

**DRAFT**

**TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO  
RESOURCE ADEQUACY PRE-MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Prepared for April 23, 2003 CREPC Meeting  
CREPC WRAT Team**

The attached table is an initial compilation the responses to the pre-meeting survey questionnaire that was distributed on March 31, 2003 to CREPC members concerning the issue of resource adequacy. The questionnaire sought answers to nine questions attempting to identify what activities or inclinations each state/province had toward the issue of resource adequacy. The questionnaire presumed that many states had experience with integrated resource planning (IRP) practices, but that resource adequacy requirements were a highly related, but somewhat different set of activities. The original questionnaire is included following the table to allow readers to see the actual question phrasing.

These responses have not yet been verified with the originators of the responses for accuracy.

## TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO RESOURCE ADEQUACY PRE-MEETING QUESTIONNAIRE

| QUESTION  | ALREADY EXISTS                         | ACTIVELY PURSUING      | NOT PURSUING                                   | INTERESTING OBSERVATIONS  |
|---|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Clear Requirement Establishing Utility Obligation to Serve   | CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, SK, UT, WA, WY | BC, CA                 | AB   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AB gives complete choice of supplier</li> <li>▪ CA once allowed retail choice but now suspended</li> <li>▪ MT allows some retail choice</li> <li>▪ NV, OR, AND WA allow retail choice under highly limited circumstances</li> </ul>              |
| 2, 3, 4. Formal Resource Adequacy Requirements (Note 1)   | BC, CO, NM                             | CA, MT, WA             | AB, BC, CO, ID, NV, OR, SK, UT, WY             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AB actively opposes SMD/RA as interference in its competitive market</li> <li>▪ CEC assessing municipal RA in parallel with CPUC review for IOUs</li> </ul>  |
| 5. Formal Integrated Resource Planning and Resource Procurement Requirements  | BC, CO, ID, MT, NV, OR, WA             | CA, NV, OR, UT         | AB, NM, SK, WY                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ AB now creating an ISO with transmission planning and congestion management responsibilities</li> <li>▪ UT conducts IRP in CPCN cases, but is now actively examining formal procurement rules</li> </ul>   |
| 6. IRP/Procurement Processes of regulatory agencies fully cover load  |  | CA                     | AB, BC, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, SK, UT, WA, WY |   |
| 7. IRP/Procurement Processes not within jurisdiction of regulatory agencies covered by other Statutory requirements |  | CA                     | AB, BC, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, SK, UT, WA, WY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CA assessing whether CPUC has authority over ESP</li> <li>▪ WA LSEs not under WUTC jurisdiction generally served by BPA under NWPPC regional IRP process</li> </ul>  |
| 8. Significant Use of Demand Response Programs  | AB, CA, MT, UT, WY (Note 2)            | BC, CA, ID, NV, OR, WA | CO, NM, SK                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CA is actively developing dynamic pricing tariffs and programs</li> </ul>  |
| 9. Alternative Method to “cover” Obligation to Serve When Neither RA or IRP Requirements Exist                      | MT, SK, WY                             | BC                     | AB, NM   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MT has default supplier requirements which partially substitute for IRP or RA</li> <li>▪ SK has a crown corp planning process satisfying MAPP reserve requirements</li> <li>▪ WY uses IRP information developed on case-by-case basis</li> </ul> |

**Explanatory Notes:**

1. Responses to Questions 2, 3, and 4 of the pre-meeting survey are amalgamated since most states talked about existing and prospective activities in more than one response.

2. A number of states included here have made policy commitments to pursue demand response programs, but have little or no actual energy or capacity savings resulting as yet from these efforts. Such states are classified as “Existing.”

**CREPC  
Pre-Meeting Survey  
State Role in Guiding Resource Adequacy**

**Background**

The purpose of this brief pre-meeting survey is to facilitate a discussion among CREPC representatives at the April 23, 2003 meeting about the topic of resource adequacy. FERC has proposed a specific resource adequacy requirement in its July 2002 Standard Market Design NOPR, but this survey seeks information about what your state/province is doing.

For purposes of this survey, resource adequacy is defined to mean a condition in which a utility or other load serving entity (LSE) has demonstrated that it has acquired sufficient resources to satisfy a forecast of future loads reliably. A formal resource adequacy requirement would establish a specific standard defining “sufficient,” it would include guidelines for counting resources toward this standard, and it would specify to whom reporting requirements would be submitted for evaluation. An acceptable procedure would also enable flexible compliance so that each entity could choose the degree of reliance upon types of resources, such as demand response capability, that it wished to pursue to minimize expected costs of compliance. In general, a resource adequacy requirement encompasses, but is broader than integrated resource planning and resource procurement. These proposals have been made in the context of a competitive or hybrid industry structure where state/provincial regulatory agencies do not have full oversight over the industry and there are operational needs for transmission system operators to know expected LSE loads and resources.

Please prepare responses to this survey and submit them to Doug Larson by April 15, 2003. Please be prepared to engage in a roundtable discussion at the CREPC meeting.

**Specific Questions**

**1. What is the situation in your state/province concerning utility “obligation to serve”? Was this relaxed in the late 1990s or early 2000s, and if it was, has a change to clarify utility responsibilities been made recently? (Please explain as needed.)**

**2. What steps have been taken by your state/provincial energy agency to assure that resource adequacy exists for those utilities or other load serving entities under your jurisdiction?**

**3. If a formal resource adequacy requirement exists, please briefly describe it and provide a reference to the full details.**

**4. If a resource adequacy requirement is being contemplated, please describe the nature of the investigation and briefly describe any proposals that have been prepared.**

**5. Is your state/province investigating or instituting a formal integrated resource planning and resource procurement process for the utilities you regulate? If so, briefly describe the nature of the process and provide a reference to further details.**

**6. For states/provinces instituting IRP/procurement, are all load serving entities taking part? If not, what percentage of load will be covered by IRPs?**

**7. For those LSEs not under state/provincial jurisdiction, how will IRP/procurement processes be conducted for such LSEs?**

**8. For states/provinces implementing either IRP/procurement or resource adequacy procedures, do the requirements encourage or require consideration or acquisition of demand response capability as part of the strategy to satisfy reliability at a reasonable cost?**

**9. If your state/province is not requiring resource adequacy or an integrated resource planning process, please describe what assurance you have that utilities and other load serving entities will be able to satisfy any “obligation to serve” requirements that may exist in your state/province.**