Market Performance Report
June 2019

October 9, 2019

ISO Market Quality and Renewable Integration

CAISO
250 Outcropping Way
Folsom, California 95630
(916) 351-4400

Executive Summary[1]

The market performance in June 2019 is summarized below.

CAISO area performance,

- Peak loads for ISO area exceeded 35,000 MW on June 10-12 driven by heat wave.
- Across the integrated forward market (IFM), fifteen-minute market (FMM) and real-time market (RTD), all four DLAP prices spiked in the middle of June driven by high temperatures.
- Congestion rents for interties skidded to $4.50 million from $10.87 million in May. Majority of the congestion rents in June accrued on NOB (13 percent) intertie and Malin500 (85 percent) intertie.
- In the congestion revenue rights (CRR) market, the balancing account for June had a surplus of approximately $8.05 million, which was allocated to measured demand.
- The monthly average ancillary service cost to load fell to $1.10/MWh from $2.08/MWh in May. There were 21 scarcity events this month.
- The cleared virtual supply and demand moved closer in early June. The profits from convergence bidding escalated to $10.65 million from $3.96 million in May.
- The bid cost recovery increased to $11.77 million from $7.04 million in May.
- The real-time energy offset cost rose to -$1.36 million in June from -$2.77 million in May. The real-time congestion offset skidded to -$1.01 million in June from $12.43 million in May.
- The volume of exceptional dispatch inched up to 119,100 MWh from 116,731 MWh in May. The main contributors to the monthly volume were load forecast uncertainty, planned transmission outage and voltage support. The monthly average of total exceptional dispatch volume as a percentage of load percentage was 0.59 percent, decreasing from 0.69 percent in May.

[1] This report contains the highlights of the reporting period. For a more detailed explanation of the technical characteristics of the metrics included in this report please download the Market Performance Metric Catalog, which is available on the CAISO web site at **http://www.caiso.com/market/Pages/ReportsBulletins/Default.aspx**.

Energy Imbalance market (EIM) performance,

- In the FMM and RTD, the ELAP prices were elevated on June 10 and 11 due to high demand driven by high temperatures.
- The monthly average prices in FMM for EIM entities (AZPS, BANCSMUD, BCHA, IPCO, NEVP, PACE, PACW, PGE and PSEI) were $29.39, $29.16, $18.72, $23.90, $26.41, $23.10, $19.82, $18.77, and $21.10 respectively.
- The monthly average prices in RTD for EIM entities (AZPS, BANCSMUD, BCHA, IPCO, NEVP, PACE, PACW, PGE and PSEI) were $33.21, $31.74, $16.98, $30.31, $34.94, $28.21, $21.71, $20.41, and $22.59 respectively.
- Bid cost recovery, real-time imbalance energy offset, and real-rime congestion offset costs for EIM entities (AZPS, BANCSMUD, BCHA, IPCO, NEVP, PACE, PACW, PGE and PSEI) were $1.07 million, -$3.01 million and -$3.40 million respectively.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Market Characteristics

Loads

Peak loads for ISO area exceeded 35,000 MW on June 10-12 driven by heat wave.

Figure 1: System Peak Load



Resource Adequacy Available Incentive Mechanism

Resource Adequacy Availability Incentive Mechanism (RAAIM) was activated on November 1, 2016 to track the performance of Resource Adequacy (RA) Resources. RAAIM is used to determine the availability of resources providing local and/or system Resource Adequacy Capacity and Flexible RA Capacity each month and then assess the resultant Availability Incentive Payments and Non-Availability Charges through the CAISO's settlements process. Table 1 below shows the monthly average actual availability, total non-availability charge, and total availability incentive payment. Starting from May 2018, the ISO reports the system RA average actual availability and flexible RA average actual availability separately.

