

Stakeholder Comments Template

Transmission Access Charge Options

December 6, 2016 Draft Regional Framework Proposal

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
<i>Andrew Meditz 916-732-6124</i>	<i>Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)</i>	<i>January 12, 2017</i>

SMUD appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Regional Framework Proposal. Our comments at this time are limited to issue number 2 below.

The ISO provides this template for submission of stakeholder comments on the December 6, 2016 draft regional framework proposal and the discussion at the December 13 stakeholder meeting. The proposal, presentations and other information related to this initiative may be found at:

<http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/TransmissionAccessChargeOptions.aspx>

Upon completion of this template please submit it to initiativecomments@caiso.com. Submissions are requested by close of business on **January 11, 2017**.

NOTE: Items highlighted in yellow below refer to elements of the present proposal that have not changed from the prior proposal, the second revised straw proposal posted on September 28. If your organization's position on one of these elements has not changed from the comments you submitted on the September 28 proposal, you may simply refer to your prior comments in response to that item and the CAISO will take your prior comments as reflecting your current position.

Draft Regional Framework Proposal

1. The proposal defines "new facilities" as facilities that are planned and approved under an integrated TPP that will plan new transmission infrastructure for the entire expanded BAA and will commence upon integration of the first new PTO. Please comment on the CAISO's proposal for the definition of "new facilities."

No Comment

The proposal previously defined “existing facilities” as transmission facilities that are in service or have been approved in separate planning processes for the current CAISO BAA and the new PTO’s area at the time the new PTO is fully integrated into the expanded BAA. Simply stated, all transmission facilities that are included in the controlled grid for the expanded BAA and are not “new” facilities will be considered “existing” facilities. Please comment on the CAISO’s proposal for the definition of “existing facilities.”

No Comment

2. The CAISO provided further details on the determination of whether a candidate PTO should be deemed “integrated” within an existing sub-region rather than designated a new sub-region. The CAISO proposed that the expanded ISO would work with the candidate PTO and other stakeholders to apply criteria specified in the tariff (listed in the December 6 proposal) for making this determination. The CAISO would then present its recommendation to the Board of Governors as part of the new PTO application process, and upon Board approval would file for FERC approval of the proposal to treat the new PTO as either a new sub-region or part of an existing sub-region. Please comment on this element of the proposal.

SMUD supported the one-time option proposed in the CAISO’s Revised Straw Proposal of May 20, 2016 primarily because it provided similar treatment as given PacifiCorp. In its subsequent Second Revised Straw Proposal of September 30, 2016, the CAISO abandoned the one-time option and proposed a new “integrated” test based on the IBAA factors. SMUD questioned at that time, and continues to question, the legitimacy of an “integrated” test based on the IBAA factors. While we understand the CAISO’s attempt to create an objective test based on established factors, the CAISO’s Draft Regional Framework Proposal of December 6, 2016 states that the determination will be made on a case-by-case basis. This is ripe for subjective application and the IBAA factors (and any other factors that are unknown at this time that could be included) may be used to target certain potential PTOs to pay a higher existing sub-regional TAC rate, or as a tool to entice another PTO to join and retain its own lower sub-regional TAC rate. Overall, this test creates an arbitrary evaluation and is ripe for inequitable treatment.

As SMUD has stated before, many potential “integrated” and “embedded” PTOs have transmission rates that are much lower than the CAISO TAC, and should be given the same License Plate rate treatment joining a regional market as PacifiCorp. In addition, by its own account (Draft Regional Framework Proposal of December 6, 2016, Page 11), the CAISO acknowledges the accepted rationale that

“individual PTO or planning areas had made decisions to build their existing systems for the benefit of their existing ratepayers without any anticipation of some other parties paying part of those costs.” This is the basis for the License Plate rate approach and should be applied equally to every new PTO that contemplates joining the CAISO.

At this point, since the CAISO has abandoned the specific one-time option proposal, and given the uncertainty created by the new IBAA-like test and the arbitrary and inequitable treatment between PTOs, SMUD strongly suggests the CAISO remove the integrated (and embedded) distinction from the proposal.

3. Consistent with the second revised straw proposal, the CAISO proposes to recover the costs of existing facilities through sub-regional “license plate” TAC rates. The CAISO has proposed that each sub-region’s existing facilities would comprise “legacy” facilities for which subsequent new sub-regions have no cost responsibility. Please comment on this aspect of the proposal.

No Comment

4. The CAISO proposes to use the Transmission Economic Assessment Methodology (TEAM) to determine economic benefits to the expanded ISO region as a whole and to each sub-region. Please comment on the use of the TEAM methodology to determine sub-regional shares of economic benefits.

No Comment

5. The CAISO assumes that a new integrated TPP for the expanded ISO will retain today’s TPP structure. Please comment on the structure of the current three phase TPP process.

