

DOCKETED

Docket Number:	18-IRP-01
Project Title:	Integrated Resource Plan
TN #:	228295
Document Title:	Supporting information for TID's IRP submission
Description:	Email
Filer:	Harinder Kaur
Organization:	California Energy Commission
Submitter Role:	Commission Staff
Submission Date:	5/16/2019 11:06:52 AM
Docketed Date:	5/16/2019

From: Willie G. Manuel <wgmanuel@TID.ORG>
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2019 1:45 PM
To: Vidaver, David@Energy <David.Vidaver@energy.ca.gov>
Cc: Deaver, Paul@Energy <Paul.Deaver@energy.ca.gov>; Cory R. Sobotta <crsobotta@TID.ORG>
Subject: RE: A couple of questions regarding the IRP

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Below are the answers to your questions:

- 1) The incremental GHG emissions estimates due to EV is based the attached CEC EV calculator with the following major assumptions changed from the CEC default values:
 - a. 5 mil EVs by 2030 (Gov. Brown's goal)
 - i. This higher EV growth assumption results in higher forecasted TID GHG emissions and higher future RPS requirements. If TID experiences lower EV growth than forecasted then our actual GHG emissions would be lower than forecasted which already meets the ARB target and RPS procurement will be higher than needed (provides margin to compensate for lower than expected actual renewable generation).
 - ii. Difference in EV MWh consumption between CEC default EV growth and 5 Mil EV by 2030 is small relative to the overall TID load.
 - b. 4% T&D losses (cell B79 in Input tab)
 - c. Assumed GHG intensity value of 0.428 mTons/MWh (line 87 in Input tab)
 - d. VMT Decay based on ARB not CEC (cell B6 in Results tab)
 - e. TID specific BEV/PHEV ratio from CVRP (lines 33-34 in Results tab)

2) The TID Board only adopted goals for the 2017-2026 period as required by statute. However, the model TID used to determine the adopted goals had estimates for several years past 2026. We used those numbers from the model in our IRP and they are as follows:

2027	2028	2029	2030
9,983	9,479	9,052	8,686

They are not much different than the CEC's estimates in your email. But I figured that if you used the numbers above they will be more consistent with what was in the IRP calculations.

Let me know if you have any other questions. Otherwise how is the review going along, any feedback would be appreciated.

Thanks,
Willie Manuel
Resource Planning Department Manager
Turlock Irrigation District
333 East Canal Drive
P.O. Box 949
Turlock, CA 95380
Phone 209-883-8348
Fax 209-656-2147

From: Vidaver, David@Energy <David.Vidaver@energy.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 3:59 PM
To: Willie G. Manuel <wgmanuel@TID.ORG>; Cory R. Sobotta <crsobotta@TID.ORG>
Cc: Deaver, Paul@Energy <Paul.Deaver@energy.ca.gov>
Subject: A couple of questions regarding the IRP

Gentlemen:

We're in the process of writing up our review and have a couple of questions.

- 1) Can you briefly describe the assumptions that drive the estimates of incremental GHG emissions due to having to meet growing vehicle electrification load?
- 2) On page 34 of the IRP, you enumerate annual energy efficiency goals in MWh for 2017 – 2026. Do you have corresponding goals for 2027 – 2030? If not, staff may extrapolate the values by reducing the 2027 value to 2026 – 0.5(2026-2024), 2028 to (2027) - 0.5(2027 – 2025), 2029 to 2028 – 0.5(2028 – 2026), and 2030 to 2029 – 0.5(2029 – 2027). This yields the following series:

2024	11638
2025	11023
2026	10476
2027	9895
2028	9331
2029	8759
2030	8190

Do you have any objections to our using this series as long as we identify it as being a creation of the Energy Commission staff?

Thanks,

Dave

Dave Vidaver
California Energy Commission
David.Vidaver@energy.ca.gov
916-654-4656