Table 1: Resource Adequacy Availability and Payment

	Total Non-availability Charge	Total Availability Incentive Payment	Average Actual Availability	Flexible Average Actual Availability	System Average Actual Availability
Jan18	$921,031	-$921,031	97.67%		
Feb18	$1,945,971	-$1,796,764	95.83%		
Mar18	$3,151,376	-$1,589,703	93.27%		
Apr18	$2,913,679	-$1,608,256	93.01%		
May18	$5,621,558	-$2,346,666		92.79%	91.75%
Jun18	$4,750,039	-$2,622,844		95.08%	92.79%
Jul18	$2,707,179	-$2,892,873		94.56%	96.58%
Aug18	$3,916,827	-$2,812,434		91.29%	96.91%
Sep18	$1,438,373	-$3,186,317		98.08%	97.38%
Oct18	$2,446,741	-$2,253,949		95.33%	96.34%
Nov18	$1,476,915	-$2,025,955		97.27%	96.95%
Dec18	$1,352,580	-$2,092,658		97.68%	96.77%
Jan19	$1,430,981	-$1,430,981		98.25%	96.70%
Feb19	$1,845,678	-$1,836,610		95.76%	97.27%
Mar19	$2,343,144	-$2,163,512		96.57%	95.25%
Apr19	$3,787,853	-$2,033,788		93.77%	93.53%
May19	$2,826,675	-$2,854,841		93.31%	97.33%
Jun19	$3,334,889	-$2,352,915		92.65%	96.62%

Direct Market Performance Metrics

Energy

Day-Ahead Prices

Figure 2 shows daily prices of four default load aggregate points (DLAPs). Table 2 below lists the binding constraints along with the associated DLAP locations and the dates when the binding constraints resulted in relatively high or low DLAP prices. All four DLAP prices were elevated on June 11-12 due to high demand driven by high temperatures.

Figure 2: Day-Ahead Simple Average LAP Prices (All Hours)



Table 2: Day-Ahead Transmission Constraints

DLAP	Date	Transmission Constraint
SDGE	June 12	7510-PAS-BAI-PAR-OOS_NG

Real-Time Prices

FMM daily prices of the four DLAPs are shown in Figure 3. Table 3 lists the binding constraints along with the associated DLAP locations and the dates when the binding constraints resulted in relatively high or low DLAP prices. All four DLAP prices spiked on June 10-11 when high temperatures drove high demand.

Figure 3: FMM Simple Average LAP Prices (All Hours)



Table 3: FMM Transmission Constraints

DLAP	Date	Transmission Constraint
VEA	June 10-11	OP-6610_ELD-LUGO

Figure 4 below shows the daily frequency of positive price spikes and negative prices by price range for the default LAPs in the FMM. The cumulative frequency of prices above $250/MWh increased to 1.02 percent in June from 0.01 percent in May. The cumulative frequency of negative prices fell to 2.52 percent in June from 11.56 percent in May.

Figure 4: Daily Frequency of FMM LAP Positive Price Spikes and Negative Prices



RTD daily prices of the four DLAPs are shown in Figure 5. Table 4 lists the binding constraints along with the associated DLAP locations and the dates when the binding constraints resulted in relatively high or low DLAP prices. All four DLAP prices spiked on June 10-11 due to high demand, driven by high temperatures

Figure 5: RTD Simple Average LAP Prices (All Hours)



Table 4: RTD Transmission Constraints

DLAP	Date	Transmission Constraint
VEA	June 10-11	OP-6610_ELD-LUGO
SCE, SDGE, VEA	June 29	MIDWAY-VINCENT 500 kV line

Figure 6 below shows the daily frequency of positive price spikes and negative prices by price range for the default LAPs in RTD. The cumulative frequency of prices above $250/MWh increased to 1.68 percent in June from 0.76 percent in May. The cumulative frequency of negative prices dropped to 3.34 percent in June from 14.04 percent in May.

Figure 6: Daily Frequency of RTD LAP Positive Price Spikes and Negative Price



Congestion

Congestion Rents on Interties

Figure 7 below illustrates the daily integrated forward market congestion rents by interties. The cumulative total congestion rent for interties in June skidded to $4.50 million from $10.87 million in May. Majority of the congestion rents in June accrued on NOB (13 percent) intertie and Malin500 (85 percent) intertie.

The congestion rent on NOB decreased to $0.61 million in June from $1.64 million in May. The congestion rent on Malin500 decreased to $3.84 million in June from $5.75 million in May.

Figure 7: IFM Congestion Rents by Interties (Import)



Average Congestion Cost per Load Served

This metric quantifies the average congestion cost for serving one megawatt of load in the ISO system. Figure 8 shows the daily and monthly averages for the day-ahead and real-time markets respectively.

Figure 8: Average Congestion Cost per Megawatt of Served Load



The average congestion cost per MWh of load served in the integrated forward market decreased to $1.15/MWh in June from $1.99/MWh in May. The average congestion cost per load served in the real-time market increased to $0.06/MWh in June from -$0.73/MWh in May.

