



Description of Meeting:	NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes
Meeting Date:	June 8, 2016
Meeting Notes Prepared By:	Amy Wachsnicht
Approved for Posting:	July 13, 2016

1. Agenda:

- a. Welcome, Establish Quorum and Agenda Review
- b. Approval Items:
 - i. February 10, 2016 Planning Committee Meeting Notes
 - ii. April 29, 2016 Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes
 - iii. May 11, 2016 Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes
- c. NTTG 2016-2017 Draft Study Plan
 - i. Review Stakeholder Comments and draft NTTG response, and
 - ii. Review proposed edits to the Study Plan stemming from stakeholder comments
- d. Round Table/Other Business

2. Discussions & Decisions:

Decision: Welcome, Establish Quorum and Agenda Review

- It was noted that quorum for the NTTG Planning Committee were met in Class 1 and Class 3 but not in Class 2. Since quorum was met in Class 1 and at least one other class, the quorum requirements for the NTTG Planning Committee was satisfied.
- Quorum was met in both Class 1 and Class 2 for the NTTG Cost Allocation Committee.
- Sharon Helms welcomed everyone to the meeting and walked through the agenda and meeting purpose.
 - This is the first opportunity for walking through the stakeholder comments and NTTG's draft responses.
 - The Cost Allocation Committee will be meeting on June 14th to discuss and seek agreement on the cost allocation scenarios to be included in the study plan. Once agreement is reached, Attachment 5 of the study plan will be updated.
 - On June 28th, NTTG will be having a Stakeholder meeting in Boise, ID to walk through the study plan and the areas modified based on stakeholder comments, and those areas where no modifications were made and why.
 - July 13th is a Joint NTTG Planning and Cost Allocation Committee meeting where members will be asked to vote to support submitting the study plan to the Steering Committee for their approval during the July 15th Steering Committee meeting.

Decision: Approval of the February 10, 2016 Planning Committee Meeting Notes

- The notes were distributed to the NTTG Planning Committee members on February 13th for review. All edits had been incorporated in the draft version for approval.
- Sharon Helms called for a vote by class. With approvals from Class 1 and Class 3, the February 10, 2016 Planning Committee meeting notes were **approved for posting**.

Decision: Approval of the April 29, 2016 Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes

- The notes were distributed to the NTTG Cost Allocation Committee members on May 9th for review. All edits had been incorporated in the draft version for approval.
- Sharon Helms called for a vote by the Cost Allocation Committee members. With approvals from both classes the April 29, 2016 Cost Allocation Committee meeting notes were **unanimously approved for posting**.

Decision: Approval of the May 11, 2016 Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes

- The notes were distributed to the NTTG Planning and Cost Allocation Committee members on May 18th for review. All edits had been incorporated in the draft version for approval.
- Sharon Helms called for a vote of the NTTG Planning Committee members by class. With an abstention from Scott Waples with Avista Corp., Class 1 and Class 3 **approved the meeting notes for posting**.
- Sharon Helms then called for a vote by the Cost Allocation Committee members. Both classes **unanimously approved the meeting notes for posting**.
- With the vote of the NTTG Planning and Cost Allocation Committees, the May 11, 2016 Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee meeting notes were **approved for posting**.

Discussion: Review Stakeholder Comments and draft NTTG response and proposed edits to the Study Plan

PLEASE NOTE: The text below are summarized versions of stakeholder comments received and NTTG's draft responses. For the full version [click here](#).

- **PacifiCorp Comments:**
 1. Asked if the total for Idaho included UAMPS resources, for Utah what made up the total, and suggested to itemize the resources for Wyoming.
 - **NTTG Response:** Idaho resources induced UAMPS resources, and broke down the Utah resources.
 2. Oregon RPS is 27% by 2025
 - **NTTG Response:** The RPS Table and Attachment 1 have been updated.
 3. Requested an explication of the Null case be added.
 - **NTTG Response:** A description of the Null case was included.
 4. The Gateway Central project is mostly complete except a small segment. PacifiCorp has the right of way and no federal permits are required.
 - **NTTG Response:** The project status is now committed and lines that were missing from the transmission additions table have been added showing committed.
 5. Asked why the modeling tools were being limited to only power flow where the Attachment K allows for both power flow and production cost modeling (PCM).
 - **NTTG Response:** NTTG's confidence of PCM in prior cycles was not high enough to warrant using PCM. The Technical Workgroup (TWG) in this cycle will evaluate the use PCM.
 6. Asked if "projects eligible for cost allocation" should be "projects requesting cost allocation".

