

DR Aggregation Stakeholder Meeting #2

Feedback Request

Thank you for participating in the MPSC Staff's DR aggregation stakeholder activities. Following the second stakeholder meeting, held on March 12, Staff requests the following feedback. All responses are voluntary and will be kept confidential unless a statement is provided that the information may be quoted in the Staff report or included as an appendix to the Staff report which will be posted in Case No. U-20348 by May 30, 2019. Please provide your responses to Heather Cantin (cantinh@michigan.gov) and Erik Hanser (hansere@michigan.gov) by April 10, 2019. The next stakeholder meeting is scheduled for May 3, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.

Indiana model ([See slides 17-20](#)):

- 1) Do you have any immediate feedback on the pros and cons of this model?
- 2) Is this model worth exploring?

Pennsylvania model ([See slide 21](#)):

- 3) Do you have any immediate feedback on the pros and cons of this model?
- 4) Is this model worth exploring?

Regarding MISO vs. PJM processes ([See slides 22-23](#)):

- 5) Does the PJM process outlined above have any pros or cons as compared to the current MISO process?
- 6) While this discussion is focused on a Michigan specific process to track and verify aggregated DR, would you support supplementing the MISO process with some of the aspects of PJM's registration process?
- 7) Would you support adopting some of these PJM procedures into a Michigan specific process?
- 8) Would you like to further discuss the IN/PA models or explore aspects of the PJM process?

Other:

- 9) Are MISO BPM or tariff revisions warranted to ensure that retail peak load contributions are increased to reflect any relevant load reductions?
- 10) Are MISO BPM or tariff revisions warranted to ensure that retail peak load contributions are not double counting the same resource on both the supply side and demand side of the resource adequacy equation? If so, what specific BPM or tariff revisions would you suggest?
- 11) What if a change was made to the MISO tariff such that the PLC was determined to be the highest load for that particular customer for MISO's top twelve peak hours of the previous year? Would this reduce or possibly eliminate the need to make PLC adjustments to account for load reductions?

- 12) Should the MPSC develop a voluntary registration process with reporting requirements for ARCs in Michigan? Why or why not? ([See slide 31](#))
- 13) Is legislation necessary to outline a more formal process for registering or licensing ARC's?
- 14) What recommendations do you have about what type of information should be included in an ARC registration at the MPSC?
- 15) Should the MPSC pursue a Michigan 4-year forward Capacity Tracking Tool that would accommodate the tracking of all capacity resources, including aggregated DR, aggregated energy efficiency and aggregated storage resources, on a 4-year forward basis? Why or why not?
- 16) At this point in time, do you have any recommended changes to the MPSC's [capacity demonstration requirements](#) adopted in U-20154, specifically for forward ZRC contracts?
- 17) The Commission order in [U-20348](#) asks us to answer whether the ability to aggregate DR for customers of Michigan AESs for bidding into RTO markets should be limited to AESs, or be extended to non-AES third parties such as CSPs. Based upon the feedback received to date, Staff recommends that we allow CSPs to bid aggregated DR into RTO markets to be consistent with MISO and PJM practices. Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, please explain.
- 18) What would need to happen to make your company comfortable with lifting the ban on DR aggregation for all customers in Michigan?