Congestion Revenue Rights

Congestion revenue rights auction efficiency 1B became in effect on January 1, 2019. It includes key changes related to the congestion revenue rights settlements process:

- Targeted reduction of congestion revenue rights payouts on a constraint by constraint basis.
- Distribute congestion revenues to the extent that CAISO collected the requisite revenue on the constraint over the month. That is, implement a pro-rata funding for CRRs.
- Allow surpluses on one constraint in one hour to offset deficits on the same constraint in another hour over the course of the month.
- Only distribute surpluses to congestion revenue rights if the surplus is collected on a constraint that the congestion revenue right accrued a deficit, and only up to the full target payment value of the congestion revenue right.
- Distribute remaining surplus revenue at the end of the month, which are associated with constraints that collect more surplus over the month than deficits, to measured demand.

Figure 9 illustrates the CRR notional value in the corresponding month for the various transmission elements that experienced congestion during the month. CRR notional value is calculated as the product of CRR implied flow and constraint shadow price in each hour per constraint and CRR.

Figure 9: Daily CRR Notional Value by Transmission Element



Figure 10 illustrates the daily CRR offset value in the corresponding month for the transmission elements that experienced congestion during the month.

Figure 10: Daily CRR Offset Value by Transmission Element



CRR offset value is the difference between the revenue collected from the day-ahead congestion and CRR notional value. It is also calculated in each hour per constraint and CRR. A positive CRR offset value represents surplus and a negative CRR offset value represents shortfall.

The shares of the CRR payment on various congested transmission elements for the reporting period are shown in Figure 11 and the monthly summary for CRR revenue adequacy is provided in Table 5.

Figure 11: CRR Payment by Transmission Element



Net monthly balancing surplus in June was $2.27 million. The auction revenues credited to the balancing account for June were $5.78 million. As a result, the balancing account for June had a surplus of approximately $8.05 million, which was allocated to measured demand.

Table 5: CRR Revenue Adequacy Statistics

Row	Description	Formula	Amount
1	CRR Notional Value		$21,682,268
2	CRR Deficit		-$2,410,866
3	CRR Settlement Rule		-$93,139
4	CRR Adjusted Payment		$19,174,745
5	CRR Surplus		$3,074,695
6	Monthly Auction Revenue		$3,651,958
7	Annual Auction Revenue		$2,130,426
8	CRR Daily Balancing Account		$4,973,731
9	Net Monthly Balancing Surplus	row 5 + row 8 - (row 6 + row 7)	$2,266,042
10	Allocation to Measured Demand	row 6 + row 7 + row9	$8,048,425

Ancillary Services

IFM (Day-Ahead) Average Price

Table 6 shows the monthly IFM average ancillary service procurements and the monthly average prices. In June the monthly average procurement increased for spinning and non-spinning reserves.

Table 6: IFM (Day-Ahead) Monthly Average Ancillary Service Procurement

	Average Procured				Average Price			
	Reg Up	Reg Dn	Spinning	Non-Spinning	Reg Up	Reg Dn	Spinning	Non-Spinning
Jun-19	330	410	883	884	$12.44	$10.92	$6.72	$0.41
May-19	402	475	835	843	$17.51	$14.12	$10.37	$0.11
Percent Change	-17.91%	-13.68%	5.79%	4.92%	-28.98%	-22.68%	-35.17%	269.13%

The monthly average prices decreased for regulation up, regulation down, and spinning reserve in June. Figure 12 shows the daily IFM average ancillary service prices, which were relatively stable in June.

Figure 12: IFM (Day-Ahead) Ancillary Service Average Price



Ancillary Service Cost to Load

The monthly average cost to load fell to $0.71/MWh in June from $1.19/MWh in May.

Figure 13: System (Day-Ahead and Real-Time) Average Cost to Load



Scarcity Events

The ancillary services scarcity pricing mechanism is triggered when the ISO is not able to procure the target quantity of one or more ancillary services in the IFM and real-time market runs. The scarcity events in June are shown in the table below.

