s 2018 Annual Technology Baseline (ATB)—which is used as the primary basis for the IRP’s renewable generation cost updates, including the cost updates for solar PV generation<sup>9</sup>—indicates differences between the cost of Arizona and southern California solar resources that are more consistent with the CAISO’s assumptions and the 2017 IRP.

<sup>7</sup> RESOLVE Documentation: CPUC 2017 IRP Inputs & Assumptions, September 2017, pp. 36-37. [https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/AttachmentB.RESOLVE\\_Inputs\\_Assumptions\\_2017-09-15.pdf](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/AttachmentB.RESOLVE_Inputs_Assumptions_2017-09-15.pdf)


<sup>8</sup> Inputs & Assumptions: 2019-2020 Integrated Resource Planning, February 2020, pp. 45-47. <ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/energy/modeling/Inputs%20%20Assumptions%202019-2020%20CPUC%20IRP%202020-02-27.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*, p. 44 and p. 49. <ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/energy/modeling/Inputs%20%20Assumptions%202019-2020%20CPUC%20IRP%202020-02-27.pdf>

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 For solar PV generation, the 2018 ATB provides a regional “Cost Multiplier Map,”  
2 reproduced below as Figure 1.<sup>10</sup> The map shows an approximately 10% capital cost  
3 differential between southern California and Arizona Solar. This 10% cost differential is  
4 much closer to the 9.0% differential assumed in the 2017 IRP and the CAISO’s analysis.  
5 For comparison, the 2019 IRP assumes only a 3.2% cost differential between southern  
6 California and Arizona Solar costs.

7 **Figure 1: Regional Capital Cost Multiplier Map for Solar PV<sup>11</sup>**



8  
9 To further validate the CAISO’s solar resource cost assumptions, I reviewed the February  
10 2020 U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) report titled “Capital Cost and  
11 Performance Characteristic Estimates for Utility Scale Electric Power Generating  
12 Technologies” (EIA Report).<sup>12</sup> The EIA Report evaluates the capital cost and  
13 performance characteristics for 25 electric generator types and includes locational cost

<sup>10</sup> The CAISO included the updated 2019 version of the same map as Figure 1 in my opening testimony as additional evidence for the regional cost differences assumed in the testimony.

<sup>11</sup> <https://atb.nrel.gov/electricity/2018/regional-capex.html>

<sup>12</sup>This report was prepared by Sargent & Lundy and is available at:

[https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital\\_cost\\_AEO2020.pdf](https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital_cost_AEO2020.pdf)

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 adjustments. According to the EIA Report the \$/kW cost in 2019 dollars of a 150 MW  
2 Solar PV project for the two locations provided for southern California ranges from  
3 \$1,400/kW in Bakersfield to \$1429/kW in Los Angeles. The report indicates a similar  
4 project located in Phoenix—the only Arizona location included—will have a cost of  
5 \$1,273/kW.<sup>13</sup> This data indicates southern California solar is 10% to 12% more  
6 expensive than Arizona Solar in terms of capacity costs, which is again consistent with  
7 the 2018 NREL ATB, the 2017 IRP and the assumptions used in the CAISO’s benefits  
8 analysis for the Proposed Project.

9 Table 2 provides a summary of the cost differences between southern California and  
10 Arizona Solar based the various sources mentioned above. Table 2 suggests that the 2019  
11 IRP assumption appears to be an outlier.

**Table 2: Summary of Cost Variation of Southern California Solar Relative to  
Arizona Solar**

	2017-2018 IRP <sup>14</sup> (Used in the CAISO’s benefits analysis)	2019-2020 IRP (Basis for Cal Advocates assertions) <sup>15</sup>	2018/19 NREL ATB	2020 EIA Report <sup>16</sup>
CA vs. AZ Solar Costs (CA/AZ)	109%	103.3%	110.5%	110%-112%

14  
15 The data does not support Cal Advocates’ assertion that the difference in the cost of  
16 building solar resources in Arizona versus California has narrowed significantly since the  
17 2017 IRP. Based on this data, I do not believe the assumptions the CAISO used in its  
18 analysis are outdated or significantly overstate the Proposed Project’s benefits.

---

<sup>13</sup> Capital Cost and Performance Characteristic Estimates for Utility Scale Electric Power Generating Technologies, [https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital\\_cost\\_AEO2020.pdf](https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital_cost_AEO2020.pdf) Table 1-24 at pdf p. 207.

<sup>14</sup> For project years 2018/2022.

<sup>15</sup> For project year 2020.

<sup>16</sup> For project year 2019.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 It is also worth noting that despite the differences in the cost assumptions from the 2017  
2 IRP, the 2019 IRP produced an RSP that includes 2,352 MW of economically-selected  
3 Arizona Solar, which favors approval of the Proposed Project.

4 **Q8. Do you agree with Cal Advocates’ argument that the CAISO should have included a**  
5 **transmission cost adder for Arizona Solar to develop the CAISO’s production cost**  
6 **modeling case with the Proposed Project?**

7 **A8.** No. Cal Advocates first agrees that my rationale for the changes in RESOLVE to remove  
8 the transmission cost adder and enable western Arizona Solar to become a candidate  
9 resource is reasonable.<sup>17</sup> Cal Advocates further indicates the change made by the CAISO  
10 is also consistent with the Commission’s decision on 2019-2020 RSP, which eliminates  
11 the “previously-associated transmission wheeling cost” or “out of state renewable  
12 transmission costs” for those Arizona resources that are directly connected to existing  
13 CAISO transmission. However, Cal Advocates then claims my analysis erred by  
14 eliminating the transmission cost adder and developing the CAISO’s PCM case with the  
15 Proposed Project, because, according to Cal Advocates, it adds resources at the Delaney  
16 Substation without incorporating the cost of the Proposed Project that is required to  
17 interconnect those resources.<sup>18</sup>

18 Cal Advocates’ claim that the Proposed Project is required to interconnect the Arizona  
19 Solar resources is inaccurate. This is evident from my opening testimony, which states  
20 that the CAISO’s analysis assumes that the Arizona Solar resources selected by  
21 RESOLVE can directly connect to the CAISO controlled grid with or without the  
22 Proposed Project.<sup>19</sup> My opening testimony further explained that the 3,262 MW of  
23 Arizona Solar capacity selected by RESOLVE, and the associated \$977 million in  
24 resource cost savings, are *not* attributable to the Proposed Project because the resources  
25 can connect to the CAISO controlled grid without the Proposed Project.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Cal Advocates Opening Testimony, p. 2-35

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*, p. 2-35 - 2-36

<sup>19</sup> *Testimony of Nebiyu Yimer on behalf of the California Independent System Operator Corporation*, A.16-10-012, December 20, 2019, p. 6. (CAISO – Yimer Opening Testimony)

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*, p. 10

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1           However, the CAISO studies did demonstrate that the Proposed Project will enable a  
2           significant amount of this economically-selected Arizona Solar resource to be  
3           deliverable, and to therefore count toward load serving entities’ resource adequacy  
4           requirements.<sup>21</sup> The CAISO appropriately took this capacity benefit in to account in its  
5           updated economic analysis.

