

<b>Description of Meeting:</b>	<b>NTTG Planning Committee</b>
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>May 2, 2012</b>
<b>Meeting Notes Prepared By:</b>	<b>Amy Wachsnicht</b>
<b>Approved for Posting:</b>	<b>June 6, 2012</b>

**Attendee List:**

Dave Angell – Chair, Idaho Power (Class 1)	Don Johnson – Portland General (Class 1)
Jamie Austin – PacifiCorp (Class 1)	John Leland – NorthWestern Energy (Class 1)
Rich Bayless – NTTG	Amy Wachsnicht - NTTG
Gil Coulam – NTTG	Scott Wapels – Avista Corp. (Class 1)
Doug Cox – Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Class 3)	Dan Wheeler – Gaelectric (Class 2)
Darrell Gerrard – Vice Chair, PacifiCorp (Class 1)	Wes Wigen – Black Hills Power (Class 1)
Sharon Helms - NTTG	

**1. Agenda:**

- a. Approval of Meeting Notes
- b. Draft Transmission Study Plan
- c. Draft Economic Study Plan
- d. Order 1000 Draft Proposals
  - i. Stakeholder Participation
  - ii. Attachment K Revisions
  - iii. Planning Committee Charter Revisions
  - iv. Planning Practice Document

**2. Discussions & Decisions:**

**Decision: Approval of Meeting Notes**

- There was some confusion in the Technical Workgroup regarding the actual clustering of the Economic Study Request versus what was approved. It was originally thought there would be two 1,500 MW systems when in fact there was only one.
  - It was asked if on page two, the first bullet under “John Leland” the minutes could reflect “via Townsend and the MSTI project.”
    - Gaelectric is only interested in Great Falls to Malin and did not request a solution of adding the MSTI project into the clustering. This was requested by NorthWestern to see if the MSTI project was suitable.
  - Another request was to include in the minutes that the requested 1,500 MW system is the same 1,500 MW system for Gaelectric and MSTI.
    - Minutes are to reflect what occurred during the meeting and it is to be captured that the study plan is about the difference of the Gaelectric resources and the transmission capability of MSTI.
- Proposed language change in the third bullet on page two was to add “if appropriate” to the end of the statement.
  - This was agreed and changes were made.
- The April 4, 2012 minutes were approved for posting as modified during this meeting.

**Discussion: Draft Transmission Study Plan**

- The Technical Workgroup put together a draft study plan and during that process there were a few points they needed input from the Planning Committee.
- The first was what core cases do the Technical Workgroup need to develop?

- For this study plan the group is using a 2022 base case that is being developed for TEPPC. This case already has a production cost model being developed by SRWG which will be done by June.
  - The group will take that base case and develop a NUL case by backing out the common transmission additions that were put into that case.
    - A concern is that this was seen differently and that the group was to develop their own null case from the export hours and not wait for the SRWG to develop their case. The reason for this is that there may be inconsistencies if the group would want to develop more than a single hour.
    - The Technical Workgroup will discuss this further at their next meeting.
- Work has been done to stress the COI flow and what has been seen is that the 2022 case has a low COI and PDCI flow. This is due California trying to be self-sufficient by not importing.
- The idea of the Biennial Transmission Plan is to establish a credible base case that is going to test the NTTG footprint to make sure NTTG has adequate resources base on what is anticipated in 2022.
- The TEPPC case is a starting point and can be modified to make it and NTTG case by moving resources out of California and increasing the COI flow.
  - It was suggested that the group look at the historic and seasonally COI flow and adjust the California generation to achieve that and then look at the peak load conditions as well as other stresses in the NTTG footprint.
  - What was found from the last TEPPC case is that east of the river was not stressed at all and there was a question from ColumbiaGrid about the status of the loads not being realistic. It is important to make sure that the flows outside of the NTTG footprint are realistic and that the results are correct.
- It was also suggested to look at three variations in the hydro conditions; an average, high and low. By looking at these three conditions the group could see the average of the COI flow.
  - Data is available from TEPPC regarding the high and low hydro conditions.
- Based on what was discussed during the meeting the Technical Workgroup will use the following for core cases:
  - Peak Loads (summer and winter)
  - High Import and Export
  - Average hydro conditions (Average, high and low)
- Dave Angell asked the Planning Committee if there were any scenarios that should be looked at during this study plan.
  - Last cycle there was a lot of generation proposed in Wyoming and Montana however there is not a lot in the current cycle.
  - The Economic Study Request could be incorporated as a scenario and will be held as something to consider.
- Dan Wheeler commented that the common case transmission assumptions in the TEPPC case include the Colstrip upgrade West in BPA but it does not include the upgrade in the Montana portions and was suggested to look at both of the upgrades.
  - This could be two scenarios, one with no Colstrip upgrade and the other with the Colstrip upgrade that starts at Colstrip and ends in the BPA system.
- The Technical workgroup will start out with the loads and resources for 2022 and with the existing transmission see how many reliability issues NTTG has and then grab the common case transmission assumption projects and add them in one at a time to see what it takes to resolve the reliability issues.
- Gil Coulam walked through the Draft Study Plan. The Technical Workgroup wanted to look at the last cycle and current cycle and see what had changed. They took the information gathered in Quarter one and compared it to the last cycle and see what the difference was.
  - Charts were developed to compare the changes in loads and resources and it was found that although load growth has slowed in some areas overall there is a significant increase in loads since the last cycle.

