2025 Reassessment and Restudy Report Meeting Follow Up

Important Note: The Facilities study sets the Maximum Cost Responsibility (cost cap) for NUs. Appendix B IR modifications are received before the Facilities study but will not be studied until the next cluster's Restudy (no power flow or SCD studies are performed in the Facilities study). Any project that has a cost change (up or down) due to an Appendix B modification that are associated with a shared NU cannot result in an increased cost for other projects. While an Appendix B modification might decrease a project's contribution towards a required NU, the project may not see the benefit of that reduction if it would result in cost increases to other projects. In other words, any cost allocation percentages of other projects will not be increased.

Appendix KK Section 3.8.1 allows for penalty free withdrawal after the Restudy if the Network Upgrade costs assigned to the Interconnection Request identified in that report have increased by more than twenty-five percent (25%) from the Cluster Study Report, but after the Facilities Study this option compares the Restudy costs to the Facilities Study costs and must increase by 100%.

PG&E Area

1. If a project wants to update their generator characteristics to get under the 100 A threshold, must they submit the changes to Appendix B, or can they also make the changes via MMA following Facilities Study? The reason we are seeking clarification is because in the past, following phase 2, if a generator made changes to their project via MMA, and a reassessment determined that the upgrade was still necessary – then the generator was still responsible for the upgrade regardless of the changes made. In a POST-IPE scenario, if a generator makes a MMA change post Facilities Study, and the reassessment determines that they are under 100 A, but the upgrade is still needed, will they be removed from cost responsibility?
    - The request would be captured in an MMA, however if the upgrade is still necessary the project would still be responsible for their portion of costs. Also, please refer to the "Important Note" at the top of this document.

2. The Los Banos SCD upgrade values need attention. Some of them have negative contribution, and the others are a few times higher compared with fault level from a similar sized project sharing gen-tie. Will addendums be issued?
    - From Cluster 15 Study to the Restudy, there is a difference in how the series compensation at Dry Lake is modeled. This difference contributes to the change in results for the LS Power generation. PG&E Protection has validated the values and didn't see a need to update the results for LS Power projects.

3. Based on the discussions and as confirmed by PG&E about the incorrect distance (35.86 miles from Midway) of the Dry Lake POI that is mentioned in the '*Substation and Transmission*

Line Work Scope' document, can CAISO please issue a revised Appendix addendum that corrects the distances of the location based on published coordinates?
   - Awaiting Response

4. During the C15 Review call for PG&E GBA, there was a discussion regarding short circuit issues at Midway, and PG&E commented that the CB's at Midway have recently been upgraded to 50 kA and that upgrades to 63 kA were in progress. However, the restricted POI information does not indicate this. What is the situation at Midway?
   - Awaiting Response

5. If a project needs to change/update its location while in the study process, is this done purely by indicating so in the Appendix B form while also updating the requisite design information and providing the new site control proof as confirmation of 100% site control?
   - The change of project site must be completed via MAA after the Facilities study has been completed.

6. Will redacted appendix A's and reassessment studies be posted to the Market Participation Portal. Substantial changes have been made to the results, therefore, a clear understanding of those changes across all queue positions is useful, even if redacted. The Reports section of the C15 Phase 1 in MPP only shows reports from January.
   - Redacted Reassessment and Restudy reports will not be posted.

7. Can customers reduce the CRD deposit if the ANUs are reduced?
   - If the required 10% CRD is less than the required 5%, customers may work with the PTO to reduce the deposit on file. However the CRD on file may never be less than the CRD provided at intake, regardless of the cost of assigned NUs.

8. Regarding SCD GRNU mitigation for Tesla 500 kV CBs 512, 522, 532, 552, 622, 632, 652, 712, 722, 732 Overstress. Total project contributions on this overload is approximately 3 kA, yet the total overload is 16 kA. What is the cause of the C15 overload? Please identify the upgrades responsible. Why is the pre case overload so high?
   - Awaiting Response

9. In the Cluster report the Nortech 115 kV upgrades were allocated 100% to Q2230, which has withdrawn. In the reassessment report the upgrades were allocated 100% to a different project that is active in the queue. How did this project go from reducing fault current at Nortech in the cluster study appendix E to increasing the fault current in the reassessment?
   - The missing upgrade at Nortech was due to an Aspen software iteration issue from C15 Cluster Study and has been addressed in C15 Restudy.

10. In the PGE NGBA Interconnection Area Report, it was shown that the GRNU Cottonwood 230 kV Circuit Breaker 212, 242, 282 replacement was assigned in Cluster 13 and CB 272 and 282 in Cluster 14. In the initial Cluster 15 Study, all 5 CBs were assigned to QX as CANU. Why were they not assigned to QY as CANUs if the cost will fall on the project if previous projects withdraw as the condition?

- There were convergent issues from Aspen software in Cluster 15 Cluster study and since the removal of the convergent issues, the results are different for Qx short circuit duty contribution in the Restudy. In the Cluster 15 Cluster Study, prior Cluster 13 and Cluster 14 projects that triggered the Cottonwood GRNUs were still active. In Cluster 15 Restudy, all prior Cluster projects have withdrawn, and Cottonwood upgrades are identified as still needed, hence they have been assigned to C15 projects as GRNUs in the Restudy.

11. What is CAISO's methodology for determining which project receives CANU disclosure, and how are projects expected to make informed commercial readiness and milestone decisions with full knowledge of their conditional cost exposure when that CANU disclosure is deferred or omitted?
    - The CANUs are identified in the study results along with the estimated in-service timeline. While it's rare, new upgrades can become assigned to projects through the restudy (reassessment) process. The Maximum Cost Responsibility is established in the Facilities Study. The Cluster study and Cluster Restudy establish the estimated, non-binding Current Cost Responsibility, Maximum Cost Responsibility, and Maximum Cost Exposure for each Interconnection Request, until the issuance of the Interconnection Facilities Study report.

12. Can the generator characteristics be updated in the appendix b?
    - Please send what you are trying to accomplish through the Appendix B to irinfo@caiso.com and we will review.

13. We are observing inconsistencies with the Short Circuit Study results and would like additional clarifications. When we total all project contributions they do not add up to the total impact presented in the report. We see a 17% mismatch for cottonwood 230 kV.
    - When PG&E examines fault current at a bus, we consider both the magnitude and angle of the current, viewing it as a vector quantity. Appendix E displays only the current magnitude and does not account for the vector contribution; therefore, simply adding the magnitudes will not yield meaningful results. The contribution at each station can vary according to transformers, lines, generation, and other components that affect the fault current at the station.

SCE Area

1. Is CAISO thinking of framework to decide which projects get to be part of the RAS?

This would be important because projects that cannot be on the RAS will see heavy curtailment.

- Footnote 4 in the ISO Planning Standards and Guidelines for Remedial Action Schemes states the following.

  "The generating facilities selected to participate in a generation dropping RAS should be optimized, so that generation deliverability and feasible congestion mitigation benefits are maximized."

  - https://www.caiso.com/documents/iso-planning-standards-effective-feb22023.pdf