6           Cal Advocates’ contention that the CAISO incorrectly used the same portfolio in its PCM  
7           cases with and without the Proposed Project has no basis in the coordinated resource and  
8           transmission planning processes. Cal Advocates’ assertion that CAISO should have used  
9           one portfolio for the case without the Proposed Project and a different portfolio for the  
10          case with the Proposed Project undermines integrated resource planning. It implies that  
11          the CAISO cannot use Commission-developed IRP portfolios to evaluate a new  
12          economic project unless the Commission develops a new portfolio for the case by adding  
13          the cost of the candidate project in its resource optimization model to certain candidate  
14          resources.

15          In contrast, the CAISO’s assessment of the Proposed Project is consistent with the  
16          coordinated resource and transmission planning process. In that process, the Commission  
17          first develops a resource portfolio using its resource optimization model (RESOLVE) and  
18          provides the portfolio to the CAISO. The CAISO then uses the Commission-developed  
19          portfolio in its transmission planning process, which includes evaluating candidate  
20          transmission projects. The CAISO’s transmission planning project evaluation always  
21          involves modeling the prevailing portfolio with and without each candidate transmission  
22          project in power flow and/or PCM. This is how the CAISO evaluated all previously  
23          approved economic transmission projects and how it continues to evaluate all new  
24          candidate economic transmission projects. The CAISO used the same process to evaluate  
25          the Proposed Project using the corrected RESOLVE portfolio.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> *Id.* at 12-13.

<sup>22</sup>To further elaborate the point using an example from the 2019-2020 TPP, the CAISO evaluated the reliability, local capacity and production benefits of increasing the rating of the Sylmar–Pardee 230 kV line, which is a tie-line between the CAISO and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). Consistent with the current

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 The CAISO's analysis does not ignore the cost of the Proposed Project, as Cal Advocates  
2 seems to suggest. The CAISO compared the cost of the Proposed Project to the benefits  
3 attributable to the investment; appropriately in calculating its benefit to cost ratio.

4 **Q9. Please respond to Cal Advocates' assertion that the CAISO's approach to modeling**  
5 **Arizona Solar is incorrect.**

6 **A9.** In the PCM case with the Proposed Project, the CAISO modeled the 3,364 MW of  
7 Arizona Solar at Delaney (60% or 2,018 MW), Hassayampa (20% or 673 MW) and  
8 Hoodoo Wash (20% or 673 MW) substations. In the PCM case without the Proposed  
9 Project, the CAISO distributed the resources at the Delaney substation in equal amounts  
10 at the Hassayampa and Hoodoo Wash substations. This resulted in the CAISO modeling  
11 1,682 MW at each substation. Cal Advocates claims this assumption is incorrect and  
12 inflates the Proposed Project's value because there are other locations on the CAISO grid  
13 that would accommodate this amount of generation at a lower cost/higher value in the  
14 absence of the Proposed Project.

15 As explained in my opening testimony, the CAISO's assumptions are not arbitrary. The  
16 CAISO selected the 60%, 20% and 20% split among the three substations based on  
17 commercial interest, *i.e.*, the proportion of actual projects in the CAISO generation  
18 interconnection queue. Since the CAISO's approval of the Proposed Project, the Delaney  
19 substation and the proposed transmission line have attracted the largest amount of  
20 Arizona Solar (with battery storage) capacity wishing to connect to the CAISO grid. On  
21 top of the 4,164 MW of capacity that was in the queue at the time of filing its opening  
22 testimony, CAISO has received three additional solar/storage projects in its Cluster 13  
23 interconnection process that wish to connect to the Proposed Project or Delaney  
24 Substation. These additional projects have a combined capacity of 2,906 MW, increasing  
25 the total solar capacity wishing to connect to the Proposed Project or Delaney Substation

---

process, the CAISO evaluated the project benefits by analyzing the system with and without the project using the same Base portfolio provided by the Commission. Neither the Commission nor the CAISO developed a new portfolio adding the cost of the project to any candidate resources in RESOLVE. The CAISO Board approved the project based on the results of the analysis. See <http://www.aiso.com/Documents/ISOBoardApproved-2019-2020TransmissionPlan.pdf> at pages 149-150

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 to 7,071 MW. The amount of solar (with storage) wishing to connect at Hassayampa and  
2 Hoodoo Wash increased by 830 MW and 365 MW, to 2,000 MW and 1,735 MW,  
3 respectively.

4 Cal Advocates correctly understands that the CAISO distributed Arizona Solar among the  
5 Delaney (60%), Hassayampa (20%) and Hoodoo Wash substations (20%) based on the  
6 commercial interest criterion. However, Cal Advocates argues that the CAISO’s analysis  
7 must also take into account deliverability status and ignore any energy only projects in  
8 the queue. Cal Advocates argues that energy only projects should be ignored because  
9 they are “relatively unattractive from a procurement standpoint given lack of [resource  
10 adequacy] credit associated with them.”<sup>23</sup>

11 This argument fails to recognize the fact that energy only projects in the CAISO  
12 interconnection queue, such as those connecting to Hoodoo Wash, have an opportunity to  
13 obtain deliverability in accordance with the CAISO Tariff.<sup>24</sup> Energy only projects have  
14 the opportunity to obtain deliverability through the annual Transmission Plan  
15 Deliverability allocation process in accordance with the Tariff when they achieve  
16 commercial operation or have executed or are actively negotiating a power purchase  
17 agreement. This is one reason why resource planning should not ignore energy only  
18 projects when applying the commercial interest criterion.

19 Furthermore, this argument is inconsistent with the Commission’s IRP process and the  
20 CAISO’s TPP. The 2017-2018 PSP (the CAISO’s base portfolio for its analysis) and  
21 2019-2020 RSP include a total of 4,662 MW and 3,319 MW of energy only renewable  
22 resources, respectively. The Commission does not ignore or discount the contribution of  
23 these energy only resources in meeting the renewable energy target because, as Cal  
24 Advocates argues, they are relatively unattractive from a procurement standpoint.  
25 Similarly, the CAISO does not ignore or discount these portfolio energy only resources in

---

<sup>23</sup> Cal Advocates Opening Testimony, p. 2-43

<sup>24</sup> CAISO Tariff Appendix DD, Section 8.9.2, <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/AppendixDD-GeneratorInterconnection-DeliverabilityAllocationProcedures-asof-Feb20-2020.pdf>.



