

Description of Meeting:	NTTG Planning Committee
Meeting Date:	March 11, 2015
Meeting Notes Prepared By:	Amy Wachsnicht
Approved for Posting:	May 13, 2015

1. Agenda:

- a. Welcome, Establish Quorum, Agenda Review
- b. Approval of February 11, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting Notes
- c. Approval of March 4, 2015 “Special” Planning Committee Meeting Notes
- d. Steering Committee Approval of the Revised Biennial Study Plan
- e. Public Policy Consideration Study Update
- f. Round Table/Other Business

2. Discussions & Decisions:

Discussion: Welcome, Establish Quorum, Agenda Review

- It was noted that quorum requirements had been met in Class 1 and in Class 2 but had not been met in Class 3.
 - According to the Planning Committee Charter in order to conduct a vote, quorum must be met in Class 1 and one additional class present.
 - Voting requirements were met since a quorum was met in Class 1 and Class 2.
- During the agenda review it was noted that the NTTG Technical Workgroup (TWG) had some items they wanted discussed with the Planning Committee during the round table.

Decision: Approval of February 11, 2015 Planning Committee Meeting Notes

- On the attendance Bill Pascoe was shown as representing “TransCanada” and indicated his representation should be with “Pascoe Energy”.
- With that change a motion was made, then seconded and unanimously approved in Class 1 and Class 2 to post the February 11, 2015 Planning Committee meeting notes.

Decision: Approval of March 4, 2015 “Special” Planning Committee Meeting Notes

- There were no changes or further discussion on the March 4, 2015 “Special” Planning Committee Meeting Notes.
- A motion was made to approve the notes and seconded. With abstentions by Scott Waples and Chelsea Loomis, the meeting notes were approved for posting.
- Dave Angell informed the committee that he had been calling for special meetings as it provides an opportunity for the committee to discuss and ask questions prior to casting a vote as well as avoid having to do email approvals.
 - When conducting an email approval 100% of participation from all member representatives is required which is a higher threshold than a meeting as there is no opportunity for member discussion or questions.
- Dave also reiterated the fact that Planning Committee members can appoint a proxy up to 1 business day prior to the meeting if they are unable to attend.
- The general consensus of the Planning Committee saw value in holding special meetings to conduct votes rather than email approval.

Discussion: Steering Committee Approval of the Revised Biennial Study Plan

- During the March 9, 2015 NTTG Steering Committee meeting, Dave Angell presented the Revised Biennial Study Plan.

- During the meeting he informed the Steering Committee that Q5 data submittals had changed since the posting of the presentation and shared a slide showing the updated information.
- Dave also informed the Steering Committee if there were any revisions or adjustments to the methodology to the Study Plan, it would be brought back to the committee.
 - However if there are only changes to input data as a result of the Q5 data submissions then it would not need to come back to Steering.
 - There was no push back from Steering regarding the input data changes.
- The tables in the Study Plan will be updated with the Q5 data submissions showing the changes from Q1.

Discussion: Public Policy Consideration (PPC) Study Update

- An update on the PPC Study was presented during the March 9, 2015 Steering Committee meeting.
 - Dave Angell informed the Planning Committee the presentation was posted on the NTTG website.
- The study was done using a TEPPC case using powerflow analysis and production cost modeling (PCM).
 - The limitations of the case is that it is not dynamic ready.
 - Because of the non-dynamics component a true simulation of the responses on the acceleration trends relay (ATR) could not be achieved.
- The study approach used by NorthWestern was to model a steady state response to the outages on the 500 kV system and trip different combinations of coal at Colstrip or wind at Broadview.
 - At a high level the study results show that for the N-0 and N-1 contingencies, the wind at Broadview did not significantly change the response of the transmission system.
 - High level study results for N-2 showed three credible double contingencies that needed to be looked at for further consideration:
 - Colstrip – Broadview
 - Broadview – Garrison
 - Garrison – Taft
 - The results under the N-2 operating conditions showed the transmission system responded similarly to wind at Broadview as it did to coal at Colstrip.
- Due to the amount of effort it would take to get the TEPPC cases set up, NTTG is not planning on doing dynamic studies.
- Fred Heutte with the NW Energy Coalitions informed the committee that he and others are having discussions with ColumbiaGrid for doing more of a dynamics analysis and realizes the need for some prep to look at a full dynamics study as WECC does not have a complete data set up.
- At this time NorthWestern Energy is the only companies to properly simulate the response of the ATR on the Colstrip units using a proprietary piece of software in conjunction with the PSS/E program.
 - NorthWestern is working with PowerWorld to develop a block model that members of WECC could use for future use.
- Timeline for producing the PPC Study Report:
 - March 20th – Study results and draft report ready for TWG review
 - March 31st – PPC Study results and report update at NTTG Q5 Stakeholder Meeting
 - April 8th – NTTG Planning Committee to review report with an open stakeholder comment period following.
- With the amount of work ahead for the TWG on implementing the revised Study Plan as well as cost allocation scenarios it is unclear if NTTG could take on a dynamics study.



- Dave Angell informed the committee he planned on discussing dynamic studies with the NTTG Management Committee for discussion and input on what direction NTTG should go should stakeholders want to move forward with dynamic studies.

Discussion: Round Table/Other Business

- Attachment K requires NTTG to do a cost allocation on the projects selected into the plan that requested cost allocation as well as any unsponsored projects that are selected into the final plan. However if the projects are not selected into the final plan then cost allocation is not required.
 - The TWG presented the Planning Committee two options on how to proceed:
 - Perform cost allocation on the projects in the Draft Regional Transmission Plan; or
 - Wait until the Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan.
 - When looking at when to perform a cost allocation something the TWG should consider is how long it would take for the Cost Allocation Committee to do their analysis as well as the timeline for completing the Regional Transmission Plan.
 - The Draft Final Regional Transmission Plan needs to be completed in Quarter 7 for stakeholder review.
 - In December of Q8, the report will be sent to Steering for their approval.
- The TEPPC cases did not include the Q1 data for the load and resources. With the revised Study Plan, the TWG can use the Q5 data to revise the cases according to the load and resources submitted.

3. Assignments:

Item #	Assignment	Owner	Target Date	Status
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

Next Meeting: The next Northern Tier Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for April 8th at 1PM Pacific.

- Dial: **(626) 425-3121**
- Access Code: **432-608-245**



Attendees:

NTTG Planning Committee Member Representatives

Membership Class 1		
Dave Angell, Chair, Idaho Power	Chelsea Loomis, NorthWestern	Craig Quist, PacifiCorp
Bill Hosie, TransCanada	Don Johnson, Portland General	Scott Waples, Avista Corp

Membership Class 2		
Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Stacy Gasvoda, Gaelectric	Rhett Hurless, Absaroka Energy

Membership Class 3		
John Chatburn, ID OER	Bob Decker, MT PSC	Jerry Maio, UT PSC

Other NTTG Members & Guests

Jamie Austin, PacifiCorp	Fred Heutte, NVEC	Kishore Patel, PacifiCorp
Gil Coulam, NTTG	John Leland, NTTG	Amy Wachsnicht, NTTG
Sharon Helms, NTTG	Bill Pascoe, Pascoe Energy	