No Comment

The CAISO proposes to allocate the entire cost to a sub-region if a reliability project within that sub-region only addresses a reliability need of that sub-region or if a policy-driven project within that sub-region is approved only to support the policy mandates for that sub-region. Please comment on this element of the proposal.

No Comment

The CAISO proposes to allocate the cost of an economic project, for which the economic benefits must exceed its cost, to sub-regions in proportion to each sub-region's economic benefits. Please comment on this element of the proposal.

No Comment

6.

7. For a reliability project that is enhanced or replaced by a more costly project that also provides economic benefits that exceed the incremental cost above the cost of the original reliability project, the avoided cost of the original project will be allocated to the sub-region with the original reliability need, and the incremental cost will be allocated to sub-regions in proportion to each sub-region's economic benefits. Please comment on this proposal.

8. For a policy-driven project that is enhanced or replaced by a more costly project that also provides economic benefits that exceed the incremental cost above the cost of the original policy-driven project, the avoided cost of the original project will be allocated to the sub-region with the original policy need, and the incremental cost will be allocated to sub-regions in proportion to each sub-region's economic benefits. Please comment on this proposal.

9. In the December 6 proposal the CAISO introduced an approach for allocating costs more granularly than just to sub-regions for certain policy-driven projects and for the policy-driven costs of projects that provide economic benefits in addition to meeting policy needs. The proposal is based on the following principles: If a project that meets policy needs is built within a different sub-region from the state or local regulatory authorities driving the policy need, the policy-related project cost will be allocated only to the load of those regulatory authorities driving the policy need. Alternatively, if a project that meets policy needs is built within the same sub-region as the state or local regulatory authorities driving the policy need, that project is deemed to provide benefits to the entire sub-region and therefore the policy-related costs will be allocated to the sub-region as a whole rather than on a more granular basis. Please comment on these principles.

No Comment

10. Continuing with the scenario of item 10 and applying the principles above, for a policy-driven project, if the new project is built outside the sub-region where the regulatory authorities driving the policy need are located, the ISO will allocate the policy-related avoided cost to the load served under the state or local regulatory authority or authorities whose policy mandates drove the need for the original project. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

11. Similarly, if the policy driver of the project was a federal policy, then for sub-regions other than the sub-region in which the project is built the ISO will allocate the associated avoided cost to the load served in each state in proportion to the state's need for the project to comply with the federal policy mandate. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

12. For a policy-driven project that supports policy mandates of more than one sub-region, or that is built in one sub-region to meet the policy mandates of another sub-region, the ISO will calculate the economic benefits of the project and allocate costs to each sub-region in proportion to the sub-region's benefits, but only up to the point where each sub-region's cost share equals the sub-region's benefits. Any additional cost of the project will be allocated to the load served under the state or local regulatory authorities within each sub-region, other than the sub-region in which the project is built, whose policy mandates drove the need for the project. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

13. Continuing with the scenario of a policy-driven project that supports policy mandates of more than one sub-region, if the policy driver of the project was a federal policy, then for

sub-regions other than the sub-region in which the project is built the ISO will allocate the project costs to the load served in each state in proportion to the state's need for the project to comply with the federal policy mandate. In such cases, if the project also supports policy mandates within the same sub-region in which the project is built, the ISO will allocate that sub-region's share of the policy-driven costs to the entire sub-region as part of the sub-regional TAC. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

14. Competitive solicitation to select the entity to build and own a new transmission project would apply to all new transmission projects rated 200 kV or greater, of any category, with exceptions only as stated in ISO tariff section 24.5.1 Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

15. The proposal indicated that the ISO would establish a formula for a single export rate (export access charge or "EAC") for the expanded region, and under the proposal, non-PTO entities would pay the same sub-regional TAC rate paid by other loads in the same sub-region. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

16. The EAC would be calculated as the sum of all high-voltage transmission revenue requirements (TRRs) of all PTOs within the expanded BAA divided by the sum of the projected internal load for the entire expanded BAA. Please comment on this element of the proposal.

No Comment

17. The CAISO proposes to allocate shares of the EAC revenues to each sub-region in proportion to their total high-voltage TRR. Please comment.

No Comment

18. The CAISO proposes to break down each sub-region's share of the EAC revenues into portions to be allocated to the sub-regional TAC and each state or local regulatory authority whose load is paying a share of the high-voltage TRR for policy-driven transmission whose costs are not included in the sub-regional TAC. These shares of the sub-region's EAC revenue would be in the same proportion as the corresponding shares of the sub-regional high-voltage TRR. This element of the proposal would not affect the allocation of EAC revenues between sub-regions. Please comment on this proposal.

No Comment

19. Please provide any additional comments on topics that were not covered in the questions above.

No Comment