

<b>Description of Meeting:</b>	<b>NTTG Planning Committee</b>
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	<b>October 12, 2016</b>
<b>Meeting Notes Prepared By:</b>	<b>Amy Wachsnicht</b>
<b>Approved for Posting:</b>	<b>November 9, 2016</b>

**1. Agenda:**

- a. Approval of the July 13, 2016 NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes
- b. Technical Workgroup Update
  - i. Recommended potential change cases and discussion
  - ii. NTTG stakeholder comment process on proposed change cases
- c. Interregional Data Coordination Update
- d. Anchor Data Set Update
- e. Round Table/Other Business
  - i. Upcoming Milestones
  - ii. Next Meeting

**2. Discussions & Decisions:**

**Decision: Approval of the July 13, 2016 NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting Notes**

- Following roll call it was noted that quorum requirements had not been met in Class 1. Subsequently, approval of the July 13, 2016 NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting notes was deferred to provide an opportunity for others to join and for quorum requirements to be satisfied.
- After the Anchor Data Set update, with Michael Manarovici from MATL joining the meeting Amy Wachsnicht confirmed quorum requirements for Class 1 had been satisfied.
- With a motion by Don Johnson and seconded by Chelsea Loomis the July 13, 2016 NTTG Joint Planning and Cost Allocation Committee Meeting notes were **unanimously approved** for posting.

**Discussion: Technical Workgroup Update**

- During the September 14<sup>th</sup> NTTG Stakeholder meeting, six base cases were discussed. Since that meeting, the Technical Workgroup (TWG) identified an additional base case.
  - The base cases include 1) a peak coincident summer load, 2) peak coincident winter load, 3) high west bound path 8 flows, 4) Boardman to Hemmingway (high import), 5) Boardman to Hemmingway (high export to and from Idaho), 6) high flows across the Tot2 path and the new case 7) high Wyoming wind (particularly stressing some of the intra-regional paths within NTTG).
- Dave Smith indicated he noticed the change case matrix distributed for stakeholder comment prior to the meeting, did not include the Wyoming wind case. He inquired which version of the matrix stakeholders should be commenting on.
  - Ron Schellberg indicated stakeholders can comment on either matrix.
- Ron Schellberg walked through the case terminology for the base case which included the Common Case Transmission Assumption (CCTA) facilities, the previous Regional Transmission Plan (pRTP) and the Initial Regional Transmission Plan (iRTP).
- It was asked if the non-NTTG CCTA facilities were excluded from the pRTP and the iRTP.
  - Ron Schellberg indicated he believed they were as they are outside of the NTTG footprint and do not have a material effect on the NTTG results.
    - These would include the Knight-Big Eddie line, the Castle Rock to Troutdale line and other projects are in the Calvary East River system.

- The methods used for reliability analysis included:
  - Tuning the cases to meet the flow objective of the cases; for example, both Path 8 and Tot2 cases were tuned to increase flows across their paths,
  - Adjusting the reactive to meet voltage targets, and
  - Testing each of the cases with 418 contingencies.
- The preliminary findings show that in general, the seven base cases are performing acceptably. However, additional tuning is still required. Ron Schellberg informed the committee that these findings are preliminary, are subject to change and should not be used for any decision-making process.
- Ron Schellberg walked through two examples showing the preliminary analysis of the contingencies and limits exceeded for the null case, pRTP, base case, iRTP, CC1 (Boardman to Hemmingway), CC6 (Cross Tie project) and CC7 (Great Basin).
  - The purpose of walking through the examples is to give more detail and background for the discussion of the change case matrix and to demonstrate how NTTG will use the results to winnow down the alternatives to a Draft Regional Transmission Plan (DRTP).
- A participant asked for an explanation for selecting the high Wyoming wind base
  - Ron Schellberg explained that the case represents the resources submitted in Quarter 1 where PacifiCorp indicated approximately 900 MW of new resources. The wind is modeled at an expected wind profile that was provided in the production cost model (PCM) data set.
- A follow-on question was why there were a lot of Wyoming wind contingencies and exceedances for the Cross Tie and Great Basin projects when they were not close to Wyoming.
  - Ron Schellberg indicated the reason was because the projects are on the western part of the system, which is relieving stress on that side but causing the stress to increase on the eastern part of the system.
- Primary conclusions for the reliability analysis of the base cases include:
  - Boardman to Hemmingway relieves a number of violations.
  - Other reinforcements such as Gateway South and portions of Gateway included in the pRTP will likely be necessary.
  - All the change cases still need to be tuned which will cause the results to change.
- Ron Schellberg walked through the change case matrix which showed the results for the null case, pRTP, iRTP and several change cases. He explained the matrix also included the major projects being added and removed, the change cases being evaluated as well as the flow conditions that will be used by the TWG to test the changes.
  - There are a total of 128 combinations of projects and 7 different flow conditions.
  - When developing the change case matrix, the TWG tried to hit on the most relevant combinations that would be of interest to NTTG. However, the change cases discussed today are subject to stakeholder input and can be ultimately be altered by the TWG to assess how to develop the DRTP.
- When asked if Boardman to Hemmingway was included in CC8 – CC17, Ron Schellberg indicated it was not included in all. However, at the end of the analysis, Boardman to Hemmingway may become part of the final evaluation due to the violations observed in the flow cases.
- It was asked if there were any changes in resources in the null case and what retirements were modeled in the change cases.
  - Ron Schellberg indicated there were no changes in the resources. With regards to the retirement, the TWG use those that were in the PCM.
- The WPRs will coordinate and discuss what resource assumptions will be used in the cases for the interregional project studies.