- John Leland commented that NorthWestern did submit additional transmission during this cycle but did not submit sufficient amount of wind development in Montana. Depending on the study plan outcome there is an additional opportunity for wind development to fill out any generation to accommodate any additional MW if needed.
  - A reasonable assumption would be that this is the 1,500 MW Gaelectic request. John Leland suggested that this would all be placed in Great Falls at the 230 bus with the 500 Kv coming down to Townsend, and will submit in writing to the Technical Workgroup to possibly incorporate in a scenario.

#### **Discussion: Draft Economic Study Plan**

- During the last Planning Committee meeting it was agreed to do a study from the Great Falls Montana to Malin looking at the transmission congestion and what would be required to move 1,500 MW from Great Falls through the NTTG footprint to Malin incorporating the MSTI project and whatever is needed from the Colstrip project.
- In order to produce the study results in this quarter the Technical workgroup would need to use the information from the last planning cycle. However if the workgroup uses the TEPCC 2022 case, the results would be delayed a quarter.
  - Gaelectric and NorthWestern were asked what their preferred approach was as well as the targeted year.
  - Dan Wheeler stated that the target year for the study was 2018 and that he did not have an issue with delaying the results one quarter.
  - Dave Angell requested that the 2022 case be used so the Technical Workgroup would not have to manipulate the loads to get to a 2018 case.
    - Dan Wheeler agreed and said that would be sufficient.
- Dave Angell will check with Legal to determine the flexibility of delaying the results by one quarter. If it is determined by Legal that the results cannot be delayed then past data will be used in order to get the results done in this quarter.
- For those who have comments on the study plan, they are encouraged to give them by May 25<sup>th</sup> so Gil Coulam has time to incorporate them into the document for the next meeting.
- During the next Planning Committee meeting the final draft will be brought for review, as well as taking any additional comments. The goal is to get approval during the meeting and then Dave Angell will take the study plan to the Steering Committee at their next meeting on June 27<sup>th</sup> for informational purposes.

#### **Discussion: Order 1000 Draft Proposals**

- Stakeholder Participation Proposal
  - Comments have been received from stakeholders through the Order 1000 process regarding stakeholder participation in NTTG's Planning Committee.
    - It was requested that those stakeholders that currently do not have voting rights would like to have that opportunity.
    - Another request was the ability to submit Economic Study Requests (ESR)
  - Dave Angell took on the action item to review Order 1000 requirements regarding stakeholder participation. It was found that the order consistently referenced "in consultation with stakeholders"
  - The proposal Dave Angell gave was to keep the Planning Committee structure the same as the meetings are public and stakeholder participation is encouraged.
  - With regards to the ESR, it was proposed to broaden the participation and allow stakeholders who are not Planning Committee members to submit ESR.
    - An ESR Agreement was developed with the main points being:
      - The obligations of submitting the ESR to a local transmission provider and not to NTTG.
      - The ESR will be reviewed at the Planning Committee meeting.
      - NTTG will conduct two free studies a year.