**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1           its annual TPP production simulation studies that evaluate the economics of transmission  
2           projects.

3           The fact that no Arizona Solar is modeled at Delaney without the Proposed Project is not  
4           arbitrary. As explained in my opening testimony, without the Proposed Project, the  
5           Delaney substation will not have a direct connection to the CAISO transmission system  
6           and, as a result, it will not be available for projects wishing to connect directly to the  
7           CAISO balancing authority area. Further, projects that have requested to connect directly  
8           to the Proposed Project will not have a valid point of connection without the Proposed  
9           Project. If the Proposed Project is cancelled, all of these projects will have to withdraw  
10          their interconnection requests. If they still wish to connect directly to the CAISO grid,  
11          such projects will have to reapply with a different point of connection such as  
12          Hassayampa or Hoodoo Wash.

13          The CAISO notes that Cal Advocates’ testimony, which is based on an analysis of the  
14          CAISO’s production simulation results, seems to correctly imply that Delaney is a high  
15          value location for the Arizona Solar resources wishing to connect to the CAISO grid.<sup>25</sup>  
16          The amount of commercial interest that has developed since CAISO approval of the  
17          Proposed Project suggests most Arizona Solar developers also agree that Delaney is a  
18          high value point of connection to the CAISO grid. This appears to be more a reason for  
19          Cal Advocates to support rather than oppose approving the Proposed Project, which  
20          makes this high value point of connection, both from rate payers’ and the developers’  
21          perspective alike, available for western Arizona Solar and hybrid resources that wish to  
22          connect to the CAISO balancing authority area.

23          **Q10. Please address Cal Advocates’ arguments that the CAISO’s capacity benefit**  
24          **calculations are either invalid or exaggerate the capacity value provided by the**  
25          **Proposed Project.**

---

<sup>25</sup> “When the Arizona Solar resource capacity is redistributed in the case with the Proposed Project, the generators at Delaney substation gain significantly more net revenues compared to the amounts the generators located at Hoodoo Wash and Hassayampa substations lose”, Opening Testimony of Pushkar Wagle at p. 2-40.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1   **A10.** In its opening testimony, the CAISO used two methods to assess the capacity benefits  
2       associated with the Proposed Project. The first method is based on the avoided cost of  
3       energy storage, while the second is based on locational renewables cost savings. In  
4       opening testimony, Cal Advocates claim the CAISO significantly overestimates the  
5       capacity benefit attributed to the Proposed Project by (1) overestimating the capacity  
6       value or ELCC of solar resources<sup>26</sup> and (2) overestimating battery storage cost values by  
7       using the 2017 IRP rather than the 2019 IRP battery cost assumptions. Cal Advocates  
8       also claims the CAISO’s renewable cost savings methodology for calculating the  
9       Proposed Project’s capacity benefit is flawed because it assumed a high solar cost  
10      differential between Arizona and California solar resources. My response to Q&A 7  
11      demonstrates that the CAISO’s solar cost differential is appropriate and consistent with  
12      industry expectations.

13       As a preliminary note, the CAISO’s first method of calculating capacity benefits, which  
14      uses avoided cost of energy storage, does not use a 14% ELCC to assess the capacity  
15      benefit associated with the Proposed Project.<sup>27</sup> As explained in my opening testimony,  
16      the CAISO discounted the Commission-adopted ELCC solar resources by two-thirds,  
17      one-half, and one-third to account for expected future declines in solar ELCC values. As  
18      a result, the CAISO’s capacity benefit calculation assumes solar ELCCs of 4.7%, 7% and  
19      9.3% in its three sensitivities, all of which led to overall benefit-to-cost ratios that exceed  
20      1.0.

21       Furthermore, the Commission’s current direction to load serving entities indicates that  
22      solar ELCCs well over 2% are appropriate for resource planning purposes. In Decision  
23      20-03-028,<sup>28</sup> the Commission delegated to Commission staff the task of maintaining a

---

<sup>26</sup> Cal Advocates claims that the CAISO used a 14% ELCC capacity value for solar resources instead of the marginal 2% ELCC adopted in D.18-02-018, Attachment B.

<sup>27</sup> The Commission adopted a 14% ELCC value for solar resources for the peak month of September for use in the resource adequacy program in Decision 19-06-026. The Decision states “The adopted values shall be effective beginning with 2020 Resource Adequacy compliance year.”, Decision 19-06-026, see Ordering Paragraph 19 <https://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M309/K463/309463502.PDF>

<sup>28</sup> <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M331/K772/331772681.PDF>

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Resource Data Template to assist individual load serving entities in preparing their  
2 individual integrated resource plans. The Resource Data Template includes solar ELCC  
3 assumptions for load serving entities to use to estimate capacity contributions for their  
4 2020 IRP filings.<sup>29</sup> The solar ELCC values from the Resource Data Template<sup>30</sup> for the  
5 peak month of September are shown in Table 3, below. As indicated in Table 3, the  
6 ELCC values range from 14% in 2020 to 9% in 2030 for the 46 MMT RSP Portfolio.

7 **Table 3**

8 **Solar ELCC Assumptions for September**  
9 **46 MMT RSP Portfolio**  
10 **2019 IRP Resource Data Template**  
11

Year	Month	ELCC
2020	9	14%
2021	9	14%
2022	9	14%
2023	9	14%
2024	9	12%
2025	9	11%
2026	9	9%
2027	9	9%
2028	9	9%
2029	9	9%
2030	9	9%

12  
13 Based on the Resource Data Template, the CAISO capacity benefit sensitivities using the  
14 4.7% to 9.3% 2022 solar ELCC values are conservative. Therefore, the Commission  
15 should reject the Cal Advocates claim that the Commission should use a 2% marginal  
16 solar ELCC to assess the Proposed Project’s capacity benefits.