Date	Hour Ending	Interval	Ancillary Service	Region	Shortfall (MW)	Percentage of Requirement
Jun 10	21	3	Non-spin Reserve	CAISO_EXP	240.66	18.51%
Jun 10	21	4	Non-spin Reserve	CAISO_EXP	131.54	10.12%
Jun 11	19	3	Non-spin Reserve	CAISO_EXP	18.30	1.59%
Jun 11	19	4	Non-spin Reserve	CAISO_EXP	78.60	6.83%
Jun 11	20	3	Non-spin Reserve	CAISO_EXP	84.96	7.08%
Jun 14	5	1	Regulation Down	CAISO_EXP	0.31	0.09%
Jun 14	5	2	Regulation Down	CAISO_EXP	0.81	0.23%
Jun 14	6	2	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.06	0.06%
Jun 14	6	3	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.07	0.07%
Jun 14	6	4	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.07	0.07%
Jun 14	7	1	Regulation Down	CAISO_EXP	0.31	0.08%
Jun 14	7	1	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.35	0.33%
Jun 14	7	2	Regulation Down	CAISO_EXP	0.81	0.20%
Jun 14	7	2	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.85	0.81%
Jun 14	7	3	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.86	0.82%
Jun 14	7	4	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.85	0.81%
Jun 17	12	2	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.10	0.10%

Jun 17	12	3	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.09	0.09%
Jun 17	12	4	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.09	0.09%
June 23	15	4	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.71	0.68%
June 25	15	2	Regulation Down	SP26_EXP	0.80	0.77%

Convergence Bidding

Figure 14 below shows the daily average volume of cleared virtual bids in IFM for virtual supply and virtual demand. The cleared virtual supply and demand moved closer in early June.

Figure 14: Cleared Virtual Bids



Convergence bidding tends to cause the day-ahead market and real-time market prices to move closer together, or “converge”. Figure 15 shows the energy prices (namely the energy component of the LMP) in IFM, hour ahead scheduling process (HASP), FMM, and RTD.

Figure 15: IFM, HASP, FMM, and RTD Prices



Figure 16 shows the profits that convergence bidders receive from convergence bidding. The total profits from convergence bidding in June escalated to $10.65 million from $3.96 million in May, mainly driven by price spikes in real-time market on June 10 and 11.

Figure 16: Convergence Bidding Profits



Renewable Generation Curtailment

Figure 17 below shows the monthly wind and solar VERs (variable energy resource) curtailment due to system wide condition or local congestion in RTD. Figure 18 shows the monthly wind and solar VERs (variable energy resource) curtailment by resource type in RTD. Economic curtailment is defined as the resource's dispatch upper limit minus its RTD schedule when the resource has an economic bid. Dispatch upper limit is the maximum level the resource can be dispatched to when various factors are take into account such as forecast, maximum economic bid, generation outage, and ramping capacity. Self-schedule curtailment is defined as the resource's self-schedule minus its RTD schedule when RTD schedule is lower than self-schedule. When a VER resource is exceptionally dispatched, then exceptional dispatch curtailment is defined as the dispatch upper limit minus the exceptional dispatch value.

As Figure 17 and Figure 18 below show, the renewable curtailment dropped in June. The majority of the curtailment was solar.

Figure 17: Renewable Curtailment by Reason



Figure 18: Renewable Curtailment by Resource Type



Flexible Ramping Product

On November 1, 2016 the ISO implemented two market products in the 15-minute and 5-minute markets: Flexible Ramping Up and Flexible Ramping Down uncertainty awards. These products provide additional upward and downward flexible ramping capability to account for uncertainty due to demand and renewable forecasting errors. In addition, the existing flexible ramping sufficiency test was extended to ensure feasible ramping capacity for real-time interchange schedules.

Flexible Ramping Product Payment

Figure 19 shows the flexible ramping up and down uncertainty payments. Flexible ramping up uncertainty payment increased to $0.22 million in June from $0.17 million in May. Flexible ramping down uncertainty payment decreased to $6,152 in June from $97,872 in May.

Figure 19: Flexible Ramping Up/down Uncertainty Payment



Figure 20 shows the flexible ramping forecast payment. Flexible ramping forecast payment slipped to $23,431 this month from 27,485 observed in May.

Figure 20: Flexible Ramping Forecast Payment



Indirect Market Performance Metrics

Bid Cost Recovery

Figure 21 shows the daily uplift costs due to exceptional dispatch payments. The monthly uplift costs in June rose to $3.51 million from $1.01 million in May. June 11 and 12 saw high uplift costs driven by the exceptional dispatches issued for load forecast uncertainty.

