

Below are stakeholder comments from BayWa r.e. Solar Projects LLC on the proposed generation deliverability methodology. Thanks.

- BayWa appreciates CAISO’s assessment of the QC Phase I report, especially [slide 21](#). Would it be possible for CAISO to publish this table again (shown below) and include MW amounts so that developers have an understanding of the additional capability in each area by constraint?
- In the straw proposal, can CAISO clearly document how under the new deliverability methodology the resources in Cluster 10, 11, and 12 will be able to access this additional deliverability, including the interplay between existing and queued generation? An illustrative example would be helpful.
- The solar paired with storage proposal appears reasonable, but for clarity, can CAISO redo the example with further details on the storage facility that include MW/MWh and duration (and any consecutive day requirements)? It was unclear whether the 100 MW storage facility was 100 MWh or 400 MWh. Also, how would you treat a hybrid resource that has storage that has smaller MW than solar name plate (e.g. 30 or 50 MW storage paired with 100 MW solar)?

PG&E South area	SCE-VEA-GWT area	SDG&E area
LDNU: Warnerville-Wilson 230 kV	RNU: Lugo – Victorville RAS expansion	RNU: Sycamore-Penasquitos 230 kV RAS
LDNU: Borden-Wilson Corridor 230 kV OLS	RNU: Bob RAS	RNU: Mission-San Luis Rey 230 kV RAS
LDNU: EICapitan-Wilson 115 kV	RNU: Innovation RAS	
LDNU: Panoche-Mendota 115 kV Line	ADNU: Desert Area Deliverability Constraint substantially alleviated	LDNU: Silvergate-Bay Boulevard 230 kV series reactor
LDNU: GWF-Kingsburg 115 kV line	ADNU: North of Lugo Area Deliverability Constraint substantially alleviated	ADNU: East of Miguel Area Deliverability Constraint (IV – Valley 500 kV line)
LDNU: Helm-Crescent SW Station 70 kV line	ADNU: Barre-Lewis 230 kV Area Deliverability Constraint (Talega-Santiago 230 kV line)	
RNU: 4 RAS (3 in Fresno and 1 in Kern) not needed		

JB Lee  
 Director of Business Development