- NTTG Response: The statement is correct in the study plan and gave an explanation of the process on how a project is eligible for cost allocation.
 - Amy Light also indicated that projects eligible for cost allocation is a subsequent step from projects requesting cost allocation.
- 7. The introduction states that the Planning Committee will select cost allocation projects, and asked if it should be projects that requested cost allocation.
 - NTTG Response: Gave an explanation of how projects need to be selected into the Regional Transmission Plan for purposes of cost allocation before cost allocation can be applied.
- 8. Requested that if the coal retirement allocation scenario is included then the timing of the retirement be taken from members IRPs.
 - NTTG Response: The Cost Allocation Committee will consider the comment when finalizing the allocation scenarios.
- 9. Asked the reason for coal retirement being considered as an allocation scenario when the policy has not been set.
 - NTTG Response: Gave an explanation for the reason of the allocation scenarios which are not limited to enacted legislation.
- **Oregon Wave Energy Trust (OWET) Comments**
 - 10. Attachment 1 did not include the Public Policy Requirement (PPR) of the Oregon Statute that regional transmission planning must consider transmission of electricity derived from ocean based renewable energy generation
 - NTTG Response: Attachment 1 will be updated to include the PPR. As per the Attachment K, needs driven by PPR will be considered in the planning process, however the law itself is not a need. NTTG did not receive any data submissions of an ocean power generating project seeking to interconnect or submissions of a transmission need driven by ocean power.
 - 11. Suggested NTTG should consider an allocation scenario specific to ocean energy resources.
 - NTTG Response: The Cost Allocation Committee will consider the comment when finalizing the allocation scenarios.
 - 12. Suggested NTTG should consider a scenario or sensitivity study for ocean energy resources as part of the evaluation of Public Policy Considerations (PPC).
 - NTTG Response: The window for submitting PPC and alternative solutions closed on January 31, 2016.
- Henry Tilghman indicated that he was still unclear on how NTTG would be complying with the statute.
 - Amy Light indicated that NTTG added the statute to the list of PPR, and that requirement is for regional transmission planning must consider transmission of electricity from ocean based renewable energy generation. Under the Attachment K process, NTTG studies and response are to transmission needs and a statute is not a transmission need. FERC was clear in Order 1000A that a statute itself does not create a transmission need. NTTG can consider the statute as a PPC if it had been submitted within the window, a cost allocation scenario, a proposed project or demonstrative transmission need.
 - Chelsea Loomis indicated that through the study work of the TWG, if a need is identified that could be resolved by ocean renewable then NTTG would have the

opportunity to consider the requirement through the change cases. At this time that would be the only way to study the requirement as the window for PPR submissions closed in January.

- Henry Tilghman suggested it would be helpful for the stakeholder meeting in Boise, ID if NTTG could write a paragraph or two describing how NTTG will be complying with its understanding of the statute.
- **Northwest Energy Coalition (NVEC)/Renewable Northwest (RNW) Comments**
 13. Suggested to add a definition of what the term “regionally significant” meant for proposed transmission projects.
 - NTTG Response: A description, not a formal definition was added as a footnote to the study plan.
 - Fred Heutte thanked NTTG for the footnote and indicated that the term “areas” within the description was still unclear and asked there better clarity on the term.
 14. Concur with OWET in their request for the study plan to include the Oregon Statute PPR.
 - NTTG Response: Thanked them for the comment
 - Fred Heutte indicated there is a support for looking at offshore energy however there is a question about how much existing transmission is there on the Oregon coast to support offshore energy and would there be a need. He felt that something would need to be more concrete in order to examine that.
 15. The Oregon RPS standard in 2025 is now 27%.
 - NTTG Response: The RPS Table and Attachment 1 have been updated.
 16. Suggested that the term for the Initial Regional Transmission Plan (IRP) be changed to IRTP to avoid confusion with Integrated Resource Plan.
 - NTTG Response: The references to IRP for Initial Regional Transmission Plan have been changed to “iRTP”
 17. Suggested adding a change case that includes all three of the interregional transmission projects (SWIP-N, TWE, Cross-Tie) to the change case table.
 - NTTG Response: The table was for illustrative purposes only. A description of how the change cases will be selected was added to the study plan.
 - Chelsea Loomis indicated that this cycle NTTG has a combination of regional and interregional projects to evaluate. The TWG will start with the Null case which has all the future transmission projects removed, and test the future transmission load against the current transmission system. Once that is completed, the TWG will compare the Null case against the previous Regional Transmission Plan and then the Initial Regional Transmission Plan. Once that analysis is done, the TWG will make the selection of change cases and bring those to the Planning Committee for discussion which is a public meeting and opportunity for stakeholder input.
 18. Asked for a short description of what deviations from the base case assumptions are acceptable or unacceptable.
 - NTTG Response: Unacceptable path flows are those that exceed the path flow rating. A brief description of how the TWG will review selected paths was also given.

