

Description of Meeting:	NTTG Planning Committee
Meeting Date:	February 24, 2014
Meeting Notes Prepared By:	Amy Wachsnicht
Approved for Posting:	April 9, 2014

1. Agenda:

- Welcome, Establish Quorum and Agenda Review
- Approval of December 11, 2013 Meeting Notes
- Review January 31st Data Submittals
- Review of Public Policy Consideration Requests
- Planning Region Coordination Meeting
- Order 1000 Planning Analysis Approach
- Reminder of March 31st Data Submittal Deadline
- Round Table/Other Business

2. Discussions & Decisions:

- Quorum Requirements:
 - It was noted that quorum requirements had been met in both Class 1 and Class 3 but **not** been met for Class 2, therefore a quorum had not been established.

Decision: Approval of December 11, 2013 Meeting Notes

- Since quorum requirements were not met for Class 2; the December 11, 2013 meeting notes will be approved during the next Planning Committee meeting.

Discussion: Review January 31st Data Submittals

- Data was received from Idaho Power, NorthWestern, PacifiCorp and Portland General. PacifiCorp also submitted summary data for Deseret Power.
 - The transmission providers found it difficult to get the data submitted by January 31st. The companies will have to look at their internal processes and see if there are any enhancements to be made and get the information submitted on time.
- A comparison of data from Quarter 1 of 2014 and Quarter 1 of 2012 showed
 - 10 Yr. Load forecast went down by 1,099 MW
 - 10 Yr. Resource forecast went down by 7,573 MW
- Decrease in Load forecast is due to:
 - No data received from Basin Electric or Black Hills
 - Idaho Power, PacifiCorp and Portland General's data is down; NorthWestern did have a slight increase.
- Dave Angell informed committee members that the forecast year in the summarized data was for 10 years out from 2013 due to the fact that PacifiCorp did not include 2024 data.
 - Dave requested to Craig Quist that before the end of Quarter 1 to have PacifiCorp submit the 2024 data.
 - Craig Quist indicated that he would speak with Jamie Austin and get the data submitted.
- 2023 Resources Data Summary
 - In the 2012 data submissions there was a variety of resources totaling 11,000 new resources of new capacity.
 - In the current submissions for 2023 there were decreases in coal and hydroelectric with an addition of natural gas and wind for a total of about 4,000MW
 - Previously NTTG had 9,000MW of natural gas and wind.
 - Another change is on the market side, where PacifiCorp has dropped out this cycle.

- New Transmission Submitted
 - The transmission providers used an updated spread sheet that was designed to be aligned with the TEPPC submission and as time goes on NTTG will be evaluating that workbook to see if any changes need to be made as the Technical Workgroup (TWG) put together.
 - Dave Angell briefly walked through the new transmission submitted by Idaho Power, NorthWestern Energy and PacifiCorp.
 - Don Johnson pointed out that in looking at NorthWestern Energy's Millcreek to Amps, he was unaware that there was a series comp. on the line.
 - John Leland informed the committee there currently is not a series comp. but NorthWestern will be upgrading the line with one. They are also looking to do the same to Broadview to Garrison.
 - Dave Angell indicated that from a regional planning perspective the "New Transmission Submitted" is no different than what NTTG had in the CCTA list from last time other than Portland General's project Cascade Crossing has dropped out.
 - NorthWestern Energy had submitted MSTI as part of an economic study request.
- Transmission Service
 - Idaho Power had about 500 MW submitted. Most of which is the Boardman to Hemmingway line beginning from the Northwest Mid-C and other small projects in the Idaho Power area.
 - PacifiCorp has various transmission services throughout their area.
 - John Leland noted that NorthWestern Energy looked at this as provided what they had firm commitments on. There are some in the queue but at this time no signed contracts and therefore nothing to be included.