17 The CAISO also notes that all the Arizona Solar resources are the first set of solar  
18 resources selected by RESOLVE in the 2017 IRP modeling. RESOLVE selected all

---

<sup>29</sup> 2020 load serving entity IRP filings are due to the Commission on September 1, 2020

<sup>30</sup> <ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/energy/modeling/Resource%20Data%20Template.xlsx> – See “ELCC” tab.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Arizona Solar resources by 2022.<sup>31</sup> RESOLVE did not select any solar resources in prior  
2 years. In addition, because Arizona Solar resources have the lowest resource cost per  
3 MWh of all candidate solar resources in the 2017 IRP,<sup>32</sup> one can assume that they are  
4 selected before all other solar resources of the same deliverability status in the resource  
5 optimization. If marginal ELCC means the ELCC of the last MW in the portfolio, then  
6 Arizona Solar will have a higher marginal ELCC than all the other incremental solar  
7 resources in the portfolio because they are likely the first incremental solar resources  
8 selected. In other words, because the Arizona resources are selected first, their ELCC  
9 will be greater than the last (*i.e.*, marginal) unit selected. Accordingly, the 969 MW of  
10 incremental Arizona Solar that becomes deliverable in 2022 as a result of the Proposed  
11 Project will have a higher marginal ELCC than any other solar selected in the portfolio.

12 **Q11. Please respond to Cal Advocates' claim that the CAISO's capacity benefit analysis**  
13 **overestimates the economic value of the Proposed Project by overestimating the**  
14 **avoided cost of battery storage.**

15  
16 **A11.** Cal Advocates incorrectly claims that the CAISO's analysis assumes the avoided cost of  
17 battery storage based on the 2017 IRP values. This claim is incorrect because, as  
18 indicated in my opening testimony, the CAISO's source for battery storage cost  
19 information is Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's Energy Storage Technology and  
20 Cost Characterization Report, dated July 2019—not the 2017 IRP.<sup>33</sup> This claim is also  
21 misleading because it suggests the battery storage cost assumption the CAISO used is  
22 outdated compared to the 2019 IRP. To the contrary, the 2019 IRP relies on storage cost  
23 assumptions from Lazard's Levelized Cost of Storage 4.0 (published in 2018),

---

<sup>31</sup> CAISO – Yimer Opening Testimony, p. 8

<sup>32</sup>

[https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/AttachmentB.RESOLVE\\_Inputs\\_Assumptions\\_2017-09-15.pdf](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/uploadedFiles/CPUCWebsite/Content/UtilitiesIndustries/Energy/EnergyPrograms/ElectPowerProcurementGeneration/irp/AttachmentB.RESOLVE_Inputs_Assumptions_2017-09-15.pdf) at pp 36-37

<sup>33</sup> Testimony of Nebiyu Yimer on behalf of the California Independent System Operator Corporation at page 14, see footnote 11.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1           supplemented by NREL’s Solar and Storage Report (also published in 2018).<sup>34</sup> In reality,  
2           the CAISO’s battery storage cost assumptions are based on more recently published data.

3           Nonetheless, there appears to be significant uncertainty in the current cost of battery  
4           storage. A recent WECC study performed by Energy and Environmental Economics  
5           found that lithium-ion battery system cost varies significantly by report.<sup>35</sup> The variation  
6           in utility-scale battery cost between NREL ATB and Lazard is shown in Figure 2. As the  
7           chart shows, the estimated cost of a 4-hour battery system varies from about \$1,100/kW  
8           (Lazard – Low) to \$2,250/kW (NREL ATB – High) in 2018 dollars. The \$1661/kW the  
9           CAISO used in its analysis approximately represents the midpoint of the range.

10          Similarly, there appears to be significant uncertainty regarding the future rate of decline  
11          in battery storage costs. Lazard’s latest report (LCOS v5.0) found that year-over-year  
12          cost declines were less pronounced than those observed in its prior report (LCOS v4.0),  
13          particularly for wholesale systems.<sup>36</sup>

**Figure 2: Utility-Scale Battery Cost Variation by Source**


---

<sup>34</sup> <ftp://ftp.cpuc.ca.gov/energy/modeling/Inputs%20%20Assumptions%202019-2020%20CPUC%20IRP%202020-02-27.pdf> at page 60.

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.wecc.org/Administrative/E3-WECC%20Resource%20Cost%20Update-201905%20RAC%20DS%20Presentation.pdf>.

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.lazard.com/media/451087/lazards-levelized-cost-of-storage-version-50-vf.pdf> at p. 10.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

Based these considerations, the Commission should reject Cal Advocates’ claim that the CAISO’s battery storage cost assumption is outdated. However, due to the uncertainty associated with the actual cost of battery storage, the CAISO believes an assessment of the Proposed Project’s benefit-to-cost ratio (BCR) with the battery storage costs from the 2019 IRP is warranted as an additional data point. To provide this additional data point, in Table 4 below I provide capacity benefits of the Proposed Project based on the avoided cost of battery storage with the 2019 IRP storage cost assumption included. Dr. Zhang’s concurrently filed rebuttal testimony calculates additional BCR results using the discounted ELCC values.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

**Table 4: Capacity Benefit of Ten West Link Based on Avoided Cost of Battery Storage**

Lithium-Ion BESS (4-hr.)	Capital Cost		Levelized Cost	
	PNNL (\$2018)	2019 IRP (\$2016)	PNNL (\$2018)	2019 IRP (\$2016)
Unit Cost (2022)	\$1661/kW	\$1058/kW	\$268/kW-Yr.	\$166/kW-Yr.
Cost of 136 MW BESS	\$225 million	\$143 million	\$36.3 million/Yr.	\$22.6 million/Yr.
Capacity benefit after discounting ELCC by 1/3, 1/2 and 2/3, respectively	\$75M/\$113M/\$150M per year	\$48M/\$72M/\$95M per year	\$12M/\$18M/\$24M per year	\$7.5M/\$11.3M/\$15M per year

**Q12. How would the CAISO’s capacity benefit calculation change if hybrid solar/storage projects use the incremental 969 MW of deliverability provided by the Proposed Project?**

**A12.** As indicated earlier in this testimony, the majority of Arizona projects in the CAISO generation queue are solar/battery hybrid projects. The capacity value of the 969 MW incremental deliverable capacity resulting from the Proposed Project will only increase if solar/battery hybrid resources located in Arizona are procured. According to the EIA Report,<sup>37</sup> Arizona solar/battery hybrid resources are about 9% less expensive than those in California. Table 5, below, compares the cost of a hybrid resource with 969 MW solar and 323 MW/4-hour battery in California (Bakersfield) vs. Arizona (Phoenix).