19. Support OWET comments to add an ocean energy allocation scenario.
 - Amy Light indicated that NTTG's response to this comment was incorrect and should tie to #11. The Cost Allocation Committee will be discussing allocation scenarios in their meeting next week. The response will be corrected.
20. Asked for a description of the reason for 800MW was chosen for the wind to solar replacement rather than another amount.
 - NTTG Response: Described the process and reasoning for choosing the 800MW which assumed approximately 50% of the Quarter 1 new incremental wind would be replaced by solar.
21. The text regarding the coal retirement allocation scenario included different options and it was requested clarity on the differences. It was also proposed that NTTG should be looking at coal retirement beyond what is in the member's IRPs.
 - NTTG Response: The first option presumed 1,000 MW of coal units that are not retired in the 2026 case can be reduced. The second option would have the coal retirements retired by 2026 in the members IRPs.
22. A question was asked about the 1,000MW of coal retirement and if it would be represented by reducing the output from each unit as well as how is it represented in the model.
 - NTTG Response: Gave a description of how the power flow study would model the retirement.
23. Additional questions were asked how much of the coal would be retired in the allocation scenario, and how NTTG will address the differences in the IRPs for units with multiple owners.
 - NTTG Response: NTTG is assuming that the TPs are submitting information consistent with their IRPs and that NTTG will use incremental resource changes as provided by the TPs in Quarter 1.
24. NWECC/RNW is in the process of securing a technical expert and requested to either they participate in the TWG during the preparation and assessment of the PPC or another reasonable accommodation for the technical expert to participate.
 - NTTG Response: Gave a description of the membership within the TWG and that they are committed to participated in the entire biennial planning process and not a single study. The response also described how the analysis of the PPC is an extension of the work the TWG is already doing and that the preliminary results being identified in the report.
 - Fred Heutte thanked NTTG for the detailed response. For those who had not been involved in prior conversations, he gave the background for securing funding for a technical expert for assistance in the PPC study. At this time NWECC and RNW does not have a designated person, however they are anticipating the technical expert will be available for the 2016-2017 planning cycle.
 - Due to the requirements of NTTG, NWECC and RNW cannot become members of the NTTG Planning Committee and can only participate in the meetings as a stakeholder. He requested additional discussion from the appropriate members of the Planning Committee for the most efficient and appropriate way to be involved and to have their technical expert involved in the process.

