



*NOTES*  
**NW TRANSMISSION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (NTAC)**  
**December 2, 2004 – Portland, OR**  
**9:00 AM-3:00 PM – PDX Conference Center**

---

**1. Introductions, Arrangements, and Agenda Changes** Chris Reese, PSE, Chair  
Agenda is Attachment 1. Attendance is Attachment 2. John Tompkins participated by phone.

**2. Meeting Notes – October 19, 2004** Dana Reedy, NWPP  
No changes. Others (eg NERC staff) are reading them.

**3. BPA Transmission Adequacy** Brian Silverstein  
Brian reported that the Coulee-Bell line was just energized – a success story. TPC facilitated in this process.

Ravi Aggarwal said that BPA received about 18 comments to the four questions:

- \* Did BPA capture all the issues, did we miss any?
- \* Are there issues that should rise to the top in terms of priority?
- \* How should BPA best engage the region throughout the process - what's the appropriate forum?
- \* Are there ideas or suggested answers to the questions posed in the discussion paper?

These have been posted on a BPA website (<http://www.transmission.bpa.gov/PlanProj/transadequacy/>).  
(See Ravi Aggarwal e-mail fwd by Dana Reedy Nov 30.)

One consistent theme was that the focus needs to be more regional (eg NWPP footprint and perhaps beyond) rather than limited to BPA. NTAC seems to be a good forum to deal with these issues. The NWPP region has a pro rata reserve sharing program that is largely dependent on transmission; expanding the geographic scope of transmission planning helps ensure the continued value to that program. Jerry Rust points out examples from the NWPP Operating Committee (OC). The OC developed its standards based on WECC standards but some OC standards are stricter. The committee voluntarily and unanimously accepts these policies for the good of all. The OC also agreed to develop and fund the automation of reserve sharing.

While it would be easier for BPA to develop standards with input from others, most of those present think a regional forum is better. Scott Waples thinks that due to its expertise with transmission and the larger footprint some forum under the NWPP is probably the best available. NTAC provides broader participation than does the TPC. However, the TPC would have to agree to fund any such forum under NWPP.

Another issue is how to measure results (SADI, SAFI, etc). It will be hard to devise such a metric, but Brian believes management wants to see some measurement improve over time.

If interested in participating further in the process, contact Brian ([bsilverstein@bpa.gov](mailto:bsilverstein@bpa.gov)) or Ravi ([rkaggarwal@bpa.gov](mailto:rkaggarwal@bpa.gov)). The first working meeting will be in January.

#### 4. Path Studies

##### a. Can-Cal Integrated Path Study

Deshazo, Landauer

Some work assignments were made at the November 12 meeting. The group is seeking a name that is more inclusive of the NW interests. The key issue for now is the work for the Puget Sound area. Gary also wants to work on economic assessment of the various alternatives.

Trevor Cline prepared a draft document which is out for comment. The group is working on a transmission map on which to show alternatives. Next meeting is Dec 13 near the Portland. The group hopes to have some study results by mid 2005.

##### 1. Resource Options

Bill Hosie

Bill presented a map of selected potential resources. Not everything is shown, but these projects represent what could be developed by 2020 to provide capacity for export. The resources are chosen to be somewhat generic to facilitate studies. See Attachment 3.

##### 2. Transmission Alternatives

Marv Landauer

Marv presented a map and table showing the current thinking on transmission alternatives to move power from Canada to the south. (Map and table previously e-mailed; current map and table will be available from [www.nwpp.org/ntac/](http://www.nwpp.org/ntac/).) Some of the options are already being seriously considered. Not all options are shown. As a next step, NTAC will need to figure out how to study the options (individually or combined) and which options to study. Gary would like to start finalizing study plans at the Dec 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Marv proposes three types of studies: cost/corridor, PF (equal angle) studies, and power cost studies. It is recognized that some of these studies overlap those of other study groups (eg MT-Coast). Send comments to Marv by December 9.

##### Economic assessment

##### 3. Puget Sound Area Studies

John Phillips

The Puget Sound Area Study Group release the final document recently. The group is considering some options such as a local load study (which may or may not be under NTAC). They will use tools developed for this past analysis to look at upcoming season on Northern Intertie. These results will be incorporated into the Can-NW-Cal study.

##### b. Montana – North Pacific Coast Study

S. Waples, J. Leland

See Attachment 4 (NTAC MT-NW 04-11-17.ppt, previously e-mailed). Scott concludes that if everything worked right, 50% compensation is probably adequate but he thinks there are smarter alternatives. Preliminary estimates of the cost of the 250 MW upgrade (capacitors) is in excess of \$100 million. Adding 750 MW capacity would cost over \$500 million, which is still less than building a new 500 kV line. A 500 kV line would add 1000-2000 MW depending on additional compensation. 750 MW is the limit without adding a new 500 kV line. Jim Eden suggested that we may need to develop some RAS benchmarks.

#### 5. Additional 2005 Work Products & Schedule

Chris Reese

##### a. Regional Plan

Marv Landauer

No report.

##### b. Regional Load Forecasts

Chris Reese

A second meeting was held Nov 23. The NWPP Transmission Planning Committee has not (yet) agreed to ongoing funding. Chris is drafting a proposal for NWPP to resume coordinating the load forecasts. This would involve one additional staff person at NWPP.

**6. Other Topics**

Open

**7. Next Meetings – When/Where?**

Chris Reese

February 8, 2005 at/near PDX 9-3.