**Table 5: Hybrid Solar/Battery Storage Resource Cost Comparison  
California vs. Arizona**

	Cost (2019\$)
--	---------------

<sup>37</sup> [https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital\\_cost\\_AEO2020.pdf](https://www.eia.gov/analysis/studies/powerplants/capitalcost/pdf/capital_cost_AEO2020.pdf), see table 1-25 at pdf p. 208

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

	California	Arizona	Difference
Hybrid resource with 150 MW Solar, 50 MW/4-hr Battery	\$1,884/kW	\$1,719/kW	\$165/kW
Hybrid resource with 969 MW Solar, 323 MW/4-hr Battery	\$1,825,596,000	\$1,665,711,000	\$159,885,000

1 The approximately \$160 million cost difference can be considered as the capacity benefit  
2 of the Proposed Project based on the selected configuration of the hybrid resource  
3 assuming the hybrid resource in California will be deliverable. In this case, there is no  
4 need to discount the capacity benefit, as the CAISO did in its opening testimony, because  
5 the capacity benefit is calculated based on locational cost difference and, unlike solar  
6 resources, the capacity value of hybrid solar/storage resources are not likely to decline as  
7 much over time. Table 6 demonstrates that the capacity benefit of the Proposed Project  
8 calculated based on hybrid solar/storage resources will be far greater than the \$75-\$150  
9 million range that the CAISO used in its opening testimony.

10 **Table 6: Cost Comparison of a 969 MW Hybrid Resource in California vs.**  
11 **Arizona**

	Cost (2019\$)		
	California	Arizona	Difference
Hybrid resource with 150 MW Solar, 50 MW/4-hr Battery	\$1,884/kW	\$1,719/kW	\$165/kW
Hybrid resource with 969 MW Solar, 323 MW/4-hr Battery	\$1,825,596,000	\$1,665,711,000	\$159,885,000

12 **III. CAL ADVOCATES’ ALTERNATIVE TO THE CAISO’S BENEFITS ANALYSIS**  
13 **IS FLAWED.**

14 **Q13. Please briefly explain how Cal Advocates assessed the CAISO benefits analysis for**  
15 **the Proposed Project.**



**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 **A13.** To assess the CAISO’s benefits analysis, Cal Advocates developed its own resource  
2 portfolio alternative (Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio). Cal Advocates then used this  
3 portfolio as the base case in its own production cost modeling runs. Cal Advocates also  
4 developed its own flawed assumptions regarding modeling of Arizona Solar. I discuss  
5 the flaws in the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio and Cal Advocates modeling of  
6 Arizona Solar in this section.

7 **Q14. Is the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio valid for transmission planning**  
8 **purposes?**

9 **A14.** No. The Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio is not a valid portfolio for transmission  
10 planning purposes because Cal Advocates arbitrarily selected the underlying resources.  
11 The Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio was not produced using either the Commission’s  
12 2017 or 2019 IRP resource optimization model.

13 **Q15. Explain why the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio is invalid in the context of the**  
14 **2017 IRP resource optimization.**

15 **A15.** The Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio is arbitrarily selected and is not a result  
16 produced by the RESOLVE resource optimization model. Unlike the portfolio the  
17 CAISO used in its analysis, which is a result of optimization using the latest RESOLVE  
18 model available at the time, Cal Advocates’ portfolio is not optimized using any version  
19 of this Commission-adopted resource optimization model. As a result, the Cal Advocates  
20 Alternative Portfolio is uneconomic from the outset, and thus invalid. Cal Advocates’  
21 portfolio involves a much higher resource cost than the RESOLVE optimized portfolio  
22 used by the CAISO.

23 The Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio significantly alters the CAISO’s economically  
24 optimized portfolio. As can be seen from Table 17 of Cal Advocates’ opening testimony,  
25 the Cal Advocates increased Riverside East\_Palm Springs Solar by 677 MW;  
26 Southern\_Nevada\_Solar by 139 MW; NW\_Ext\_Tx\_Wind by 195 MW; and reduced  
27 Arizona\_Solar by 1,012 MW compared to the CAISO’s economically-optimized  
28 portfolio.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Using RESOLVE, the CAISO demonstrated that the resource portfolio that includes  
2 3,262 MW of Arizona Solar results in a resource cost saving of \$977 million in present  
3 value of revenue requirements (PVRR) or \$58 million in terms of annual levelized cost  
4 (ALC), both in 2016 dollars, compared to the portfolio without Arizona Solar.<sup>38</sup> Because  
5 Cal Advocates modeled only 2,352 MW of Arizona Solar, a simple calculation indicates  
6 that the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio would be roughly \$273 million (2016  
7 dollars) more expensive in terms of PVRR and \$16 million more expensive in terms of  
8 ALC, compared to the CAISO’s optimized portfolio. In its effort to reduce the benefits  
9 of the Proposed Project, Cal Advocates arbitrarily created a resource portfolio that  
10 increases the total resource costs compared to the RESOLVE-optimized portfolio.

11 **Q16. Explain the flaws in Cal Advocates’ assumptions regarding how to model Arizona**  
12 **Solar.**

13 **A16.** Cal Advocates’ allocation Arizona Solar to the Delaney, Hassayampa, and Hoodoo Wash  
14 substations is problematic. Cal Advocates’ Table 18 in its opening testimony, which is  
15 reproduced as Table 7 below, shows how it chose to allocate the 2,352 MW of Arizona  
16 Solar with and without the Proposed Project.

**Table 7: Comparison of CAISO’s Economically-Optimized Portfolio and Cal  
Advocates Alternative**

RESOLVE Resource	Transmission Zone	CAISO RESOLVE- Optimized Amount (MW)	Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio (MW)
Riverside East_Palm Springs Solar	Riverside East Palm Springs	0	677
Southern_Nevada_Solar	Mountain Pass_El Dorado	1,402	1,541
SW_Ext_Tx_Wind	Riverside East_Palm Springs	61	256
Arizona_Solar	Riverside East_Palm Springs	3,364	2,352
Total (MW)		4,827	4,827

<sup>38</sup> CAISO – Yimer Opening Testimony, p. 15.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1  
2 First, without the Proposed Project, Cal Advocates allocated 60% (1411 MW) of the  
3 Arizona Solar to Hassayampa and 40% (941 MW) to Hoodoo Wash. These are allocated  
4 in proportion to the amount of FCDS resources requesting to connect to the CAISO grid  
5 at these two substations as represented in the CAISO generation interconnection queue.<sup>39</sup>  
6 By the same logic, with the proposed Project, Cal Advocates should have modeled 69%  
7 of the resource at Delaney Substation, and only 19% and 12% at Hassayampa and  
8 Hoodoo Wash substations, respectively. Instead, with the Proposed Project, Cal  
9 Advocates modeled only 41% of the Arizona Solar resource at Delaney substation while  
10 almost doubling the amount at Hassayampa (35%) and Hoodoo Wash (24%) that should  
11 have been allocated based on FCDS. These materially inconsistent assumptions between  
12 the modeling with and without the Proposed Project is another reason that Cal  
13 Advocates' PCM analysis and results are invalid.