- Once the stakeholder comment period has closed, the TWG will review the comments submitted and revise the cases as necessary. An update will be given during the November 9<sup>th</sup> NTTG Planning Committee meeting.
- The TWG will also be developing the dynamics data for the Public Policy Consideration study.

**Discussion: Interregional Data Coordination Update**

- As this is the first attempt to coordinate regional assessments, some coordination issues have been experienced. Some of the reasons for the issues include the fact that the regions have different modeling methods and emphasis, each region is developing different change files from the TEPPC Common Case to satisfy their respective emphasis, and the release of the Common Case should have been earlier in the cycle.
- The regions are beginning to coordinate the Interregional Transmission Project (ITP) data which includes checking the transmission data submitted, adding any changes necessary to the model, resource assumption coordination and where the sink resources will be dispatched.
  - The goal is to have agreement by the end of October.

**Discussion: Anchor Data Set Update**

- During the September 14<sup>th</sup> NTTG Stakeholder Meeting, John Leland spent a great deal of time discussing the Anchor Data Set (ADS) and the activities leading up to the proposal for WECC Board approval.
- Since the NTTG Stakeholder Meeting, the Joint PCC/TEPPC Review Task Form (JPTRTF) reviewed the comments submitted on the draft proposal. A total of 42 comments were received regarding the Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC) and ADS.
  - The JPTRTF considered all comments submitted and revised the draft proposal. They also developed responses to the major comment themes as well as a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document which included answers to the comments and questions provided by stakeholders and WECC members.
- On October 5<sup>th</sup>, the JPTRTF posted the revised final draft of the proposal (but not for comment), the FAQ document and the responses to the major comment themes.
- Looking forward:
  - October 11<sup>th</sup> – TEPPC coordination call
    - Walk through of comments received on the RAC and ADS proposal document and answer any additional questions and/or concerns TEPPC members may have.
  - October 12<sup>th</sup> – PCC meeting
    - Walk through of comments received on the RAC and ADS proposal document and answer any additional questions and/or concerns PCC members may have.
  - October 19<sup>th</sup> – Joint PCC/TEPPC meeting
    - Review any comments, questions or concerns from PCC and TEPPC members as well as review the final proposal document.
  - November 14<sup>th</sup> – TEPPC meeting
    - Review the proposal document and any additional revisions as a result of the October 19<sup>th</sup> Joint PCC/TEPPC meeting.
    - TEPPC members will also take a straw poll if the proposal should move forward to the WECC Board for approval in December. The results of the poll will be sent to the WECC Board as input.
  - November 18<sup>th</sup> – PCC meeting
    - Review the proposal document and any additional revisions as a result of the October 19<sup>th</sup> Joint PCC/TEPPC meeting.
    - PCC members will take a vote to accept or not accept the proposal. The results of the vote will be sent to the WECC Board as input.
  - December 17<sup>th</sup> – WECC Board Meeting

