

Description of Meeting:	NTTG Quarter 7 Public Stakeholder Meeting
Meeting Date:	September 26, 2019
Meeting Notes Prepared By:	Amy Wachsnicht
Approved for Posting:	November 25, 2019

Agenda:

- Welcome & Agenda Review
- NTTG 2018-2019 Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan
- 2019 NTTG Economic Study Request
- WECC Anchor Data Set Update
- Neighboring Planning Region Updates
- Next Steps/Stakeholder Comments/Other Business

Welcome and Agenda Review

- Sharon welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the agenda.
- NTTG completed Quarter 7 of the biennial planning cycle which included stakeholder review of NTTG's 2018-2019 Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan (RTP).

NTTG 2018-2019 Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan (Presented by Chelsea Loomis)

- In Quarter 7, the Draft Final RTP was posted for stakeholder comment. NTTG received one set of comments from TransCanyon. These were reviewed, responded to and changes incorporated into the Draft Final RTP.
- During the August meeting the NTTG Planning Committee approved the responses to the comments and subsequent changes to the plan.
- Chelsea Loomis walked through the [stakeholder comments](#) and subsequent [changes to the Draft Final RTP](#) made as a result of the comments.

2019 NTTG Economic Study Request

- The Joint Parties submitted an Economic Study Request (ESR) in 2019 during NTTG's annual ESR window.
- The request was to study replacing 500 kV Gateway West and South projects segments with [345 kV construction](#). NTTG preformed the studies on the eight power flow cases used in the Draft Final RTP as well as a sensitivity case ran on one of the Public Policy Consideration case. Overall, the studied conditions showed the ESR appeared to preform acceptably, however, the configuration changes the flows and support of the Wasatch Front and the Utah area in general.
- Heat maps were developed to illustrate the impacts of the ESR studied configuration results compared to the Draft Final RTP configuration results. ([Slides 11 – 14](#)).

➤ **Question:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – Can you explain what the HighTot2/COI case incumbencies? Is it almost like a force case? ([Slide 12](#))

- **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – It is not a forced case, it was extracted from the production cost analysis, and that particular case or scenario was setting up a case for studying the interregional projects and moving energy to California. That case had high stress north and south on Tot2 and COI. You are moving energy from the northeast to the southwest.

➤ **Question:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – At a rate payer's expense?

- **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – It doesn't have anything to do with rate payers' expense, it's just how the economics of that case can perform. This particular case for NTTG draft plan wasn't a principle driver for the configuration selection, it was used for analyzing the interregional project and whether they brought benefits to NTTG.

- **Comment:** *Chelsea Loomis (NorthWestern)* – Ron (Schellberg) makes a good reminder that these cases weren't chosen out of thin air. We ran production cost modeling (PCM) and utilized the expertise of the Technical Workgroup (TWG) to find the hours with different stresses on the system and having a High Tot2/COI path was certainly one of the possibilities in the 8760 of the PCM.
- **Question:** *Brian DeKiep (NWPCC)* – What was the hour and timeframe? I'm curious as we are getting ready to do a plan for 2021 and I am curious to what you are seeing compared to us.
 - **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – Its listed in the report. May 16th at 7:00pm.
 - In the Draft Final RTP, Gateway South provides support for outages in the Path C cutplane. However, in the ESR configuration the Gateway South support doesn't exist and therefore has limited future expansion capabilities. To demonstrate this, a QV [plot graph was created for the critical Path-C](#) outage. The ESR configuration showed a risk of voltage collapses sooner than the Draft Final RTP which is indicative of less future growth capability just beyond the 10-year horizon.
- **Question:** *Brian DeKiep (NWPCC)* – To clarify, you are better off with the draft plan than the ESR configuration?
 - **Answer:** *Chelsea Loomis (NorthWestern)* – For opportunities across Path C beyond the 10-year horizon, we are better off with the draft plan.
- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – That is a good caveat. We can build a lot of transmission and put it on the backs of rate payers, but we have to understand there is a cost savings to the ESR study. There are limitations in the future.
- **Comment:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – What this points out is, beyond 10 years you are having to build something else to accommodate that growth. If you are going to plan for that future, you need to start planning for that future right now, because you are not going to get that new facility built in 10 years.
- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – So everyone understands, the perspective of Deseret, both plans are adequate. We see advantages of both plans, however, as a Utah Transmission dependent utility, the cost of Gateway is going to be put into PacifiCorp rate. And those rates are more than quadruple our costs. It's installing a \$5billion to \$6billion project and we are trying to find alternatives for our rate payers to these costs. As a Director of a utility in my prior life, I always wanted to build best and greatest and what makes sense for future growth, but the backs of the customers couldn't carry it at that time. We are trying to find alternatives and we appreciate the effort that has gone into the Economic Study, alternative study and we don't want to throw that aside because Gateway is already out the door.
- **Comment:** *Jamie Austin (PacifiCorp)* – This is not a forum for talking about rate making. NTTG is sanctioned by FERC to do economic studies and not discuss rate making. I think this is out of line for bringing those topics here. With regards to the alternative project, we can study that and provide an opinion, but this is not the forum for rate making discussions.
- **Comment:** *Chelsea Loomis (NorthWestern)* – Thank you for that, it was my understanding that Phil's (Solomon) comment was not introducing a rate making discussion, I think he was trying to give us a little bit of color on where he is coming from and the concerns he's got.
- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – The key word is economic study and that's what it's about. We don't want it to be thrown aside because someone wants a project to move forward. I understand that it is always prudent if you can afford it to accommodate future growth.
- **Comment:** *John Leland (NTTG)* – I agree, this is not a rate making forum, but it is an Economic Study Request we evaluated, and it provides information. That is the sole purpose of what NTTG does. It doesn't provide an opportunity for construction, only information for PacifiCorp, Deseret and other that are interested in understanding these results. What we try to do here is lay out, as best we could, given the level of studies we did, all the things we saw with respect to the two alternatives. Its not for us to make any decision, we are saying "This is what we found". As information, this could be forwarded through other processes with PacifiCorp, if that is the case, that would cause things to happen or change if the study itself doesn't. However, that is all we are trying to do here.

- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – I understand and appreciate that. My comment, as Chelsea (Loomis) alluded to was not about rate making. We wanted to make sure everyone understands our argument for the economic study.
 - [Megawatt flow graphs for different paths](#) were also created to illustrate the differences between the ESR configuration and the Draft Final RTP. In the ESR configuration, a number of paths in and out of Wyoming, as well as other WECC paths, become more congested.
- **Question:** *Brian DeKiep (NWPCC)* – Path 8 is contractually full. How can you increase it almost doubled? The congestion costs almost double, so significant flows are going to Path 8. ([Slide 19](#))
 - **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – It is a cost because Path 8 is full.
- **Question:** *Brian DeKiep (NWPCC)* – If we were an RTO and had congestion costs, that is what the production cost model gives you.
 - **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – It's a portion of the costs. It looks at each hour. If you started with an hour and changed the configuration to cause the flow to go up, that gets captured as a congestion cost. Changing the dispatch keeps the flow within the system's capability.
- **Question:** *Brian DeKiep (NWPCC)* – If we increase the capacity of Path 8 out of Montana, it would likely lower the congestion costs?
 - **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – Presumably the cost would go down or be eliminated.
- **Comment:** *John Leland (NTTG)* – With the Economic Study Request configuration of transmission, you don't have as much ability to move that Wyoming wind out of where it would go with the Gateway Projects. It would go other routes and one of those other routes would be through Montana. This would cause additional flows across Path 8 and like Chelsea said earlier the flows change because you have different transmission configurations.
- **Comment:** *Jamie Austin (PacifiCorp)* – To summarize, all paths exit in Wyoming simply because you have lower capacity with the ESR scenario. The energy is being pushed on anything exiting Wyoming to the north and then to the west on Path 8 through Idaho, Bridger West as well as TOT 3. Everything exiting Wyoming is trying to make up the slack of the lower capacity transmission that we have with the ESR scenario.
 - In the Public Policy Consideration scenarios, the Draft Final RTP configuration overall performed better than the ESR configuration.
 - While the ESR configuration shows a potential \$1,924M capital cost savings, the Path C cutplane becomes a limiting constraint.
 - The ESR report was posted for stakeholder comment. One set of comments were received from the Joint Parties. These comments were reviewed, responded to and changes made to the report and were approved by the NTTG Planning Committee during their September meeting.
 - Chelsea Loomis walked through the [comments received, NTTG's responses and changes to the report](#).
- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – With the first comment about the Executive Summary, and the response implied there were other things wanting to be added, then it was decided not to change the Executive Summary.
 - **Answer:** *Ron Schellberg (NTTG)* – The response says, "thank you for the comment". It doesn't say anything would change.
- **Comment:** *Phil Solomon (Deseret)* – [I mean comment number two](#). The answer says, if we put that language in, then we would also want to put in these other clarifying factors.
 - **Answer:** *Chelsea Loomis (NorthWestern)* – That is a good observation.
- **Comment:** *Jamie Austin (PacifiCorp)* – I believe the same is listed under results at the end of the report and would be redundant to have all the costs at the front. It's not necessarily the answer, but



the intention was if the capital cost savings were included, then you have to include the rest of the project costs to make it reasonable and not misleading.

WECC Anchor Data Set Update

- Work on the Anchor Data Set (ADS) started in 2016 following WECC Board approval. The ADS as proposed was to define a single coordinated data source from which planning information could be used for the regions and other stakeholders. The source of the data would be from the planning regions' regional transmission plans.
- An ADS Taskforce was created to address questions and respond to requests the WECC Board had on the ADS. In that time, the taskforce created an ADS Process Guide which describes the foundational requirements of the ADS for WECC staff to develop. The details of the process are included in attachments and workflows.
- Gary DeShazo, Chair of the ADS taskforce requested WECC review the document to ensure it answers the request of the Board before it is put before the RAC Committee for approval during their October 18th meeting.
 - There is a push to get the process guide completed and approved this year as the October RAC meeting is the last one for 2019.
- Gary DeShazo thanked John Leland and Jamie Austin for their work in this process.

