January 4, 2023

MEMORANDUM

TO: Council Members

FROM: John Fazio, Senior Power Systems Analyst

SUBJECT: 2027 Resource Adequacy Assessment

BACKGROUND:

Presenters: John Ollis, John Fazio, Dan Hua, Dor Hirsh Bar Gai

Summary: Staff will brief the Council on the results of the resource adequacy assessment for 2027. Analysis indicates that the regional power supply will not be adequate when relying solely on existing resources, existing reserve levels, and on no new energy efficiency measures. However, adequacy is expected to be maintained if resources and reserves identified in the 2021 Power Plan’s resource strategy are added to the supply. If future electricity market supplies are significantly limited or if demand increases rapidly (e.g., with the implementation of accelerated electrification policies) or if major resources are retired earlier than expected without replacement, then additional resources and reserves will be required to maintain adequacy, as anticipated by the 2021 Power Plan.

Staff is asking the Council to agree to release of the 2027 Resource Adequacy Assessment publicly, including any committee amendments to the executive summary and after any needed editorial edits to the report. In addition, staff is asking the Council to direct staff to continue the development of the multi-metric approach for future assessments, as we believe it provides a more robust approach for assessing adequacy.
Staff is anticipating that the Power Committee will make a recommendation to the Council for both release of the report and the continued work on new metrics. Note that staff is seeking the informal endorsement of the Council members, not a formal decision of the Council by motion and vote.

Relevance: Resource adequacy is a critical component of the Council’s mandate to develop a regional power plan that “ensures an adequate, efficient, economic and reliable power supply.” To test the efficacy of the plan’s resource strategy, the Council – in cooperation with regional stakeholders – annually assesses the adequacy of the power supply with planned resource additions derived from the plan’s resource strategy. The annual assessment is based on a resource adequacy standard established by the Council in 2011. However, for this year’s assessment, the Council enhanced its assessment by also examining measures related to shortfall frequency, duration, and magnitude.

Background: An adequate power supply should meet the electric energy requirements of its customers within acceptable limits, considering a reasonable range of uncertainty in resource availability and in demand. Resource uncertainty includes forced outages, early retirements and variations in wind, solar and market supplies. Demand uncertainty includes variations due to temperature, economic conditions, and other factors. Resource availability and demand are also affected by environmental policies, such as those aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The Council uses a Monte-Carlo simulation model to assess the likelihood of a future year having one or more disruptions to service, when considering the many different combinations of future resource availabilities and demands described above. The metric used, referred to as the annual LOLP, has been instrumental in the development of the Council’s power plans since the early 2000s. However, due to increasing complexities (e.g., significant development of renewable and distributed resources, adoption of clean-air laws and a more dynamic market environment), LOLP is no longer sufficient to accurately measure the adequacy of the region’s power supply and the risk to customers.

An enhanced adequacy assessment includes metrics related to the frequency, duration, and magnitude of potential shortfalls. The objectives for the new standard are to:

- Prevent high use of emergency measures
- Limit occurrences of very long shortfall events
- Limit occurrences of big capacity shortfalls
- Limit occurrences of big energy shortfalls
With the approval of the Council, staff will continue to develop this approach to assess adequacy and will work with all stakeholders to refine the limits set for all adequacy measures.
2027 Adequacy Assessment

January 11, 2023
Council Meeting
Objectives

Seeking Council agreement on the following two items:

1. Release the 2027 Resource Adequacy Assessment publicly
2. Direct staff to continue the development of the multi-metric approach for future assessments
Overview

- Role of the Adequacy Assessment
- Adequacy Metrics
- Results Overview
- Next Steps
Role of Assessment (1)

- Assess bulk power system adequacy of the plan’s resource strategy.
  - In recent times, this has primarily been the energy efficiency target accompanied with sited, licensed and constructed new resources built since the plan. Since the 2021 Power Plan resource strategy has more specific direction when it comes to interpreting the resource strategy for new generating resources and demand response this assessment includes those in the analysis as well.