Figure 21: Exceptional Dispatch Uplift Costs



Figure 22 shows the allocation of bid cost recovery payment in the IFM, residual unit commitment (RUC) and RTM markets. The total bid cost recovery for June increased to $11.77 million from $7.04 million in May. Out of the total monthly bid cost recovery payment for the three markets in June, the IFM market contributed 20 percent, RTM contributed 55 percent, and RUC contributed 25 percent of the total bid cost recovery payment.

Figure 22: Bid Cost Recovery Allocation



Figure 23 and Figure 24 show the daily and monthly BCR cost by local capacity requirement area (LCR) respectively.

Figure 23: Bid Cost Recovery Allocation by LCR



Figure 24: Monthly Bid Cost Recovery Allocation by LCR



Figure 25 and Figure 26 show the daily and monthly BCR cost by utility distribution company (UDC) respectively.

Figure 25: Bid Cost Recovery Allocation by UDC



Figure 26: Monthly Bid Cost Recovery Allocation by UDC



Figure 27 shows the cost related to BCR by cost type in RUC.

Figure 27: Cost in RUC



Figure 28 and Figure 29 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and LCR in RUC respectively.

Figure 28: Cost in RUC by LCR



Figure 29: Monthly Cost in RUC by LCR



Figure 30 and Figure 31 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and UDC in RUC respectively.

Figure 30: Cost in RUC by UDC



Figure 31: Monthly Cost in RUC by UDC



Figure 32 shows the cost related to BCR in real time by cost type. Minimum load cost contributed largely to the real time cost this month.

Figure 32: Cost in Real Time



Figure 33 and Figure 34 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and LCR in real time respectively.

Figure 33: Cost in Real Time by LCR



Figure 34: Monthly Cost in Real Time by LCR



Figure 35 and Figure 36 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and UDC in Real Time respectively.

Figure 35: Cost in Real Time by UDC



Figure 36: Monthly Cost in Real Time by UDC



Figure 37 shows the cost related to BCR in IFM by cost type.

Figure 37: Cost in IFM



Figure 38 and Figure 39 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and location in IFM respectively.

Figure 38: Cost in IFM by LCR



Figure 39: Monthly Cost in IFM by LCR



Figure 40 and Figure 41 show the daily and monthly cost related to BCR by type and UDC in IFM respectively.

Figure 40: Cost in IFM by UDC



Figure 41: Monthly Cost in IFM by UDC



Real-time Imbalance Offset Costs

Figure 42 shows the daily real-time energy and congestion imbalance offset costs. Real-time energy offset cost rose to -$1.36 million in June from -$2.77 million in May. Real-time congestion offset in June cost skidded to -$1.01 million from $12.43 million in May.

Figure 42: Real-Time Energy and Congestion Imbalance Offset



Market Software Metrics

Market performance can be confounded by software issues, which vary in severity levels with the failure of a market run being the most severe.

Market Disruption

A market disruption is an action or event that causes a failure of an ISO market, related to system operation issues or system emergencies.[2] Pursuant to section 7.7.15 of the ISO tariff, the ISO can take one or more of a number of specified actions to prevent a market disruption, or to minimize the extent of a market disruption.

Table 7 lists the number of market disruptions and the number of times that the ISO removed bids (including self-schedules) in any of the following markets in this month. The ISO markets include IFM, RUC, FMM and RTD processes

Table 7: Summary of Market Disruption

Type of CAISO Market	Market Disruption or Reportable	Removal of Bids (including Self-Schedules)
Day-Ahead		
IFM	0	0
RUC	0	0
Real-Time		
FMM Interval 1	6	0
FMM Interval 2	3	0
FMM Interval 3	3	0
FMM Interval 4	3	0
Real-Time Dispatch	75	0

Figure 43 shows the frequency of IFM, HASP (FMM interval 2), FMM (intervals 1, 3 and 4), and RTD failures. There were a total of 90 market disruptions this month. On June 20, there were one FMM and five RTD disruptions due to application issue. There were also ten other RTD disruptions on that day due to broadcast not being successful. On June 29, there were two HASP, six FMM and 22 RTD disruptions due to application issue. There were also one other RTD disruption on that day due to broadcast not being successful.

[2] These system operation issues or system emergencies are referred to in Sections 7.6 and 7.7, respectively, of the ISO tariff.