14 Second, Cal Advocates also incorrectly ignores energy only projects in applying the  
15 commercial interest criterion as explained in response to Q&A 9 above; despite the fact  
16 that a substantial amount of the Arizona Solar resources selected by the resource  
17 optimization are energy only.

18 **Q17. Explain why the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio is invalid in the context of the**  
19 **2019-2020 RSP and the mapping of Arizona Solar for the 2020-2021 TPP.**

20 **A17.** First, Cal Advocates claims its alternative portfolio models Arizona Solar capacity  
21 consistent with the Commission's 2019-2020 RSP, which selected 2,353 MW of Arizona  
22 Solar resources by 2030. However, the consistency of Cal Advocates Alternative  
23 Portfolio with 2019-2020 RSP ends there. Table 6 compares the Cal Advocates  
24 Alternative Portfolio with the 2019-2020 RSP in Southern CA Desert & Southern NV  
25 (SCADSNV) Transmission Zone, which represents the part of the transmission system  
26 that is most impacted by the Proposed Project. The table shows that the Cal Advocates

---

<sup>39</sup> Cal Advocates Opening Testimony, Table 12, p. 2-42.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Alternative Portfolio is entirely inconsistent with 2019-2020 RSP in the SCADSNV  
2 transmission zone, other than the amount of Arizona Solar.

3 The Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio selects arbitrary quantities of  
4 Riverside\_Palm\_Springs\_Solar, Southern\_Nevada\_Solar, and New\_Mexico\_Wind. The  
5 Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio selects these resources without optimization and the  
6 quantities are materially different from those in the 2019-2020 RSP. As indicated in Dr.  
7 Zhang’s testimony, the 2019-2020 RSP also includes other resources that the Cal  
8 Advocates’ Alternative Portfolio either reduces in quantity or entirely excludes. The  
9 CAISO expects this to materially affect the benefits with and without the Proposed  
10 Project. These resources include New\_Mexico\_Wind (606 MW) delivered at Palo Verde  
11 and Greater\_Imperial\_Solar (548 MW) and Baja\_California\_Wind (600 MW) delivered  
12 at Imperial Valley/Ocotillo.

13 **Table 8: Comparison of Cal Advocates’ Alternative Portfolio with the 2019-2020 RSP in**  
14 **the Southern CA Desert & Southern NV (SCADSNV) Transmission Zone**

RESOLVE Resource	Tx Zone	2029/2030 Resource Capacity (MW)	
		Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio	2019-2020 RSP
Greater_Imperial_Solar	SCADSNV-Greater_Imperial	--	548
Riverside_Palm_Springs_Solar	SCADSNV- Riverside_Palm_Springs	677	--
Southern_Nevada_Solar/ SCADSNV_Solar	SCADSNV-GLW_VEA/SCADSNV	1,541	1,192
Riverside_Palm_Springs_Wind	SCADSNV-Riverside_Palm_Springs	42	--
Arizona_Solar	SCADSNV-Riverside_Palm_Springs	2,352	2,352
Baja_California_Wind	SCADSNV-Greater_Imperial	--	600
New_Mexico_Wind	SCADSNV-Riverside_Palm_Springs	256	606
Greater_Imperial_Geothermal	SCADSNV-Greater_Imperial	1,276	--

15  
16 The CAISO notes that the California Energy Commission (CEC) mapped the renewable  
17 resources in the 2019-2020 RSP to specific substations through a sequenced transfer of  
18 information between the Commission, CEC and the CAISO. Though the total Arizona

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 Solar resource selected is consistent with the 2019-2020 RSP, the Cal Advocates  
2 Alternative Portfolio does not allocate the Arizona Solar resource to the Delaney,  
3 Hassayampa, and Hoodoo Wash substations consistent with the CEC’s 2019-2020 RSP  
4 mapping.<sup>40</sup> Table 7 provides a comparison between the CEC bus bar mapping and the  
5 Arizona Solar resource allocation in the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio.

6 **Table 9: Comparison of Cal Advocates’ mapping of Arizona\_Solar with the**  
7 **CPUC/CEC mapping of the Resource for the CAISO 2020-2021 TPP**

Substation	Cal Advocates’ Mapping (MW)		CEC Resource Mapping for 2020-2021 TPP (MW)
	Without Proposed Project	With Proposed Project	
Delaney	-	969	870
Hassayampa	1,411	830	259
Hoodoo Wash	941	553	1,223
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,352</b>	<b>2,352</b>	<b>2,352</b>

8  
9 Contrary to the CEC mapping efforts, Cal Advocates increased the Hassayampa  
10 substation share of the Arizona Solar to 60% and reduced the Hoodoo Wash substation  
11 share to 40% in the Cal Advocates Alternative Portfolio. This allocation is entirely  
12 inconsistent with the CEC mapping of Arizona Solar, which allocates only 259 MW to  
13 Hassayampa Substation and 1,223 MW at Hoodoo Wash. Using the CEC mapping, the  
14 870 MW allocated to the Delaney substation would need to be redistributed without the  
15 Proposed Project.

16 **IV. CAL ADVOCATES INCORRECTLY ARGUES THAT THE COMMISSION**  
17 **SHOULD IGNORE THE PROPOSED PROJECT’S RELIABILITY BENEFITS.**

18 **Q18. Are there other factors besides the economic benefits of the Proposed Project that**  
19 **you believe the Commission should consider in this proceeding?**

20 **A18.** Yes. Although the Ten West Link Project was approved as an economic project with  
21 benefits exceeding its costs, it also provides significant reliability benefits. The CAISO

---

<sup>40</sup> California Energy Commission - Bus Bar Mapping for 2019-2020,  
<https://caenergy.databasin.org/documents/documents/b4dd2901cfc24a15b95792a026a41cb9/>.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 identified reliability benefits in its initial documentation to its Board of Governors in  
2 requesting approval of the Proposed Project. These reliability benefits are included in  
3 Mr. Millar’s opening testimony.<sup>41</sup> Cal Advocates’ direct testimony asserts that the  
4 Commission should focus only on the economic benefits of the Proposed Project. Mr.  
5 Millar’s rebuttal testimony explains that the Commission should not limit its review to  
6 economic benefits, but should instead review the entire suite of benefits provided by the  
7 Proposed Project. In this testimony, I describe the significant reliability benefits that the  
8 Proposed Project provides.