- A resource adequacy assessment is only a relative measure of customer risk.
  - It does not draw a bright line between a system with no risk and one with risk. An “adequate” system is not immune to resource shortfalls nor is an “inadequate” system certain to have them.
Role of Assessment (2)

- The assessment focuses on bulk system supply-side adequacy, not distribution.
  - Pertinent given the recent severe storm across the US as clarification, a supply-side adequacy assessment of a severe storm considers the impact of a prolonged increase of heating demand, and not the risk of downed transmission lines or damaged substations. While important to evaluate, these are excluded from the scope of Council adequacy assessments.

- By examining additional adequacy measures, the Council can identify the risks associated with shortfalls in regional power supply more precisely.
  - The Council has used a Loss of Load Probability threshold in the past to protect against low hydro conditions in conjunction with high load conditions and thermal forced outage events. Large additions of variable energy resources (wind, solar, etc.) throughout the system changes the prevailing risks. These additional adequacy measures better identify these risks and help the region target more specific mitigation options.
Transitioning to a Multi-Metric Adequacy Standard

- **Current standard**
  - Power supply is adequate if the annual LOLP is 5% or less
  - Measures the likelihood of a future year having *one or more* shortfall events of any size and duration

- **Limitations**
  - No measure of *shortfall event* size, duration or frequency
  - No indication of shortfall timing (i.e., seasonality)
Objectives for the New Standard

- Prevent overly frequent use of emergency measures
- Limit occurrences of very long shortfall events
- Limit occurrences of big capacity shortfalls
- Limit occurrences of big energy shortfalls
Value at Risk Metric

Value-at-risk is a statistical measure of the risk of shortfall for a specified confidence level and is often referred to as a "tail-end" metric.

For example, VaR$_{97.5}$ is the 97.5$^{th}$ highest shortfall out of all possibilities, reflecting a once per 40-year risk of a shortfall equal to or greater than the VaR$_{97.5}$ value.

A power supply is deemed adequate if its VaR$_{97.5}$ value is less than the predetermined VaR$_{97.5}$ adequacy limit.

Two power supplies with a 5% LOLP have differing VaR$_{97.5}$ values. Assuming a VaR$_{97.5}$ adequacy limit of 1000 MW, the blue case is adequate, but the red case is not.

![Capacity Shortfall Duration Curve](image)
Proposed Metrics

- **LOLEV** – *Prevent overly frequent use of emergency measures*
  - Expected number of shortfall events/year, counting all shortfall events
  - Adequacy Limit = TBD, possible range 0.1 or 0.2 shortfall events/year

- **Duration VaR\textsubscript{97.5}** – *Limit the risk of long shortfall events to 1/40 years*
  - Longest shortfall event for the 97.5\textsuperscript{th} worst simulation year
  - Adequacy Limit = TBD, possible range 8 to 12 hours (e.g., start of a cold snap or heat wave)

- **Peak VaR\textsubscript{97.5}** – *Limit the risk of big capacity shortfalls to 1/40 years*
  - Highest single-hour shortfall for the 97.5\textsuperscript{th} worst simulation year
  - Adequacy Limit = TBD, possible range 2,000 to 3,000 MW
  - Limit set to aggregate emergency capacity or acceptable amount of single-hour demand at risk

- **Energy VaR\textsubscript{97.5}** – *Limit the risk of big energy shortfalls to 1/40 years*
  - Total annual shortfall energy for the 97.5\textsuperscript{th} worst simulation year
  - Adequacy Limit = TBD, possible range 4,000 to 8,000 MWh
  - Limit set to aggregate emergency energy or acceptable amount of annual energy demand at risk
Examples of Non-modeled Emergency Measures

**Quantifying Emergency Capability is Difficult**

**Type 1:**
- High operating cost resources not in utility’s active portfolio
- High-priced market purchases over max import limits
- Load buy-back provisions
- Industry backup generators
- Banks Lake emergency generation

**Type 2:**
- Official’s call for conservation
- Reduce less essential public load (e.g., gov’t buildings, streetlights, etc.)
- Utility emergency load reduction protocols
- Curtail F&W hydro operations

**Capacity Shortfall Duration Curve**

Setting the VaR\textsubscript{97.5} limit equal to Type 1 emergency measure capability means that in 97.5% of years, Type 1 measures will offset anticipated shortfalls. The risk of a real curtailment is reduced to no more than once per 40 years and depends on the capability of extraordinary emergency measures.