Neighboring Planning Region Updates

- CAISO – Gary DeShazo
 - CAISO held two days of stakeholder meetings to present the reliability results for the 2019-2020 planning cycle. The first day, CAISO presented their study results with the second day being the transmission owners study result presentations for their projects being proposed to the CAISO.
 - In November the results of the economic studies will be presented to stakeholders followed by a Board meeting in early 2020 to review and approve the final plan.
 - In December, the CAISO will begin its 2020-2021 planning process by developing the study plan which will be presented to stakeholders in February.
- ColumbiaGrid – Larry Furumasu
 - ColumbiaGrid is in its first year of the biennial planning cycle, with system assessments done annually. The 2019 system assessment is completed and did not identify any Order 1000 needs and has been posted on ColumbiaGrid's website.
 - The last quarter of the year will be running special studies looking at NERC standards PRC 26, MOD33 and TPL7.
 - Given the transition of ColumbiaGrid members to the new regional planning organization, NorthernGrid, many of the 2020 studies have moved up a few months.
 - The 2020 system assessment should be done in May with the Biennial Plan completed in October.
 - The next planning meeting is on October 10th in Portland, OR.
- WestConnect – Charlie
 - WestConnect is finishing the current biennial process with the development of the Plan Report. During the October 16th PMC meeting, members will review the draft final report and ask for approval. A stakeholder meeting will be scheduled in November with stakeholder input and then finalized.
 - During Quarter 4 of this cycle, WestConnect will begin development of the study plan for the next biennial cycle.

Next Steps/Stakeholder Comments/Other Business

- On September 24th, the NTTG 2018-2019 Revised Draft Final RTP was posted for stakeholder comment. The window for submitting comments ends at 5:00pm MDT on October 2nd.
 - NTTG will compile any comments received, respond and make additional modifications to the report if necessary.



- During the October NTTG Planning Committee, members will review stakeholder comments, any subsequent changes to the report and vote to submit the plan to the Steering Committee for their approval at their December meeting.
- On December 5th, NTTG will hold its final stakeholder meeting reviewing the two-year process followed by the final Steering Committee meeting on December 19th.
- In Quarter 8, NTTG will also open the process for Project Sponsor Pre-Qualification.
 - NTTG's transmission providers have given notice and have been working to develop a new regional planning organization that encompasses the footprints of NTTG and ColumbiaGrid.
 - Should NTTG received any Project Sponsor Pre-Qualification submittals, Sharon Helms will work with the transmission providers on the process of transferring the information for NorthernGrid's planning process.

Hearing no other comments, the meeting was adjourned.



Attendees List:

First	Last	Company	In Person	Webinar
Rhett	Hurless	Absaroka Energy	x	
John	Gross	Avisa Corp		x
Gary	DeShazo	California ISO		x
Larry	Furumasu	ColumbiaGrid		x
Pat	Bordelon	Crest Operation		x
Nathan	Powell	Deseret	x	
Phil	Solomon	Deseret	x	
Kathleen	Fraser	Energy Strategies		x
John	Chatburn	ID Gov. OEMR		x
George	Lynch	ID Gov. OEMR		x
Marissa	Warren	ID Gov. OEMR		x
Jared	Ellsworth	Idaho Power		x
Courtney	Waites	Idaho Power		x
Curtis	Westhoff	Idaho Power		x
Alan	Hockenson	KBT Energy		x
Younglae	Kim	MATL		x
Larry	Nordell	MT Consumer Council		x
Jamie	Stamatson	MT Consumer Council	x	
Robin	Arnold	MT Public Service Commission		x
Antonio	Utrillas	NaturEner		x
Bill	Hosie	New American Transmission Co.		x
Rich	Bayless	Northern Tier Transmission Group		x
Sharon	Helms	Northern Tier Transmission Group	x	
John	Leland	Northern Tier Transmission Group	x	
Ron	Schellberg	Northern Tier Transmission Group	x	
Amy	Wachsicht	Northern Tier Transmission Group	x	
Chelsea	Loomis	NorthWestern Energy	x	
Brian	Dekiep	NWPCC	x	
Jamie	Austin	PacifiCorp		x
Scott	Beyer	PacifiCorp		x
Kishore	Patel	PacifiCorp		x
Rikin	Shah	PacifiCorp		x
Shaun	Foster	Portland General		x
Charlie	Reinhold	WestConnect		x
Belinda	Kolb	WY OFC Consumer Advocates		x
James	Branscomb	WY Public Service Commission		x
Daney	Brauchie	WY Public Service Commission		x
Kara	Fornstrom	WY Public Service Commission		x