9 **.Q19. Please describe the reliability concerns and the relevant North American Electric**  
10 **Reliability Corporation (NERC) reliability standards that the Proposed Project can**  
11 **address.**

12 **A19.** The Proposed Project is a 500 kV line that parallels the existing Palo Verde–Colorado  
13 River 500 kV line—one of the critical 500 kV lines serving southern California. The  
14 Proposed Project mitigates the reliability impacts of the loss of the Palo Verde–Colorado  
15 River 500 kV line. One reliability issue that the Proposed Project mitigates is the existing  
16 Path 46 System Operating Limit; which qualifies as an Interconnection Reliability  
17 Operating Limit,<sup>42</sup> as further explained below.

18 NERC reliability standards<sup>43</sup> require the CAISO, as a registered Planning Authority, to  
19 have a documented methodology for use in developing System Operating Limits,  
20 including those that qualify as Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits. The  
21 reliability standards also require CAISO to establish System Operating Limits, including  
22 Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits, for its Planning Authority Area that are

---

<sup>41</sup> *Testimony of Neil Millar on Behalf of the California Independent System Operator Corporation*, A.16-10-012, December 19, 2019, Attachment A, pp. 264-265.

<sup>42</sup> The Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards defines an IROL as a System Operating Limit that, if violated, could lead to instability, uncontrolled separation, or Cascading outages that adversely impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System.

<sup>43</sup> NERC Reliability Standard FAC-010-3 available at: <https://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/Reliability%20Standards/FAC-010-3.pdf> and NERC Reliability Standard FAC-014-2 available at <https://www.nerc.com/files/FAC-014-2.pdf>.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 consistent with its System Operating Limit Methodology.<sup>44</sup> In accordance with these  
2 standards, the CAISO has developed a System Operating Limit Methodology for the  
3 Planning Horizon,<sup>45</sup> and using that methodology, established System Operating Limits  
4 including those that qualify as Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits.

5 The CAISO identified only two multiple contingencies across its entire system that cause  
6 a System Operating Limit to qualify as an Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit  
7 because the contingencies could lead to instability, uncontrolled separation, or Cascading  
8 outages that adversely impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System. One of these  
9 multiple contingencies is the overlapping loss of Palo Verde–Colorado River and North  
10 Gila–Imperial Valley 500 kV transmission lines. These critical overlapping outages  
11 cause the existing Path 46 System Operating Limit (11,200 MW) to qualify as an  
12 Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit. If these contingencies occur while Path 46  
13 is operating close to its System Operating Limit, the contingencies could lead to  
14 widespread instability, uncontrolled separation, or cascading outages that adversely  
15 impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System unless transfers are reduced quickly  
16 enough<sup>46</sup> after the initial contingency. The CAISO first identified this Interconnection  
17 Reliability Operating Limit in the 2014-2015 Transmission Plan<sup>47</sup> and it was later  
18 updated with a Path 46 Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit Qualification Study  
19 in February 2020.

20 Figures 3 and 4 below provide projected transfers on Path 46 in 2029 based on Dr.  
21 Zhang’s PCM results without the Proposed Project for the CAISO Baseline and  
22 Sensitivity cases.<sup>48</sup> The figures show there are a significant number of hours during

---

<sup>44</sup>The Glossary of Terms Used in NERC Reliability Standards defines an IROL  $T_v$  as the maximum time that an IROL can be violated before the risk to the interconnection or other Reliability Coordinator Area(s) becomes greater than acceptable. Each Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit’s  $T_v$  shall be less than or equal to 30 minutes.

<sup>45</sup> <http://www.caiso.com/Documents/FAC-10-3-FAC-14-2SystemOperatingLimitsMethodology-PlanningHorizon.pdf#search=sol%20methodology>.

<sup>46</sup> Within the Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit  $T_v$  of 30 minutes.

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.caiso.com/Pages/documentsbygroup.aspx?GroupID=55EBA03B-525E-438B-8D9A-C3C5B7B3DD3C>, See for example pp. 94, 99 of the main report and pdf pages 417, 426 of Appendix C.


<sup>48</sup> *Response of the California Independent System Operator to Data Request Number Cal-Advocates-A1610012-CAISO-004 by the Public Advocates Office*, CAISO Response to Public Advocates Item No. at p. 3.

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 which Path 46 is loaded close to or above its existing 11,200 MW System Operating  
2 Limit.<sup>49</sup> If the Proposed Project does not proceed, overlapping contingencies during  
3 these periods could lead to the widespread reliability impacts associated with the  
4 violation of an Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit.

5 For example, there are 81 hours and 217 hours in which Path 46 is loaded above 11,200  
6 MW in the baseline and sensitivity cases, respectively. Similarly, there are 599 hours and  
7 1,169 hours during which Path 46 is loaded above 10,000 MW in the baseline and  
8 sensitivity cases, respectively.

9 **Figure 3: Projected Path 46 Transfers without Ten West Link in the Baseline Case**



10  
11


---

<sup>49</sup> Transfers on Path 46 exceed the existing SOL during some hours because the WECC approved future rating of 12,150 MW is modeled. The new rating will become effective when upgrades on the Lugo–Victorville 500 kV transmission line and certain series capacitors on SCE’s and LADWP’s Path 46 500 kV lines are in service.



**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF NEBIYU YIMER  
ON BEHALF OF  
THE CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
A.16-10-012**

1 **Figure 4: Projected Path 46 Transfers without Ten West Link in the Sensitivity**  
2 **Case**



3  
4 As noted above, the Proposed Project creates a new 500 kV line that parallels the Palo  
5 Verde–Colorado River 500 kV line. As a result, it mitigates the reliability impacts of the  
6 loss of the Palo Verde–Colorado River 500 kV line, including the overlapping  
7 contingency with the Imperial Valley–North Gila 500 kV line, which could lead to the  
8 violation of the Path 46 Interconnection Reliability Operating Limit. As a result, the  
9 Proposed Project mitigates one of the Interconnection Reliability Operating Limits in the  
10 CAISO system, if violated, could lead to widespread instability, uncontrolled separation,  
11 or cascading outages that adversely impact the reliability of the Bulk Electric System.

12 **V. CONCLUSION**

13 **Q20. Please summarize your recommendations.**

14 **A20.** For the reasons discussed above and in the concurrently filed testimony of Mr. Millar and  
15 Dr. Zhang, the Commission should approve DCRT’s application for certificate of public  
16 convenience and necessity to construct the project.