For example, Type 1 emergency measures can be used to set the VaR\textsubscript{97.5} adequacy limit.
Evaluating the Resource Strategy

- **Resource Strategy (RS Ref)**
  1. 1,000 aMW of new EE
  2. 720 MW of new DR
  3. 5,410 MW of additional new Renewables
     - 590 MW of new renewables already built since plan
  4. 6,000 MW of Up Reserves
     - 3,100 MW of additional balancing up reserves over current regional reserve assumptions

- **Resource Strategy (Min RS)**
  1. 750 aMW of new EE
  2. 720 MW of new DR
  3. 2,910 MW of additional new Renewables
     - 590 MW of new renewables already built since plan
  4. 6,000 MW of Up Reserves
     - 3,100 MW of additional balancing up reserves over current regional reserve assumptions

- **No Resource Strategy (No RS)**
  - Just the 590 MW of new renewables already built since plan

---

**2021 Plan Strategy**
- Energy Efficiency: 750-1,000 aMW
- Renewable Resources: at least 3,500 MW (wind, solar, etc.)
- Demand Response: 720 MW
  - 520 MW of demand voltage regulation
  - 200 MW from time-of-use rates
- Additional reserves for adequacy: at least 3,100 MW
Reminder of Studies

- **Plan Resource Strategy**
  - Resource Strategy baseline (*RS Ref*)
  - No Resource Strategy (*No RS*)
  - Minimum Resource Strategy (*Min RS*)
  - Limited Markets (*RS Ref*)
  - High WECC Demand (*RS Ref, +200 aMW EE*)

- **Market Conditions**
  - Global Instability (*RS Ref*)
  - Early Coal Retirement (*RS Ref*)
  - No WECC Buildout (*RS Ref*)

- **WECC Stress**
  - SW Drought (*RS Ref*)
  - Pipeline Freeze (*RS Ref*)
  - Wildfire (*RS Ref*)
Limited Markets

- Removed planning reserve margins
  - Implemented by setting operating pool planning reserve margins to -99 in AURORA
  - All other inputs the same as the baseline

Figure 1: Summer Reliability Risk Area Summary
High WECC Demand

- High electrification Pacific NW, California, BC and Alberta
  - High demand only in those areas, baseline forecast elsewhere

- All other inputs the same as the baseline, except updating policy targets (in MWhs)
Persistent Global Instability

- Higher fuel costs and delayed renewable deployment.
  - Implemented by changing maximum annual new additions on short duration storage, solar and wind generation until 2030.

- Other resource ramps unchanged due to online date or previous restrictions

- All other inputs the same as the baseline
Early Coal Retirement

- Removal of Colstrip 3 and 4 from the adequacy analysis without replacement
No WECC Buildout

- Only existing resources across the WECC, except the NW
- Reference resource strategy included for the PNW
Pipeline Freeze-off

i. Loss of 5,000 MW natural gas from Arizona

ii. November – February
SW Drought

i. Glen Canyon
   i. Removal of 923 MW (Arizona)

ii. Hoover
   i. Removal of 730 MW (Arizona)
   ii. Removal of 316 MW (Nevada South)

iii. Lake Oroville
   i. Removal of 542 MW (No_Cal)

iv. See Lake Shasta
   i. Removal of 315 MW (No_Cal)

On Average, 2,826 MW of SW hydro is removed
Wildfire

i. BPA_OR <-> PACW: 5,800 MW

ii. BPA_OR <-> IP: 2,000 MW

iii. BPA_OR <-> BPA_WA: 7,500 MW

iv. Wildfire dates:
   i. July 16-23
   ii. Derating:
      i. 50-90% of lines
Key Takeaways

