

Requests for Information

1 PUB-CA-002 **On page 17, lines 11 to 15 Elenchus states: “Given the increasing**
2 **uncertainty about the long-term value of traditional generation,**
3 **transmission and distribution grid assets, prudence dictates that**
4 **options that are less vulnerable to stranding should be given preference**
5 **over traditional assets, even if their expected cost is modestly higher**
6 **based on a scenario in which market disruptions are more benign than**
7 **the more dire scenarios that can be envisioned.”**

8
9 a) **Is there a risk of impact to reliability and adequate supply in the**
10 **near-term if existing sources are replaced with non-traditional**
11 **options? If so, how can this risk be accounted for in least-cost**
12 **planning?**

13
14 b) **How does a utility address the uncertainty with take-up by**
15 **customers of non-grid options while at the same time having the**
16 **obligation to provide reliable service at the lowest possible cost?**

17
18 RESPONSE: a) Provided that standard planning practices are adhered to, there will
19 be no abnormal risk of an impact to reliability and adequate supply
20 in the near-term if existing sources are replaced with non-traditional
21 options.

22
23 No supply of power is 100% reliable. This reality is the basis for
24 including reserve margin in power system planning. Planned
25 capacity is set at a level that equals projected demand plus the
26 required reserve margin. The determination of the required reserve
27 margin takes into account the reliability of individual supply
28 resources; hence, the assumed available capacity for intermittent
29 generation resources (e.g., wind and solar), as a percentage of their
30 rated capacity, is much lower than the assumed available capacity
31 for hydro generation.

32
33 Least cost planning therefore embeds differences in the reliability of
34 individual supply resources in the economic analysis of the
35 alternatives. This analysis requires the holistic analysis that is
36 provided by integrated resource planning (“IRP”) since the impact
37 of the reliability of any individual supply resource on overall system
38 reliability cannot be assessed in isolation.

39
40 Elenchus notes that both NLH and NP offer their customers an
41 interruptible supply option. The conceptual approach to
42 incorporating Interruptible supply into system planning as a supply

1 tool rather than a customer service has evolved in recent years.² The
2 interruptible supply option is best utilized to the extent that it is the
3 least cost option for balancing available resources and customer
4 requirements. Interruptible supply options also have the attraction
5 that they are highly flexible since terms and conditions, including
6 price, can be adjusted in response to changes in firm supply and firm
7 demand over the years.

- 8
9 b) The inherent “uncertainty with take-up by customers of non-grid
10 options” can be managed prudently by ensuring that the utility has
11 access to flexible supply resources, including interruptible supply
12 options as noted above.

13
14 There are two primary approaches to maintaining flexibility of
15 supply resources consistent with the scenario analysis of the high
16 and low projections of future requirements for capacity and energy.

- 17
18 1) Adopting options that have comparatively low fixed costs and
19 comparatively high variable costs. The high variable costs
20 will not be incurred in the longer run if the capacity is not
21 required. This approach can include technological options as
22 well as contractual options. A flexible alternative will be
23 prudent if the expected cost of the flexible alternative (i.e.,
24 the cost weighted by an estimate of the probability of alternate
25 scenarios) is less than the cost of the non-flexible option.

- 26
27 2) Adopting options that can be scaled up if and when additional
28 capacity is required. Again, the flexible alternative will be
29 prudent if the expected cost of the flexible alternative (i.e.,
30 the cost weighted by an estimate of the probability of alternate
31 scenarios) is less than the cost of the non-flexible option. This
32 approach is the basis of treating interruptible options for
33 customers as a supply tool.

34
35 The least cost option is based on scenario analysis that explicitly
36 takes into account the cost and probability of the alternative
37 scenarios.

² For example see Elenchus Research Associates, Report on Énergir's Cost Allocation and Pricing of Gas Supply, Transportation and Load Balancing Services and Supply of Interruptible Service, October 17, 2019 which was prepared for the Régie de l'énergie.