

NTTG 2018-2019 Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan Stakeholder Comments and NTTG Response

Commenter Contact Information			NTTG Tracking Information		
Date: July 15, 2019					
Name: Bob Smith			Committee Assignment: Planning Committee		
Organization: TransCanyon					
Comments			NTTG Responses		
DFRTP Section	Page/Line #	Comment	ID#	Response Date	Response & Incorporated Changes (if any) (Section, Page, Table, etc.)
Preface Paragraph 2	A	States "represents a lower-cost transmission plan than one represented by a rollup of the combined Transmission Provider's plans." Are the uncommitted projects considered to be in the rollup? Is it lower cost because it represents a subset of the rollup?	1	7-25-19	All uncommitted projects are included in the roll up, and is referred to as the IRTP. The dRTP is a lower cost because three segments of the Gateway West Project (Hemmingway-Midpoint, Midpoint-Cedar Hill, and Borah-Populus) were not included. This was last cycle's RTP configuration as well.
Executive Summary	Page 1 Lines 15-16	Indicates two potential dRTP cases but then on lines 20 and 21 it indicates change made and study performed on one but not clear which one	2	7-25-19	The two cases considered for the dRTP were the IRTP and the pRTP (last cycle's RTP). Lines 21 refers to the dRTP that selected the pRTP in Q4 of this cycle. A clarifying sentence was added to the Executive Summary.
Resource Submissions	Page 3 Lines 61-62	PGE provided resource data. No other entities provides data?	3	7-25-19	In Q1, PGE did not list any resource additions in its data submittal, where other data submitters had. So in Q5 the summary and report includes submissions from all. The resource submission paragraph was revised to just indicate the figure and tables include Q1 and Q5 submissions.
Power Flow Cases	Page 11 Lines 186-187	Statement: "the balancing area loads in the powerflow model were adjusted to get peak loads that represent 1 in 5 to 1 in 10 peak load conditions" is not clear.	4	7-25-19	Only the NTTG footprint loads were adjusted. Each BA was adjusted to a targeted 1 in 5 level. Since several subareas peak at different periods than the coincident footprint

Commenter Contact Information			NTTG Tracking Information		
Date: July 15, 2019					
Name: Bob Smith			Committee Assignment: Planning Committee		
Organization: TransCanyon					
Comments			NTTG Responses		
DFRTP Section	Page/Line #	Comment	ID#	Response Date	Response & Incorporated Changes (if any) (Section, Page, Table, etc.)
		Were all loads adjusted to get somewhere between 1 in 5 and 1 in 10. What was criteria for determining which?			peak, the scaling's were not uniform and would likely represent a 1 in 10 footprint condition. The reference to 1 in 10 was removed from the report.
Simultaneous Wind Production in Wyoming	Page 13 Lines 218-219	Statement: "90% of the peak capacity of the existing and forecasted wind resources to be installed". Does the 90% refer to 90% of the maximum actual production, or 90% of installed capacity? Or is it the same thing?	5	7-25-19	The peak installed capacity of the Wyoming wind is 3177 MW, however, some of that nameplate capacity is limited. The maximum coincident production is limited to 2950 MW. The 2655 MW value selected was 90% of that maximum coincident production.
High Wyoming Wind Case	Page 26 Lines 319-320	Is exceedance defined?	6	7-25-19	Yes. Multiple dictionaries define Exceedance as "an act or fact of exceeding something, especially a limit or amount". TWG choose to use 90% level in selecting the wind production level for its studies. The text at lines 318 and 319 was revised to state that 2655 MW was 90% of the peak wind production.