- System is adequate with the plan resource strategy but is not adequate if we do nothing.
  - In the high demand world, we need to do more, as described in the strategy
  - When retiring existing resources early, we need to do more, as indicated in plan analysis

- Strategy effective at eliminating summer shortfalls and mitigating winter events

- Market reliance limit is serving us well for now, but market dynamics do pose some risks to monitor
System is Adequate in 2027 Under Plan Strategy

- System is adequate with the plan resource strategy

- The system is not adequate if we do nothing.

- High WECC demand (caused by, say, a faster pace of electrification) is a risk requiring more resources as outlined in the plan strategy

- Plan analysis showed and this study confirmed that early coal retirement is a risk requiring more resources to maintain adequacy
# Results Overview

| Provisional Limit | <5% LOLP | <5% LOLEV | <5% VaR Duration | <5% VaR Peak | <5% Var Energy | 0.1-0.2 Event-year LOLP | 0.1-0.2 Event-year LOLEV | 0.1-0.2 Event-year VaR Duration | 0.1-0.2 Event-year VaR Peak | 0.1-0.2 Event-year Var Energy | 8-12 Hours LOLP | 8-12 Hours LOLEV | 8-12 Hours VaR Duration | 8-12 Hours VaR Peak | 8-12 Hours Var Energy | 2,000-3,000 MW LOLP | 2,000-3,000 MW LOLEV | 2,000-3,000 MW VaR Duration | 2,000-3,000 MW VaR Peak | 2,000-3,000 MW Var Energy | 4,000-8,000 MWh LOLP | 4,000-8,000 MWh LOLEV | 4,000-8,000 MWh VaR Duration | 4,000-8,000 MWh VaR Peak | 4,000-8,000 MWh Var Energy |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| RS Ref            | 4.4     | 0.067   | 2               | 357         | 590           | 46.1                 | 0.933                | 6                           | 2922                       | 12504                    | 4.4                   | 0.067                | 2                   | 357                 | 590                 | 46.1                 | 0.933                | 6                   | 2922                 | 12504               |
| No RS             | 46.1    | 0.933   | 6               | 2922        | 12504         | 46.1                 | 0.933                | 6                           | 2922                       | 12504                    | 4.4                   | 0.067                | 2                   | 357                 | 590                 | 46.1                 | 0.933                | 6                   | 2922                 | 12504               |
| Min RS            | 4.4     | 0.061   | 2               | 837         | 1666          | 4.4                  | 0.061                | 2                           | 837                        | 1666                     | 4.4                   | 0.067                | 2                   | 357                 | 590                 | 4.4                  | 0.061                | 2                   | 837                 | 1666                |
| Limited Markets   | 7.8     | 0.144   | 2               | 1450        | 3147          | 7.8                  | 0.144                | 2                           | 1450                       | 3147                     | 7.8                   | 0.144                | 2                   | 1450                | 3147                | 7.8                  | 0.144                | 2                   | 1450                | 3147                |
| High WECC Demand  | 17.2    | 0.589   | 5               | 4792        | 36617         | 17.2                 | 0.589                | 5                           | 4792                       | 36617                    | 17.2                  | 0.589                | 5                   | 4792                | 36617               | 17.2                 | 0.589                | 5                   | 4792                | 36617               |
| Global Instability| 7.2     | 0.144   | 3.5             | 2041        | 5969          | 7.2                  | 0.144                | 3.5                         | 2041                       | 5969                     | 7.2                   | 0.144                | 3.5                 | 2041                | 5969                | 7.2                  | 0.144                | 3.5                 | 2041                | 5969                |
| Early Coal        | 13.9    | 0.233   | 2.5             | 1895        | 3807          | 13.9                 | 0.233                | 2.5                         | 1895                       | 3807                     | 13.9                  | 0.233                | 2.5                 | 1895                | 3807                | 13.9                 | 0.233                | 2.5                 | 1895                | 3807                |
| No WECC Buildout  | 8.3     | 0.172   | 3.5             | 2015        | 6410          | 8.3                  | 0.172                | 3.5                         | 2015                       | 6410                     | 8.3                   | 0.172                | 3.5                 | 2015                | 6410                | 8.3                  | 0.172                | 3.5                 | 2015                | 6410                |
| SW Drought        | 5       | 0.083   | 2               | 744         | 1421          | 5                    | 0.083                | 2                           | 744                        | 1421                     | 5                     | 0.083                | 2                   | 744                 | 1421                | 5                     | 0.083                | 2                   | 744                 | 1421                |
| Pipeline Freeze   | 5       | 0.072   | 1.5             | 505         | 710           | 5                    | 0.072                | 1.5                         | 505                        | 710                      | 5                     | 0.072                | 1.5                 | 505                 | 710                 | 5                     | 0.072                | 1.5                 | 505                 | 710                 |
| Wildfire          | 4.4     | 0.067   | 2               | 357         | 590           | 4.4                  | 0.067                | 2                           | 357                        | 590                      | 4.4                   | 0.067                | 2                   | 357                 | 590                 | 4.4                  | 0.067                | 2                   | 357                 | 590                 |

