



<b>NTTG Order 1000 Stakeholder Comment and Input Form</b> Your input on Northern Tier's processes are important to us. Please submit comments to <a href="mailto:info@nttg.biz">info@nttg.biz</a>			<b>NTTG Response</b> All responses are dynamic and based upon assumptions that may be adjusted as options are fleshed out and alternatives considered; Unless otherwise indicated, responses are subject to change.			
<a href="#">Received via info @ nttg on July 17, 2012</a> <a href="#">July 17, 2012: Assigned to the CostAllocation Compliance Workgroup</a> <b>Commentor Contact Information</b> Date: July 17, 2012 Name: Vicki M. Baldwin Organization: UIEC			<b>NTTG Tracking Info</b> Date Received: July 17, 2012 @ 12:05 PM Committee Assignment: NTTG Cost Allocation Compliance Workgroup Date Assigned: July 17, 2012			
<b>Comments</b>			<b>DRAFT RESPONSE</b>			
Source Document	Page / #	Comment	ID#	Title	Response Date	Draft Response
NTTG O1K Cost Allocation Compliance Work Group meeting minutes of May 30, 2012	1	The second bullet point under the second topic under "Discussions & Decisions" states: "A local plan can only be trumped if a regional plan is better; hence, cost allocation only applies to a plan that is better than the initial plan." Please explain what is meant by this.	64	UIEC #26	7.23.12	At that time, NTTG contemplated limiting cost allocation eligibility to projects which replaced or deferred a project in the Initial Plan by meeting the same needs more cost effectively; accordingly, absent such project replacement/deferral, the Initial Plan would consist only of "rolled up" projects from local plans designed to meet local needs and would not warrant regional cost allocation. However, NTTG has since decided to allow Initial Plan projects to be submitted with a request for cost allocation, irrespective of whether it replaced or deferred another project in the plan.
NTTG O1K Cost Allocation Compliance Work Group meeting minutes of June 7, 2012	2	The third bullet under "Alternate Assumption/Scenarios for Second Screen" talks about the second- screen proposal requirements and states "Beneficiaries can be identified and reached by NTTG cost allocation." What exactly is meant by "reached by NTTG cost allocation"? There is extensive evidence throughout Order 1000 and Order 1000-A that cost allocation is NOT to be limited to only jurisdictional facilities and entities. Therefore, if that is what is meant by "reached by NTTG cost allocation" we have serious disagreement with such a statement.	65	UIEC #27	7.23.12	The metrics currently contemplated by NTTG for measuring transmission benefits as a basis for cost allocation include cost-effective replacement/deferral of an Initial Plan project, peak capacity loss savings, energy loss savings, and savings from reduced contingency reserves. To the extent these metrics---or others approved for use by the Cost Allocation Committee---identify benefits for a non-jurisdictional entity, NTTG may consider a conditional cost allocation, conditioned on that entity's willingness to accept its allocated costs.