17 **Q21. Does this conclude your testimony?**

18 **A21.** Yes, it does.

ATTACHMENT A



**Public Advocates Office**  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Tel: 415-703-1584  
[www.publicadvocates.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.publicadvocates.cpuc.ca.gov)

**PUBLIC ADVOCATES OFFICE RESPONSE TO DCR TRANSMISSION, LLC's**  
**DATA REQUEST NO. 1**  
**A.16.10.012: APPLICATION OF DCR TRANSMISSION, LLC FOR**  
**TEN WEST LINK PROJECT**

Data Request No.: Data Request No. DCRT-A1610012-DCRT-001  
Original Date of Request: May 19, 2020  
Response Date: May 29, 2020

To: Jackson Stoddard fjackson.stoddard@morganlewis.com  
Attorney for DCR Transmission, LLC (415) 442-1153

Pejman Moshfegh pejman.moshfegh@morganlewis.com  
Attorney for DCR Transmission, LLC

Brooke McGlinn brooke.mcglinn@morganlewis.com  
Attorney for DCR Transmission, LLC

From: Jerry Melcher jerry.melcher@cpuc.ca.gov  
Utilities Engineer (415) 703-1923

Robyn Purchia Robyn.Purchia@cpuc.ca.gov  
Attorney for Public Advocates Office (415) 703-2354

**GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

The Public Advocates Office provides the following responses to DCR Transmission, LLC's (DCRT) first set of data requests dated May 19, 2020 (DCRT DR 1). Questions from DCRT DR 1 are produced below, followed by the Public Advocates Office's responses. The Public Advocates Office does not adopt or admit any question or any portion of any question as correct or true. The Public Advocates Office reserves the right to supplement, clarify, revise, or correct any or all of the responses and objections herein,

and to assert additional objections or privileges in one or more subsequent responses. Responses pertaining to questions of law or legal conclusions have been prepared with the assistance of legal counsel.

The Public Advocates Office objects to each data request to the extent that it mischaracterizes the Public Advocates Office's opening testimony.

The Public Advocates Office objects to each data request to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, or not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence.

The Public Advocates Office objects to each instruction, definition, and data request to the extent that it seeks information or documents protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege.

The Public Advocates Office objects to each instruction, definition, and data request as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks documents or information that are readily or more accessible to DCRT from DCRT's own files, from documents or information in DCRT's possession, or from documents or information that DCRT previously produced to the Public Advocates Office. Responding to such requests would be oppressive, unduly burdensome, and unnecessarily expensive, and the burden of responding to such requests is substantially the same or less for DCRT as for the Public Advocates Office. All such documents and information will not be produced.

The Public Advocates Office incorporates by reference every general objection set forth above into each specific response set forth below. A specific response may repeat a general objection for emphasis or for some other reason. The failure to include any general objection in any specific response does not waive any general objection to that request.

## **DATA REQUESTS AND RESPONSES**

### **Question 1**

Produce all WORKPAPERS for Chapters 1 and 2 of the TESTIMONY, including but not limited to, WORKPAPERS for Table 2, on pages 2-12 and Table 16 on pages 2-52.

### **Response to Question 1**

The Public Advocates Office objects to the question on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome. DCRT has defined “workpapers” to include a broad range of materials, some of which are in the sole possession of DCRT or other parties, some of which are protected by attorney-client privilege, and some of which are publicly available by accessing the information provided in the citation to the tables and figures.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objections, the Public Advocates Office responds as follows:

Chapter 1 sponsor: Jerry Melcher  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 703-1923

Mr. Melcher did not develop or use workpapers to support its Chapter 1 Opening Testimony.

Chapter 2 sponsor: Pushkar Wagle, Ph.D.  
Flynn Resource Consultants Inc.  
5440 Edgeview Drive  
Discovery Bay, CA 94505  
888-634-3339

Mr. Wagle has provided the attached zipped folder named “Public Advocates Office Testimony Workpapers\_DCRT-DR-001\_Ch.2.zip.” The “Table\_of\_Contents” tab of the spreadsheet includes a brief description of the Figures/Tables and provides hyperlinks to the underlying data sources and calculations included in separate tabs.

DCRT requested workpapers for Table 2 in Chapter 2 of the Public Advocates Office’s Opening Testimony. This table was developed by the California Independent System

Operator (CAISO), not by the Public Advocates Office. Therefore, Public Advocates Office does not have any workpapers responsive to this request. However, Mr. Wagle has provided the table again in the zipped folder.

DCRT also requested workpapers for Table 16 in Chapter 2 of the Public Advocates Office’s Opening Testimony. The “Table 16” tab in this workbook is linked to a separate Excel workbook, “DR\_7\_I - Benefit Cost Analysis\_Cal Advocates Scenario 1” and provides the calculations using DCRT’s benefit-cost analysis template. The benefit-cost ratios based on DCRT’s benefit-cost analysis template are mentioned in the footnote 184 of the Public Advocates Office’s Opening Testimony.

In collecting materials responsive to DCRT’s request for Table 6, Mr. Wagle found that that the Capital Cost (2016 \$/kW) and the Implied Levelized Cost of Energy (2016 \$/MWh) from the 2017 IRP in the Riverside East - Palm Springs Solar resource were reported incorrectly in Table 6. While this error does not affect any of the conclusions in Public Advocates Office testimony, it will be brought to the Administrative Law Judge’s attention. Mr. Wagle has corrected the two numbers as shown in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: A Comparison of Solar Resource Cost in California’s Riverside East-Palm Springs versus in Arizona in 2030**

Resource	2017 IRP		2019 IRP	
	Capital Cost (2016 \$/kW)	Implied Levelized Cost of Energy (2016 \$/MWh)	Capital Cost (2016 \$/kW)	Implied Levelized Cost of Energy (2016 \$/MWh)
Arizona Solar	\$1,558	\$51	\$1,100	\$27
Riverside East - Palm Springs Solar	<del>\$1,974</del> \$1,699	<del>\$79</del> \$58	\$1,136	\$28

Finally, the underlying data in Figures 2 and 5 and Table 10 tab is confidential in nature and should be marked and treated as confidential. Mr. Jordan Pinjuv, counsel for the CAISO, has indicated that the confidential materials can be provided to DCRT and Center for Biological Diversity because they have signed non-disclosure agreements with the CAISO.

The Public Advocates Office will provide the underlying data for Figures 2 and 5 and Table 10 as a **confidential** attachment in a separate email to DCRT, the CAISO, and the Center for Biological Diversity.