



Description of Meeting: Meeting Date: Meeting Notes Prepared By: Approved for Posting by Planning Committee: Approved for Posting by Cost Allocation Committee:	NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes April 11, 2018 Amy Wachsnicht June 27, 2018
--	--

1. Agenda:

- a. Roll Call, Establish Quorum and Agenda Review
- b. Approval of November 8, 2017 NTTG Planning Committee meeting notes
- c. 2018 – 2019 Quarter 1 Transmission Planning Needs
- d. 2018-2019 Cost Allocation Data Submittals Overview
- e. Public Policy Consideration Study Request Overview
 - i. **Approval Item:** Planning Committee recommendation on whether to accept the Public Policy Consideration Study
- f. **Round Table/Other Business**

2. Discussions & Decisions:

Decision: Approval of November 8, 2017 NTTG Planning Committee meeting notes

- Prior to asking for a motion to approve the meeting notes, Bob Decker inquired if the attendee list was correct in showing Chelsea Loomis as Absaroka Energy’s proxy. Chelsea Loomis confirmed that was correct as Rhett Hurless reached out to her to be his proxy.
- With a motion by Bob Decker and second by Craig Quist, the November 8, 2017 NTTG Planning Committee meeting notes were **approved** for posting.

Discussion: 2018-2018 Quarter 1 Transmission Planning Needs

- Jared Ellsworth walked through the data submittals received by NTTG on or before March 31, 2018.
- Comparing load submissions between 2016 and 2017 actual peak, there is approximately an additional 116 MW in the NTTG footprint.
- For resource submissions, there is a drop off of natural gas submissions for 2028 compared to 2026 as well as a large change in coal retirements for 2028. The Technical Workgroup (TWG) is still reviewing the coal retirements to verify what should be included in the 10 year planning horizon and what is considered outside of the study window.
- Transmission submissions from NTTG’s transmission providers show those transmission additions that are more regionally significant.
 - NorthWestern did not have any submissions this cycle.
 - It was noticed that the Portland General various local service projects showed 138kV, however, Portland General indicated this should be 115kV and below.
 - PacifiCorp indicated that the Deseret Bonansa-Upalco has been dropped from their local transmission plan and therefore will be removed from the list.



- Idaho Power based on their IRP submitted two new transmission service requests.
- For Public Policy Requirements, Idaho Power does not have any RPS requirements, whereas, NorthWestern, PacifiCorp and Portland General, all submitted RPS requirements that will be met by 2028.
- No Economic Study Requests were submitted to NTTG, therefore NTTG will not be performing any of these studies.
- NTTG received three interregional project submissions; Cross-Tie, SWIP-North and TransWest Express projects.
 - Ron Schellberg indicated that TransWest Express submitted two configurations of the project, one is the DC line and the other is an AC/DC combination.
- NTTG received a number of coal retirements with an end date of 12/31/2028, which is also the date the planning cycle goes through.
 - The TWG has been struggling with how to deal with the 2028 heavy summer power flow model. They thought of two alternatives for how to handle and requested Planning Committee input.
 - Alternative 1 – Strict model – Model Unit in-service
 - Alternative 2 – Loose model – Model resource out-of-service
 - 2028 Loads and 2029 Resources
 - Through discussion with members on both alternative options, a suggestion was made to model both. Alternative 1 would be the official model for this planning cycle and Alternative 2 could be done as a sensitivity case.
 - Jared Ellsworth indicated he would take the suggestion back to the TWG for further discussion.

Discussion: 2018-2018 Cost Allocation Data Submittals Overview

- NTTG received two cost allocation data submittals, Great Basin Transmission (SWIP-North project) and TransCanyon (Cross-Tie project). Both project sponsors had been pre-qualified and submitted the cost allocation data information for their projects, on or before March 31st.
- Courtney Waites walked through each section of the cost allocation data submittal form for each project:
 - [SWIP-North](#)
 - [Cross-Tie](#)
- After the overview, it was asked if the submittal forms and appendices would be circulated to the members of the Cost Allocation Committee.
 - John Leland indicated the redacted versions, removing data marked confidential would be sent following this meeting.