- **LS Power Comments**

25. Places in the study plan interchangeably used the various terms of the Regional Plan and suggested to define and properly use the terms. Their other comment indicated that the acronym used for both the Initial Regional Transmission Plan and Interregional Transmission Projects were the same "ITP".
 - NTTG Response: A footnote will be added to address the various terms of the Regional Plan and that the acronym for the Initial Regional Transmission Plan has been changed to "iRTP"
 - John Leland pointed out that in NTTG's response the acronym "iRTP" should have a lower case "i".
26. Suggestion to add a footnote for the SWIP-N project in the table that listed the interregional projects and included proposed language.
 - NTTG Response: The proposed language was added as a footnote.
27. The Oregon RPS increased to 27%
 - NTTG Response: The RPS Table and Attachment 1 have been updated.
28. Study for alternative projects should include economic and policy benefits not just reliability. Suggested that the ITP Evaluation Process Plans be included in the study plan since they are evaluated as change cases under the Regional Plan.
 - NTTG Response: The reliability of the region must be maintained in the Regional Plan and gave an explanation of how alternative projects are evaluated. The study plan will include the ITP Evaluation Plans as an attachment for those projects where NTTG is a Relevant Planning Region.
29. Requested a description of each projects listed in the Table. Recommended a case with SWIP-N and Gateway West as well as a SWIP-N only case.
 - NTTG Response: Project descriptions were added to the study plan. An explanation was given of how the TWG will use their profession judgement to select change cases as the TWG will not be able to run all combination of projects and flow patterns.
30. Indicated the reference in the study plan of the resubmittal of project qualification in each succeeding cycle is not consistent with the Attachment K language.
 - NTTG Response: Indicated the language is consistent and gave a description of the language in the Attachment K.
31. Suggested additional milestones and updates on interregional transmission project review be added giving more opportunities for stakeholders to provide input. Another suggestion was to include the ITP Evaluation Plans into the study plan.
 - NTTG Response: Updates on both regional and interregional projects will be given during NTTG's Planning Committee and Stakeholder meetings which are public and stakeholders are encouraged to participate. The study plan will include the ITP Evaluation Plans as an attachment for those projects where NTTG is a Relevant Planning Region.

- Sharon Helms reviewed the changes needing to be made as discussed during the meeting
 - #25 – A small "i" in iRTP.
 - #19 – Correct the language in the response to tie to #11
 - Agreement to add a paragraph on how NTTG will comply with the ocean energy and is consistent with how NTTG complies with other PPR.



- Sharon Helms reminded participants the NTTG Cost Allocation and Planning Committee meetings are open and encouraged stakeholders to participate. As a reminder the Cost Allocation Committee will meeting on June 14th to discuss the cost allocation scenarios and the next NTTG Stakeholder meeting is scheduled for June 28th.

Discussion: Round Table/Other Business

- There was none.

3. Assignments:

Item #	Assignment	Owner	Target Date	Status
1.	Correct #25 NTTG response to include a small "i" in iRTP	A Wachsnicht	6/8/16	Completed
2.	Correct the language in #19 NTTG response to tie to #11	A Wachsnicht	6/8/16	Completed
3.	Develop a paragraph on how NTTG will comply with ocean energy for discussion at the NTTG Stakeholder meeting in Boise.	A Light/C Loomis	6/22/16	Completed
4.				

Next Meeting: The next Northern Tier Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for July 13th at 1PM Pacific.

- Voice Conference Mtg.: **(626) 425-3121** Access Code: **432-608-245**



Attendees:

NTTG Planning Committee Member Representatives

Membership Class 1		
Jared Ellsworth, Idaho Power	Don Johnson, Portland General	Nathan Powell, Deseret
Bill Hosie, TransCanada	Chelsea Loomis, Vice Chair, NorthWestern	Scott Waples, Avista Corp

Membership Class 2

Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Rhett Hurless, Absaroka Energy	
-----------------------	--------------------------------	--

Membership Class 3

Johanna Bell, ID PUC	Bob Decker, MT PSC	David Walker, WY PSC
John Chatburn, ID OER		

NTTG Cost Allocation Committee Member Representatives

Membership Class 1

Jamie Austin, PacifiCorp	Amy Light, Portland General	Kim McClafferty, NorthWestern
Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Clay MacArthur, Deseret	Courtney Waites, Idaho Power

Membership Class 2

Johanna Bell, Idaho PUC	Bob Decker, MT PSC	Larry Nordell, MT CC
Bob Davis, UT Div. PU	Marci Norby, WY PSC	Bela Vastag, UT OF CS

Other NTTG Members & Guests

Travis Allen, MATL	John Leland, NTTG	Ron Schellberg, NTTG
Darrell Gerrard, TransCanyon LLC	Morgan Kikendall, WY PSC	Henry Tilgham, OWET
Sharon Helms, NTTG	Bill Pascoe, TWE	Amy Wachsnicht, NTTG
Fred Heutte, NW Energy Coalition	Kishore Patel, PacifiCorp	