



## NTTG 2016-2017 Draft Study Plan Stakeholder Comment Form

Open Comment period May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016 through May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2016

Please submit comments to [info@nttg.biz](mailto:info@nttg.biz)

### Commenter Contact Information

Date 5/27/2016
Name Fred Heutte and Cameron Yourkowski
Organization NW Energy Coalition and Renewable Northwest

### Stakeholder Comments

Study Plan Section	Page/Line #	Comment
	108	Please add a short definition of "regionally significant" proposed transmission projects
	267	We concur with Oregon Wave Energy Trust in requesting that the NTTG study plan include the Oregon public policy requirement to consider the transmission of electricity derived from ocean based renewable energy generation. ORS 7575.811, HB 2187 (2015).
	268	As noted in the table on p. 29, the Oregon RPS standard in 2025 is now 27%, an increase from 25%
	422	In the text and the table, to avoid confusion with the term IRP (Integrated Resource Plan), we suggest using Initial Regional Transmission Plan (IRTP)
	422	Noting that the table is an initial proposal and may be amended, we suggest a change case including all three of the proposed interregional projects -- SWIP North, TWE and TransCanyon/Cross-Tie
	486	It would be helpful to add a short description of what deviations from base case assumptions are acceptable or unacceptable. To what degree does this reflect NERC or WECC planning criteria and engineering judgement.
	548	We support Oregon Wave Energy Trust's proposal to add an allocation scenario which would replace 1000 MW of onshore wind and solar with 1000 MW of a mix of offshore wind and marine hydrokinetic energy.
	555	Please briefly describe why 800 MW was chosen for the wind-to-solar replacement alternative rather than some other amount.
	561	It appears that the text starting at 564 and 568 are different options. We would probably prefer the second option but would like additional clarity. In general, we propose that NTTG should be running scenarios that look at coal retirement beyond what is in the current member IRPs.

	564	For the first option, would a total 1000 MW of coal retirement be represented by reducing output from each coal unit? If so how is this represented in the model - as seasonal shutdown, maintenance outage, etc.?
	568	How much coal would be retired if this follows each NTTG member's IRP? For units with multiple owners, how will differences in the IRPs be addressed?
	707	We appreciate the inclusion of the NWECC/RNW requested public policy consideration study in the proposed 2016-17 study plan. We anticipate securing the services of a technical expert with substantial background in transmission planning and modeling, and would like to request either 1) their participation with the Technical Working Group during preparation and assessment of the PPC study, or 2) some other reasonable accommodation to provide our consultant meaningful access to the data, model, assumptions and any preliminary results associated with the PPC study. Appropriate arrangements for confidentiality would be made and we would like to stress that our consultant will have expertise relevant to this specific study request and the ability to meaningfully contribute to the study with minimal intrusion.