- Requires and entity to give the support necessary to take on the ESR and to execute a non-disclosure agreement.
  - The entity would be bound to the dispute resolution process of NTTG.
- Comments and concerns were received from the North West Energy Coalition:
  - The current Planning Committee Charter only allows Planning Committee members to submit an ESR.
    - By creating the new ESR Agreement that satisfy this concern.
  - It was felt that two ESR studies are not reasonable.
    - NTTG can run additional studies above the two however those would be at the expense of the stakeholder.
    - Order 1000 does not focus on ESR however in Order 890 the only requirement is a number of high priority studies are done annually.
  - With regards to the Planning Committee membership it was suggested to develop a Class 4 membership to broaden the participation.
  - The Order 1000 Planning Compliance Workgroup reviewed the Planning Committee charter and added a description of the Technical Workgroup.
    - In previous drafts it stated that these member would be Planning Committee members who have the technical expertise and back ground.
  - The ESR Agreement was presented to stakeholders at the April 25<sup>th</sup> Order 1000 stakeholder meeting and the NW Energy Coalition felt this was more complicated than what should be required.
    - It is the perspective of NTTG members that having an acknowledgement of the voting process, dispute resolution and the expectation of the customer is important.
  - It was suggested that NTTG considers funding for stakeholder participation.
    - Order 1000 and 890 reference that the commission would neither enforce but would support if funding for the stakeholder participation was provided.
    - Within NTTG the states decided that it would be a conflict of interest for NTTG to provide funding for their participation.
- Dave Angell asked if there were any other comments or adjustments to stakeholder participation.
  - There were none.
- Attachment K Revisions
  - Most of the revisions made were to incorporate Public Policy Requirements and make sure language is consistent with Order 1000.
  - This document lays out the eight quarter study process as well as references the new Planning Process document.
  - Q1 – Data gathering process and incorporates Public Policy Requirements
  - Q2 – Creation of the study plan.
    - This also identifies that the Steering Committee will now have final approval of the study plan along with the Regional Transmission Planning report.
  - Q3 & Q4 – When the studies are done.
  - Q5 – Results of the studies are presented and allows for any comments on the results along with any adjustments that need to be incorporated based on material changes received.
  - Q8 – Final Report
  - A section on stakeholder participation and announcements of meetings was added.
  - A public comment period will be defined and NTTG will utilize those comments for any changes to the draft transmission report as well as the final transmission report.
- Planning Committee Charter
  - The Planning Compliance Workgroup worked on scaling back the charter to focus on the operation of the Planning Committee. The previous charter had a lot of detail

- about the study process and development of the plan. These details have now been moved to the new Planning Practice document.
  - Membership of the Planning Committee has not been changed.
  - Sections added to the charter were defining the Technical Workgroup and a change and approval process on the document.
  - The Planning principles have been moved to an attachment at the end of the charter.
- Planning Practice Document
  - The document incorporates language regarding cost allocation. This is a big focus in Order 1000 and how an entity will submit a project into the Regional Plan.
  - Two tables were created one for sponsor qualification and another regarding what information is needed to submit a project for cost allocation.
  - Sponsor qualification is determined in the quarter before the cycle begins and then once a sponsor is qualified they would submit the information for cost allocation in the first quarter of the new cycle.
  - The goal is to create a transmission project that is more efficient and cost effective than the roll up of the local transmission providers plans.

**Discussion: Action Items**

- The objective is to finalize the Economic Study Request and the Biennial Transmission Plan to create a Regional Transmission Plan.
  - The Technical Workgroup is holding weekly meetings on Fridays and doing the work to support the study plan.
- Comments on the study plan are due May 25<sup>th</sup>.
- The objective of the next meeting is to vote on the study plan and then present to the Steering Committee on June 27<sup>th</sup> for informational purposes.
- The Technical Workgroup will continue to work on the Economic Study Request and will work with John Leland and Dan Wheeler to ensure the studies performed and results provided meet the needs of the customer.

**Discussion: Round Table/Other Business**

- There was none and the meeting was adjourned.

**3. Assignments:**

Item #	Assignment	Owner	Target Date	Status
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

**Next Meeting:** The next Northern Tier Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for June 6, 2012 at 1PM Pacific.

- Voice Conference Mtg. **503-813-5600** (toll free #800-503-3360)
- Meeting ID **688499** and password **123456**