**Not adequate with resources tested**

**Borderline with resources tested**

**Adequate with resources tested**
Strategy Most Effective at Addressing Certain Types of Shortfalls

The strategy...

- Eliminates summer shortfalls
- Mitigates winter shortfalls
- Limits remaining shortfalls to ramp hours
- Protects against long duration shortfalls
### Heatmap of Maximum Capacity Shortfall by Month-Hour

| Month / Hour | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| **Reference with Resource Strategy (RS Ref)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1            | 1300 | 3203 | 2856 | 1915 | 792 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 25 |
| 2            | 402  | 443  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7            | 9    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10           | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11           | 173  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12           | 1942 | 2160 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Reference without Resource Strategy (No RS)** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1            | 3149 | 5222 | 4964 | 4396 | 3699 | 496 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 25 |
| 2            | 334  | 2560 | 3010 | 3357 | 2011 | 1844 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4            | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5            | 676  | 1780 | 1154 | 248  | 1189 | 1526 | 1174 | 979  | 1089 | 587  | 29  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6            | 625  | 285  | 384  | 749  | 370  | 398  | 355  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7            | 303  | 767  | 1153 | 888  | 697  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8            | 782  | 780  | 94   | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9            | 746  | 191  | 467  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10           | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11           | 0    | 0    | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12           | 1323 | 4275 | 4496 | 1732 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

#### Notes
- **Elimination of summer shortfalls**
- **Mitigation of winter shortfalls**
- **Ramp hours**
Protection Against Long Duration Shortfalls

The diagram shows the VaR97.5 Duration and Max Shortfall Duration for various scenarios:

- **Wildfire**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **Pipeline Freeze**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **SW Drought**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **No WECC Buildout**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **Early Coal**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **Global Instability**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **High WECC Demand**: VaR97.5 Duration 11 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 11 hours
- **Limited Markets**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **Min RS**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours
- **No RS**: VaR97.5 Duration 7 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 7 hours
- **RS Ref**: VaR97.5 Duration 5 hours, Max Shortfall Duration 5 hours

The provisional range for Max Shortfall Duration is 8 to 12 hours.
Current Market Reliance Limit Offers Effective Risk Mitigation

- Out-of-region market supply uncertainties have a minimal effect on regional adequacy, assuming the Council’s current market reliance limits:
  - Drought
  - Gas supply issues
  - Wildfire