Discussion: Review of Public Policy Consideration Requests

- NTTG created sets of 2 Public Policies – Requirements and Considerations
 - Public Policy Requirements (PPR) are established by local, state, or federal laws or regulations promulgated by a relevant jurisdiction
 - Public Policy Considerations (PPC) are not established by local, state, or federal laws or regulations
- PPR's will be studied as part of the study process.
- PPC's will be ran as scenarios if NTTG chooses to with consultation with stakeholders.
- Two PPC requests were submitted to NTTG.
 - The Planning Committee would not be making a decision on studying these two PPC at this time, but NTTG wanted to confirm that they have received the information.
 - Any additional study analysis NTTG does on these two requests will be for information only and will not be in the Regional Transmission Plan but can inform it.
- **Renewable NW Project Public Policy Consideration Submittal:**
 - Understand the transmission impacts associated with retiring
 - 1) Colstrip units 1&2 and
 - 2) Colstrip units 1, 2, 3, & 4
 - Replacing the respective amounts of capacity with proportional amounts of wind capacity in Montana
- Question: Craig Quist - The analysis on Colstrip, it is saying that one generator's set of generation is equivalent to the other? Even though wind is effectively an energy resource, in the analysis they want us to replace a firm coal resource?
 - Answer: Dave Angell – That is correct.
- Comment: John Leland – This is interesting in the sense that the Colstrip units are not serving all of the Loads in NTTG, it is almost an NTTG and ColumbiaGrid study.
 - Answer: Dave Angell – We can choose to coordinate with ColumbiaGrid if we choose to.

- **NW Energy Coalition Public Policy Consideration Submittal:**
 - Assess an accelerated phase out of coal plants and enhancement of clean energy resources, including:
 - energy efficiency, demand response, distributed generation, and utility-scale renewable resources
 - Assess how to maximize the delivery of renewable energy and minimize new transmission while also trying to achieve a targeted reduction in carbon emissions
- Question: Don Johnson - What would be the targeted reductions in carbon emissions?
 - Answer: Dave Angell – I don't know if we can answer that.
- Comment: Fred Heutte - I can look into that. This is similar to the RNP submission. We are looking to have NTTG run one of its 2013 cases from WECC which has the data already there so I they can see what the carbon impact would be, but I don't have that information in front of me.
 - You mention the possibility of a joint study with ColumbiaGrid and we would support that.
 - Answer: Dave Angell – We will see if that can work.
- During the January stakeholder meeting there were a lot of questions from stakeholders about how to submit this type of scenario request. Dave Angell had encouraged parties to use the “gen_add” tab in the data submittal form (Xcel spread sheet) and use the “Other” tab to describe what they wanted out of the scenario.
- Dave Angell walked through both Renewable NW Project and NW Energy Coalition spread sheet details:
- **Renewable NW Project Spread Sheet:**
 - Gen_Add Tab
 - Take units 1 & 2 of 358 and replace them with 716 of wind – A 1:1 replacement
 - Target year is 2020
 - Taking 778 and replacing with 1,214 – NOT a 1:1 replacement.
 - Target year 2027
 - Other Tab
 - The first phase assuming that Colstrip units 1&2 are shut down and replaced with equal amounts of wind. The second phase assuming that all Colstrip units are shut down and replaced with a total of 1930 MW of wind.
 - They are interested in understanding what enhancement, protocols and upgrades would be necessary to the existing transmission system in order to maintain the current carrying capability of Path 8.
- **NW Energy Coalition Spread Sheet:**
 - Gen_Add Tab
 - Retirement of generation units throughout the Western System
 - The replacement is 4,400 of renewables (wind and other) and 5,366 of coal reduction.
 - Other Tab
 - NW Energy Coalition wanted NTTG to take the WECC PC6 study and study it from a NTTG point of view, possibly validating the study.
- Comment: Fred Heutte - Even though it is a copy of a WECC study, there may be differences in how NTTG runs that study and if it turns out to be identical that tells us something and gives us more confidence in looking at the results of other WECC studies in NTTG context.
 - If they are not the same it would be interesting to find out why and how NTTG runs their study vs. WECC.
- Dave Angell indicated that he would like to get the TWG together and have discussions with them about what questions the workgroup may have as well as potential approaches to



consider then they would bring a recommendation back to the Planning Committee for their feedback approval or recommendation on moving forward.

Discussion: Planning Region Coordination Meeting

- On Friday, February 28th the four regions, NTTG, WestConnect, CAISO and ColumbiaGrid will be holding a Planning Region Coordination Meeting in Folsom, CA.
- If parties are interested, information and materials can be found on the ColumbiaGrid website.
 - A link to the ColumbiaGrid website has been posted to the calendar on NTTG's website.