Figure 43: Frequency of Market Disruption



Manual Market Adjustment

Exceptional Dispatch

Figure 44 shows the daily volume of exceptional dispatches, broken out by market type: real-time incremental dispatch and real-time decremental dispatch. The real-time exceptional dispatches are among one of the following types: a unit commitment at physical minimum; an incremental dispatch above the day-ahead schedule and a decremental dispatch below the day-ahead schedule.

The total volume of exceptional dispatch in June inched up to 119,100 MWh from 116,731 MWh in May.

Figure 44: Total Exceptional Dispatch Volume (MWh) by Market Type



Figure 45 shows the volume of the exceptional dispatch broken out by reason.[3] The majority of the exceptional dispatch volumes in June were driven by planned transmission outage (22 percent), voltage support (18 percent), and load forecast uncertainty (37 percent).

[3] For details regarding the reasons for exceptional dispatch please read the white paper at this link: **http://www.caiso.com/1c89/1c89d76950e00.html**.

Figure 45: Total Exceptional Dispatch Volume (MWh) by Reason



Figure 46 shows the total exceptional dispatch volume as a percent of load, along with the monthly average. The monthly average percentage was 0.59 percent in June, declining from was 0.69 percent in May.

Figure 46: Total Exceptional Dispatch as Percent of Load



Energy Imbalance Market

On November 1, 2014, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (ISO) and Portland-based PacifiCorp fully activated the Energy Imbalance Market (EIM). This real-time market is the first of its kind in the West. EIM covers six western states: California, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Idaho and Wyoming.

On December 1, 2015, NV Energy, the Nevada-based utility successfully began participating in the western Energy Imbalance Market (EIM). On October 1, 2016, Phoenix-based Arizona Public Service (AZPS) and Puget Sound Energy (PSEI) of Washington State successfully began full participation in the western Energy Imbalance Market.

On October 1, 2017, Portland General Electric Company (PGE) became the fifth western utility to successfully begin full participation in the western Energy Imbalance Market (EIM). PGE joins Arizona Public Service, Puget Sound Energy, NV Energy, PacifiCorp and the ISO, together serving over 38 million consumers in eight states: California, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Nevada.

On April 4, 2018, Boise-based Idaho Power and Powerex of Vancouver, British Columbia successfully entered the western Energy Imbalance Market (EIM) today, allowing the ISO's real-time power market to serve energy imbalances occurring within about 55 percent of the electric load in the Western Interconnection. The eight western EIM participants serve more than 42 million consumers in the power grid stretching from the border with Canada south to Arizona, and eastward to Wyoming.

On April 3, 2019, Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), part of the Balancing Authority of Northern California (BANC), successfully began full participation in the Western EIM, becoming the first publicly owned agency to be an EIM entity in the Western EIM.

From June 23 to June 3, 2019, there was a planned market disruption for NEVP due to internal transmission congestion. NEVP did not participate in the EIM during this time period while EIM transfers were locked and administrative pricing rule was in effect for NEVP area.

Figure 47 shows daily simple average ELAP prices for PacifiCorp east (PACE), PacifiCorp West (PACW), NV Energy (NEVP), Arizona Public Service (AZPS), Puget Sound Energy (PSEI), Portland General Electric Company (PGE), Idaho Power (IPCO), Powerex (BCHA), and Sacramento Municipal Utility District (BANCSMUD), for all hours in FMM. The ELAP prices were elevated on June 10 and 11 due to high demand driven by high temperatures.

Figure 47: EIM Simple Average LAP Prices (All Hours) in FMM



Figure 48 shows daily simple average ELAP prices for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD for all hours in RTD. The prices were generally quiet in this month. On June 5, NEVP price spiked due to limited transfer, renewable deviation and upward load forecast. The ELAP prices were elevated on June 10 and 11 due to high demand driven by high temperatures.

Figure 48: EIM Simple Average LAP Prices (All Hours) in RTD



Figure 49 shows the daily price frequency for prices above $250/MWh and negative prices in FMM for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD. The cumulative frequency of prices above $250/MWh increased to 0.43 percent in June from 0.05 percent in May. The cumulative frequency of negative prices declined to 1.74 percent in June from 8.28 percent in May.

Figure 49: Daily Frequency of EIM LAP Positive Price Spikes and Negative Prices in FMM



Figure 50 shows the daily price frequency for prices above $250/MWh and negative prices in RTD for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCOBCHA, and BANCSMUD. The cumulative frequency of prices above $250/MWh rose to 1.02 percent in June from 0.53 from in May. The cumulative frequency of negative prices fell to 3.41 percent in June from 11.52 percent in May.