Discussion: Public Policy Consideration Study Request Overview

- NTTG received a Public Policy Consideration Study Request. This request was jointly submitted by the following entities:
 - Wyoming Industrial Energy Consumers
 - Utah Association of Energy Users
 - Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems
 - Desert Power
 - Utah Department of Commerce Office of Consumer Services
 - Utah Municipal Power Agency

- Prior to walking through the presentation slides of the request, Chelsea Loomis informed participants that subsequent to the slides being prepared, the Joint Parties submitted a revised PPC study request. She indicated that while walking through the slides, she would point out where the changes are.
- The initial request asked to examine how regional and interregional public policies impact the transmission needs within the NTTG footprint. It was intended to determine whether the NTTG system can operate reliably without certain segments of Gateway West and South if exports to other regions are reduced. The study scope would be limited to meeting the load needs of NTTG and exports would be at a minimal value. Lastly the original question proposed in the request was, does NTTG need all the segments identified in the 2016-2017 plan if NTTG reduced exports out of Wyoming?
- Chelsea Loomis indicated that on April 9th, the Planning Leadership team met with the requesters regarding their request. Following that discussion, the Joint Parties submitted a revised request on April 10th incorporating changes suggested by the Planning Leadership.
- The revised request was less focused on the load and resource balance of NTTG's load needs and more around finding a balance where the replacement power would come from. In the study details of the request they listed coal resources they are requesting to be retired within the NTTG footprint and should be made up with generators outside to make sure the system is balanced and that the assessment is to compare if the transmission needs still identified the segments of Energy Gateway listed in the request. In addition, the Joint Parties requested that NTTG provide clarity regarding resources in each of the study cases.
- Following the overview of the revised PPC study request, Chelsea Loomis walked through [discussion points, Attachment K language and a list of questions](#) for the Planning Committee to consider.
 - Chelsea Loomis indicated that when considering a transmission need, the solution/need could be an addition or subtraction. The revised request focused on coal units being retired and an emphasis on renewables to displace the energy which one could argue being similar to an EPA 111-d which is not necessarily a regulation or law.
- Before opening the floor for discussion, Chelsea Loomis also indicated that had the Planning Committee only had the initial request, she would have proposed to vote to approve the request with modifications. However, it was brought to her attention that with the revised request coming in a day before the meeting, a request to vote to approve the study may be premature and that members may need more opportunity to review the revised request. With that, Chelsea Loomis opened the floor for discussion.
- Craig Quist indicated that PacifiCorp became aware of the request through the NTTG Funders Committee and had concerns. NTTG requested a review from NTTG's outside legal counsel and their response pointed back to Order 1000. Based on the legal review and input, PacifiCorp submitted comments indicating they felt the request does not identify a transmission need and there is no public policy objective that the request satisfies. Further, the request is asking to reduce all of PacifiCorp's coal fleet in the analysis and view the request as a redispach of PacifiCorp's system, which is outside the scope of NTTG.
 - PacifiCorp would support an NTTG evaluation of all coal retirements in the members IRPs, which would fit within the scope of NTTG.
- Regarding PacifiCorp's letter, it appeared PacifiCorp was specifying a transmission need as an addition, whereas Chelsea Loomis mentioned it could be an addition, subtraction or change and it was asked if clarification could be given.