Discussion: Order 1000 Planning Analysis Approach

- NTTG is now acting under Order 1000 which is a much different process than Order 890, where NTTG will be selecting projects into a Regional Transmission Plan rather than just evaluating projects.
- With this new process there were a few questions that have come up on how the prior cycle's plan fit into the current cycle's plan.
 - With the Order 1000 process, NTTG will develop an initial plan from the prior cycles plan and a roll up of submitted projects from the local transmission providers.
 - In the Order 890 process NTTG did not select projects into the plan but can use that prior cycle plan to inform the current cycle's initial plan.
 - NTTG does have the roll up of transmission projects from the transmission providers for the current cycle and it is possible to use that as a fresh start and based the initial plan on that information.
 - Another question was will NTTG continue to select hours to study as was done in the past.
 - Dave Angell suggested that could be up to the TWG to have those conversations and decide.
- In the Order 1000 process there are three components that will drive the selection process to determine if a project is more efficient or cost effective: capital costs of the projects, change in losses in the NTTG footprint and changes in reserves in the NTTG footprint.
 - NTTG will need to determine the method to do all three of the analysis.
 - Would reliability analysis and an ability to gain insight in losses benefit on the production cost side? Would those two be comparable?
 - The changes in reserves could bring those questions as well.
 - With capital costs, that is a step that is reviewed once a plan meets all reliability requirements.
- Dave Angell asked committee members if they had any comments or insight regarding the approach and if so they could email himself or Craig Quist.
 - John Leland indicated that the process Dave Angell had outlined made sense to him.
- In discussing the definition of the regional initial plan in Attachment K, Dave Angell indicated that the definition did make sense once NTTG had gone through the process, however since this is the first cycle NTTG should not put the same weight of the Order 890 version plan because it does not have the same level of analysis. In the next cycle NTTG could put that weight on the plan because it would have gone through the Order 1000 process.
 - In Attachment K, once a project is selected in to the plan, a project status update must be provided. It was discussed that NTTG would not ask for that update at this time as NTTG is coming out of the Order 890 process and into Order 1000.
- John Leland indicated that NTTG should move forward and recognize that ultimately it is up to the transmission providers to decide what they are going to build and they may not move forward with the projects that come out of the plan. NTTG needs to know what the transmission providers are and are not moving forward with.



- Question: Gil Coulam - In the prior cycle of the transmission projects in the Regional Transmission Plan were the CCTA's that came up from the 2022 case and this year we will evaluate using the 2024 case from TEPPC which has a different set of CCTA.
 - And in Order 1000 we will be looking at removing some of those projects to evaluate the effects?
 - Answer: Dave Angell – The only obligation we have is to evaluate alternatives to the initial plan, and if none are submitted, then there is no obligation to remove it from the cases in a scenario.

Discussion: Reminder of March 31st Data Submittal Deadline

- Dave Angell reminded parties that the deadline for project data and economic study requests is March 31st.
- Parties can submit that information to info@nttg.biz.

Discussion: Round Table/Other Business

- Tracking Committee Participation
 - Automatic removal after non-participation in 3 consecutive meetings
 - Dave Angell encouraged parties that if they know they will not be attending the meeting to assign a proxy.
- Question: John Tompkins – Each time the Rod is not available and I take meeting, do we have to submit a letter for each meeting?
 - Answer: Dave Angell – The only thing I can direct you to is our Charter on the NTTG website, and it is filed with FERC so we do have to adhere to that.
- Dave Angell indicated that he would also take a look at the Charter to make sure what the requirement is (example: one business day).
- The next Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for March 12th. Depending on the ability to get the TWG going before that meeting, there is the possibility of cancelling the March meeting and meeting in April.

3. Assignments:

Item #	Assignment	Owner	Target Date	Status
1.	PAC to submit 2024 data to NTTG.	C. Quist	March 31 st	In Process
2.	Review Charter for Proxy notice requirements (one business day?)	D. Angell	March 12 th	In Process
3.	Approve December 11, 2013 PC Meeting Notes.	A. Wachsnicht	March 12 th	In Process
4.				

Next Meeting: The next Northern Tier Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for March 12th at 1PM Pacific.

- Voice Conference Mtg. **503-813-5252** (toll free #855-499-5252)
- Conference ID **1254249**

Attendees:

<u>NTTG Planning Committee Member Representatives</u>		
Membership Class 1		
Dave Angell, Chair, Idaho Power	John Leland, Chair, NorthWestern	Craig Quist, Vice Chair, PacifiCorp
Don Johnson, Portland General		



Membership Class 2		
Dan Wheeler, Gaelectric		

Membership Class 3		
Johanna Bell, ID PUC	Jerry Maio, UT PSC	David Walker, WY PSC

<u>Other NTTG Members & Guests</u>		
Gil Coulam, NTTG	Chelsea Loomis, NorthWestern	Amy Wachsnicht, NTTG
Pam Greensky, NTTG	Kim McClafferty, NorthWestern	
Fred Heutte, NWECC	John Tompkins, Sea Breeze Pacific	