Figure 50: Daily Frequency of EIM LAP Positive Price Spikes and Negative Prices in RTD



Figure 51 shows daily real-time imbalance energy offset cost (RTIEO) for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total RTIEO decreased to -$3.01 million in June from -$2.41 million in May.

Figure 51: EIM Real-Time Imbalance Energy Offset by Area



Figure 52 shows daily real-time congestion offset cost (RTCO) for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total RTCO increased to -$3.40 million in June from -$3.96 million in May.

Figure 52: EIM Real-Time Congestion Imbalance Offset by Area



Figure 53 shows daily bid cost recovery for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total BCR rose to $1.07 million in June from $0.44 million in May.

Figure 53: EIM Bid Cost Recovery by Area



Figure 54 shows the flexible ramping up uncertainty payment for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total flexible ramping up uncertainty payment in June slipped to $0.06 million from $0.17 million in May.

Figure 54: Flexible Ramping Up Uncertainty Payment



Figure 55 shows the flexible ramping down uncertainty payment for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total flexible ramping down uncertainty payment in June dropped to -$14,727 from $62,176 in May.

Figure 55: Flexible Ramping Down Uncertainty Payment



Figure 56 shows the flexible ramping forecast payment for PACE, PACW, NEVP, AZPS, PSEI, PGE, IPCO, BCHA, and BANCSMUD respectively. Total forecast payment in June increased to -$0.13 million from -$0.31 million in May.

Figure 56: Flexible Ramping Forecast Payment



The ISO's Energy Imbalance Market Business Practice Manual[4] describes the methodology for determining whether an EIM participating resource is dispatched to support transfers to serve California load. The methodology ensures that the dispatch considers the combined energy and associated marginal greenhouse gas (GHG) compliance cost based on submitted bids[5].

The EIM dispatches to support transfers into the ISO were documented in Figure 57 and Table 8 below.

Figure 57: Percentage of EIM Transfer into ISO by Fuel Type



[4] See the Energy Imbalance Market Business Practice Manual for a description of the methodology for making this determination, which begins on page 42 -- http://bpmcm.caiso.com/Pages/BPMDetails.aspx?BPM=Energy Imbalance Market.
[5] A submitted bid may reflect that a resource is not available to support EIM transfers to California.

Table 8: EIM Transfer into ISO by Fuel Type

Month	Coal (%)	Gas (%)	Non-Emitting (%)	Total
Jan-17	0.00%	69.88%	30.12%	100%
Feb-17	0.00%	36.42%	63.58%	100%
Mar-17	0.00%	13.37%	86.63%	100%
Apr-17	0.00%	15.47%	84.53%	100%
May-17	0.00%	18.47%	81.53%	100%
Jun-17	0.00%	21.42%	78.58%	100%
Jul-17	0.00%	36.08%	63.92%	100%
Aug-17	0.00%	59.20%	40.80%	100%
Sep-17	0.00%	45.94%	54.06%	100%
Oct-17	0.00%	24.85%	75.15%	100%
Nov-17	0.00%	11.57%	88.43%	100%
Dec-17	0.00%	15.36%	84.64%	100%
Jan-18	0.00%	9.12%	90.88%	100%
Feb-18	0.00%	15.20%	84.80%	100%
Mar-18	0.16%	25.00%	74.84%	100%
Apr-18	0.00%	0.14%	99.86%	100%
May-18	0.00%	1.09%	98.91%	100%
Jun-18	0.00%	2.89%	97.11%	100%
Jul-18	0.00%	25.04%	74.96%	100%
Aug-18	0.00%	35.87%	64.13%	100%
Sep-18	0.00%	35.50%	64.50%	100%
Oct-18	0.00%	24.51%	75.49%	100%
Nov-18	1.16%	53.81%	45.03%	100%
Dec-18	2.00%	57.77%	40.23%	100%
Jan-19	0.46%	53.87%	45.67%	100%
Feb-19	5.60%	58.13%	36.28%	100%
Mar-19	1.07%	55.40%	43.52%	100%
Apr-19	1.15%	47.18%	51.67%	100%
May-19	2.22%	34.75%	63.03%	100%
Jun-19	3.47%	35.32%	61.21%	100%