

Near-Term Reliability Benefits of Retaining Diablo Canyon

PRESENTED BY

Sam Newell
Wonjun Chang
Ragini Sreenath

PRESENTED FOR


Policy Impact on Behalf of
Carbon Free California

AUGUST 2, 2022




New Resources Needed for Reliability (in nameplate GW)

- The state has analyzed how much capacity is needed to operate reliably under adverse weather scenarios. They determined that a 22.5% reserve margin is needed, and ordered the procurement of **11.5 GW NQC** in the **Mid Term Reliability Report** to meet that need.
- CEC's Midterm Reliability Analysis translates that into **>20GW of new nameplate capacity** over the next 5 years, of resources that are consistent with clean energy goals and can provide that much NQC (net of intermittency and energy limits). This includes
 - >8.7 GW Solar by 2025
 - >10 GW of 4-hr Storage by 2025
 - 2 GW of Long-Lead Time Resources by 2026
- Deploying so much capacity will require siting and interconnecting resources at unprecedented rates, while being challenged by supply chain issues
- The following analysis takes the CEC's assessment of reliability needs and their assumed portfolio to meet that need as a starting point; then examines the impact of potential capacity deployment delays on possible shortages relative to the CEC's assessed need (in NQC terms)




2025 Net Qualifying Capacity (NQC) Supply (in GW)

- Adequacy depends on adding > 10 GW storage (nameplate)
 - With max build rate of 6 GW/yr nameplate in 2023
 - But the max historical rate was 1.8 GW in 2021
 - Even this may be optimistic about supply chains
- If no more than 1.8 GW/yr materializes, a **3.4 GW NQC shortfall** could occur
 - This would subject the state to the risk of rolling blackouts in extreme weather (as in August 2020)
 - Could be worse if some events exceed 4 hours
 - Could be worse if PV deployment is limited to recent historical rate of 1 GW; not a large direct effect on NQC but would reduce the value of storage
- Retaining Diablo could reduce the gap by **~2.2 GW**
 - During the September peak (Base Case assumes both units of Diablo retire by August 26th, 2025 as planned)



2026 Net Qualifying Capacity (NQC) Supply (in GW)

- **Achieving adequacy in 2026** further assumes 1 GW each of geothermal and pumped storage
 - Having 1 GW new PSH online by 2026 is extremely optimistic given permitting challenges and construction timelines
 - No large geothermal projects are yet in the CAISO queue or under development, and would take several years to develop
- If these do not materialize by 2026 and battery deployment is limited to 1.8 GW/yr, **a shortfall of 3.7 GW** could occur; if only one of them materializes, the state faces a shortfall of approximately 2 GW
- Retaining Diablo could cut the shortfall **in half** and could eliminate it entirely, if only one of the two issues occur
 - This does not account for additional capacity that could be retained or added via the recently established strategic electricity reliability reserve fund at a cost; thus retaining Diablo would help maintain reliability even if it is not be the *only* way to maintain reliability
 - But retaining Diablo provides additional benefits of helping California reliably meet its long-term clean energy goals, while reducing cumulative emissions by 40 MMT through 2032 and of saving over \$4 billion through 2045.¹
 - *Note:* the MTR discusses possible extensions to 2028 for Geo and PSH resources, but the state would suffer reserve margins below the 22.5% target in the meantime, that Diablo could fill



¹S. Newell, W. Chang, D. Murphy and R. Sreenath, [Retaining Diablo Canyon: Economic, Carbon, and Reliability Implications](#), presented to Carbon Free California, June 9 2022