- Craig Quist indicated that PacifiCorp's currently has firm transmission requests above what is available on TOT 4b. Therefore, PacifiCorp needs the D.2 segment of Gateway to support those requests.
- There was additional discussion regarding some of the cases NTTG looked at last cycle and specifically the 3,000 MW export case. Through the study analysis, it was found that segments of Gateway were needed to support that case; however, it was not the only case that needed segments of Gateway.
- One of the Joint Parties indicated that the request is asking for a sensitivity to be done form informational purposes and wouldn't impact the results of the plan. With regards to the questions to consider, it was felt that the request is similar to what was done last cycle the PPC study in reducing coal and wind generation.
- A concern was raised with resources being able to run the analysis and that PacifiCorp doesn't have the band-with to perform the analysis. It was indicated that last cycle the bulk of the work on the PPC study was done in Quarter 5, where there was a down period while NTTG waited for updated Quarter 5 data submittals. While it would be ideal to have a PacifiCorp representative, the TWG would allocate resources appropriately to perform the studies.
- Given the discussion, Chelsea Loomis asked Planning Committee members for input on either 1) voting to approve/reject the PPC study request or 2) post pone voting.
 - A few members indicated that given the discussion and the fact that the revised request and PacifiCorp's comments were sent the day prior, should there be a vote today, they would not feel comfortable voting to approve the request and wanted more time to review.
 - Other members indicated that they didn't support the language as it was currently written and thought that the request should be revised to look at the coal retirements within the IRPs.
- Based on the feedback given from Planning Committee members, Chelsea Loomis recommended that if the requesters wanted to revise their request to look at a fleet coal reduction across the NTTG footprint, that needs to be done no later than May 2nd. This would allow a full week of review by the Planning Committee prior to the next meeting on May 9th.
 - Given the number of parties who jointly submitted the request, it was felt that NTTG should do something to provide the information they are seeking and there was support with pushing the vote out to the next meeting.
- Jared Ellsworth indicated that he would be willing to help the submitters with revising the PPC request to be something everyone can support and move forward with.

Decision: Planning Committee recommendation on whether to accept the Public Policy Consideration Study

- Chelsea Loomis made a motion to not vote on whether or not to study or consider the PPC request today. With the clarification that if there are any changes, that be submitted to NTTG by May 2nd. Then vote on the PPC as it is on May 2nd at the Planning Committee meeting on May 9th.
 - With Craig Quist seconding the motion, it was **approved** in all three classes.

Discussion: Round Table/Other Business

- NTTG's Quarter 1 Stakeholder Meeting is being held on April 26th in Portland, OR at the Sheraton Portland Airport.



- NTTG's Steering Committee is meeting on May 2nd.
- The next Planning Committee meeting is on May 9th.
- NTTG's Cost Allocation Committee is meeting next Wednesday, April 18th.
- John Leland indicated that the cost allocation subcommittee is meeting on Friday, April 13th to discuss the allocation scenarios and gathering data. If any Cost Allocation Committee members are interested in joining in the discussion to let himself and Amy Wachsnicht know.

3. Assignments:

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

Next Meeting: The next Northern Tier Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting is scheduled for TBD.

- Voice Conference Mtg.: **(626) 425-3121** Access Code: **432-608-245**



Attendees:

NTTG Planning Committee Member Representatives

Membership Class 1		
Jared Ellsworth, Vice Chair, Idaho Power	Chelsea Loomis, Chair, NorthWestern	Craig Quist, PacifiCorp
Bill Hosie, TransCanada	Nathan Powell, Deseret	Curt Winterfeld, Citizens Energy
Kevin Johnson, TransCanyon (Proxy)		

Membership Class 2		
Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Rhett Hurless, Absaroka	

Membership Class 3		
Bob Decker, MT PSC	Steven Goodson, ID PUC	

NTTG Cost Allocation Committee Member Representatives

Membership Class 1		
Travis Allen, MATL	Shaun Foster, Portland General	Nathan Powell, Deseret
Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Patience Kerchinsky, PacifiCorp	Courtney Waites, Chair, Idaho Power

Membership Class 2		
Bob Davis, UT Div. PU	Belinda Kolb, WY OFC CA	Marci Norby, WY PSC
Bob Decker, MT PSC	Kim McClafferty, NorthWestern	Larry Nordell, MT CC
Stephen Goodson, Idaho PUC		

Other NTTG Members & Guests

Justin Bieber, UAE	Rachel Meeker, WY PSC	Jamie Stamatson, MT CC
Kathleen Fraser, Energy Strategies	Katie Pegan, ID OEMR	Amy Wachsnicht, NTTG
John Leland, NTTG	Ron Schellberg, NTTG	