- However, under certain future scenarios results show regional adequacy levels to become borderline or unacceptable:
  - High gas prices coupled with continued supply chain challenges
  - Lower than expected west-wide renewable generation acquisition
  - Increased WECC demand
Results Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional Limit</th>
<th>&lt;5%</th>
<th>0.1-0.2 Event-year</th>
<th>8-12 Hours</th>
<th>2,000-3,000 MW</th>
<th>4,000-8,000 MWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>LOLP</td>
<td>LOLEV</td>
<td>VaR Duration</td>
<td>VaR Peak</td>
<td>Var Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Ref</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No RS</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2922</td>
<td>12504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min RS</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Markets</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>3147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High WECC Demand</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4792</td>
<td>36617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Instability</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>5969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Coal</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No WECC Buildout</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Drought</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Freeze</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequate with resources tested
Not adequate with resources tested
Borderline with resources tested
Future WECC Buildouts May Pose Market Dynamic Risks

- Projected renewable resource acquisition driven by clean policies is expected to change market supply and demand dynamics
  - Hourly pattern of renewable generation does not always coincide with the hourly pattern of greatest energy need.
  - Certain periods of the day may have very inexpensive market supply due to renewable surplus (mostly solar).
- Under conditions of increased supply and lower prices, the Northwest is expected to consistently import more power than it has in the past.
- However, there also will be times within the same day, often during morning and evening ramps, when available market supply is less and more expensive.
  - This provides an opportunity for the Northwest to export to other regions in the west but also means that those are the times of most market risk for the Northwest.
- The ability of the Northwest hydroelectric and thermal systems to ramp up and down to respond to those changing market dynamics requires appropriate market signals, either from a regional reserve pooling effort or from an enhanced market structure.
CA Import/Export During Summer and Winter Ramp Hours

No WECC Buildout
Persistent Global Instability
Wildfire
Early Coal Retirement
Pipeline Freeze
Min RS
Limited Markets
High WECC Demand
SW Drought
RS Ref

Morning
Evening

Import
Export

Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Comparison of California Prices

- Reduced buildouts → higher prices and narrower distribution in CA
- Higher summer prices
- Very small/no buildouts nearly eliminate negative prices
Revisiting Key Takeaways

• System is adequate with the plan resource strategy but is not adequate if we do nothing.
  • In the high demand world, we need to do more, as described in the strategy
  • When retiring existing resources early, we need to do more, as indicated in plan analysis

• Strategy effective at eliminating summer shortfalls and mitigating winter events

• Market reliance limit is serving us well for now, but market dynamics do pose some risks to monitor
Seeking Council Direction

- Are you comfortable releasing the 2027 Resource Adequacy Assessment publicly after an editorial review by staff?

- Do you agree that staff should continue to develop the multi-metric approach as a more robust approach for assessing adequacy?
Appendix
Comparison of Reference to Minimum?

- Recap on difference:
  - Renewables:
    - Additional 2,500 MW
  - Energy Efficiency
    - Additional 250 aMW

- Main Impact:
  - Reduction of shortfall magnitudes (decreased reliance on emergency resources)

- Reduction of 480 MW
- Reduction of 1,076 MWh

![Graph showing Energy Use Efficiency (EUE) comparison between Min RS and RS Ref](image)
Example of Daily California Summer Import/Export Behavior

This example highlights the impact of High WECC Demand on a summer day (Aug):
1. Substantially less import during the morning ramp (A)
2. Earlier start to exporting during mid-day (B)
3. Less export in the evening ramp and night (C)
4. Less mid-day import (D)

Positive = PNW import from California | Negative = PNW export to California
Average* California Import/Export

- Substantial reduction in average imports (MWh) under **High WECC Demand, Limited Markets and No WECC Buildout**
  - **Persistent Global Instability** shows a smaller impact on imports
- For exports, reduction across scenarios is observed, especially **High WECC Demand**
  - **Persistent Global Instability** is the only scenario suggesting higher exports during the summer months

*Average across all import/export hours respectively in each month*
Note on Canadian imports: Alberta relies on imports from BC and region for adequacy and economics in the recent past, but this has already changed to primarily economic exchanges.

For context as of December 8th, 2022 at 10 am, the market had 11.8 GW generating with 3 GW of unused gas plants.

The Alberta_XX represents the supply capability near the price, XX $/MWh.