- The WECC Board will decide on how to proceed with the proposal.
  - The proposal of the ADS is asking for approval to move forward with implementation and development of the ADS in Quarter 2 of 2018.
- Craig Quist asked John Leland if he could explain the urgency on getting WECC Board approval in December.
  - John Leland explained that the urgency is to have the ADS developed in 2018. If the WECC Board does not approve the proposal, it would most likely be 2020 before the ADS is available. With regards to the RAC, that would be the committee that houses the development of the ADS.
  - John Leland also informed attendees that an important aspect of the proposal being discussed is that it does not alter the PCC and TEPPC processes. The products and data collection processes of the two committees will continue as usual. The RAC is trying to merge the two processes together and have consistency between the PCM and power flow models.
    - If the WECC Board approves the ADS but not the RAC, then it is believed the ADS can still be developed using the existing structures. If that does happen, there would need to be discussions on where the ADS is housed and who is responsible for its development.
- Fred Heutte commented that the WECC Member Advisory Committee (MAC) is meeting on November 1<sup>st</sup> and it is important for MAC member input on the proposals as the WECC Board is also looking for input.
- Fred Heutte also commented that in attending some of the PCC meetings, the coordination and development of the ADS on time is dependent on the consistency between the WPRs and WECC. He believed the WPRs will meet their deliverables on time, but is concerned the development of the ADS may not happen on time and didn't want to see the WPRs in distress because the ADS was not available on time.
- Assuming the WECC Board approves to move forward with the proposals, the transition plan will be critical. This will help to make sure that the WPRs and WECC are responding in a timely manner to develop the ADS.
  - The transition plan at this time is very high level and includes a need to appoint the RAC and its subcommittee governing bodies and membership, the ADS process development, charters and protocols, data quality protocol, and collaboration. The final transition will happen when the CEO determines the RAC is ready.
  - It is anticipated the transition plan will be flushed out the first two quarters of 2017 following WECC Board approval.
- Between now and 2018, the WPRs are following their regional processes for regional planning and interregional project studies. The information to populate the ADS will come from the regional plans and in 2018 WECC will have the information necessary to develop the ADS.
- John Leland was asked his opinion on the likelihood of the ADS approval. He indicated that while there have been questions on the ADS, there have been no show stoppers or negative reactions to moving forward. The ADS proposal was presented to the WECC Board and there appears to be no negativity towards the proposal by the Board. With regards to the RAC moving forward, John Leland could not comment as he is not participating in the development of that effort.
- John Leland was also asked how the ADS aligned with the other planning regions regional processes. The proposal is to have the process begin on even number years and end on odd numbered years. As the implementation of the ADS is fleshed out through 2017, there will need to be discussions on coordination between the WPRs and the WPRs and WECC possibly trying to align cycles. If there is a change to allow for the alignment, that would cause Attachment K changes, which is also a lot of work that would likely occur after 2017.



**Discussion: Round Table/Other Business**

- At this time the open comment period on the change case matrix is open through October 21<sup>st</sup>. The TWG will consider all comments and give responses on why the suggested change cases were or were not incorporated.
- The next NTTG Planning Committee meeting is on November 9<sup>th</sup> and will include an update on the TWG analysis and results on the reliability studies.
- December 13<sup>th</sup> is the next NTTG Stakeholder Meeting, scheduled to be held in Salt Lake City, UT.
  - The goal is to have completed the DRTP, including both the reliability and metrics analysis. In addition, time permitting, the PCC analysis will be done.
- Once completed the DRTP will be posted with an open comment period for stakeholder input.

**3. Assignments:**

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

**Next Meeting:** The next Northern Tier Planning Committee Meeting is scheduled for November 9<sup>th</sup> at 1PM Pacific.

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



**Attendees:**

**NTTG Planning Committee Member Representatives**

**Membership Class 1**

Jared Ellsworth, Idaho Power	Don Johnson, Portland General	Michael Manarovici, MATL
Bill Hosie, TransCanada	Chelsea Loomis, Vice Chair, NorthWestern	Craig Quist, Chair, PacifiCorp

**Membership Class 2**

Marshall Empey, UAMPS	Rhett Hurless, Absaroka Energy	
-----------------------	--------------------------------	--

**Membership Class 3**

John Chatburn, ID OER	Gene Fadness, ID PUC	Morgan Fish, WY PSC
Bob Decker, MT PSC		

**Other NTTG Members & Guests**

Jamie Austin, PacifiCorp	Fred Heutte, NW Energy Coalition	Ron Schellberg, NTTG
Gary DeShazo, CAISO	John Leland, NTTG	Dave Smith, TransWest Express
Sharon Helms, NTTG	Kishore Patel, PacifiCorp	Amy Wachsnicht, NTTG