



FINAL NOTES

NW TRANSMISSION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (NTAC)

**October 1, 2003, 9:00 AM-4:00 PM
Portland, OR – PDX Airport Conference Center**

Introductions, Arrangements, and Agenda Changes

Chris Reese, Puget Sound Energy (PSE), NTAC Chair, presided over the meeting. The attendance list is Attachment 1. The Agenda is Attachment 2. Don Johnson, PacifiCorp (PAC), TPC Chair, reported that TPC had approved of Chris Reese as NTAC Chair.

Chris emphasized that NTAC funding is dependant on approval of the TPC; NTAC has no funds of its own. Chris also set goals for the day's meeting, which may be found as Attachment 3.

At Lon Peters' request, the Committee ensured sufficient time was allocated to Item 7 on the Agenda.

Meeting Notes – September 16, 2003

There were no changes to the Notes as e-mailed.

RTO West Options 1, 2, and 3

This item was not discussed in order to devote more time to Item 7. Descriptions of the three options are posted on the RTO West website (rtowest.com).

Other Study Groups Work Update

Presentation to Western Governors Association

Rich Bayless, PacifiCorp, was absent so there was no report. Rich's report had been distributed via e-mail and was similar to what Don Johnson presented at the September 16 meeting..

Rocky Mountain Subgroup

Marv Landauer, BPA; Ron Schellberg, IPC; Kurt Granat, PAC; and Dana Reedy, NWPP, attended the kick-off meeting in Salt Lake City on September 26. The Subgroup plans to have its work completed in March 2004. A draft Charter document was available before the meeting. The Subgroup is looking at options similar to those explored by SSG-WI (eg coal, wind, etc) and plan to use the SSG-WI studies to jump start its study effort. Some alternatives surfaced at that meeting (eg demand side management, tariff structures, etc) that have shown up in similar forums.

Marv thinks it is a one time effort and notes there is a lot of overlap with the NWPP foot print. Ron viewed it a more of a policy analysis. Kurt says the focus is on next steps. Dana noted that Nora Brownell's, FERC, introductory remarks touted the effort as a "poster child" for regional planning. The effort was named Rocky Mountain Area Transmission Study (RMATS) at the meeting.

Notes and presentations from the meeting may be found at <http://psc.state.wy.us> under the link to Sub Regional Transmission Planning (sic).

Path Utilization Study

Dean Perry, SSG-WI, reported on a path utilization study he conducted each of the past 3 or 4 years. The RTAs (eg WRTA) sponsored the first couple studies. SSG-WI did the most recent study. These analyses were based on WECC EHV data, real time net schedules, and path operating transfer capability (OTC) ratings, when available, for about 30 paths. Dean notes that there were some problems with the data. To determine which paths are heavily loaded or congested, he used the somewhat arbitrarily chosen measure of the amount of time the path is loaded to 75% or more of its capability. SSG-WI compared its study results to this analysis as a benchmark. Some paths correlated very well. Those that did not will be further analyzed to better understand the poor correlation. Dean suggests that it would be valuable for NTAC to do similar benchmarking. Dean hopes to refine the studies by incorporating data from OASIS sites. Chris notes that some paths may not appear to be fully loaded but cannot be loaded more due to reliability constraints (eg not offsetting counter schedules.)

Review Draft Scope of Work

The NTAC considered the submitted comments and further edited the Scope document. Amir Amjadi, Lon Peters, Kenny Dillon, and Natalie McIntire submitted comments. Editing continued as part of other discussions.

Planning Process Flow Chart

Marv talked about the chart and the comments he had received so far. NTAC edited the chart during the meeting. Marv noted that some functions may be missing from the chart and others shown on the chart may not need to be represented.

One discussion issue was generating resource adequacy and how NTAC planning should address cases of inadequate resources. Scott suggested that generic resources be used with the type depending on the location. Proposed generation would be considered in the plan before generic generation. There was also question of how to sort out which proposals are viable. A suggested measure was "steel in the ground." But it was noted that measure may accurately reflect which projects are viable. For example, a mothballed project would have "steel in the ground" but would not be viable. It was proposed that a task group look at that issue. Another topic of discussion was LOLP in measuring resource adequacy.

The group looked to incorporate changes made to the Scope document into the Process chart and vice versa.

How Will Study Work Be Performed?

Part of the discussion involved which years would be studied. One largely supported opinion favored picking the same years that SSG-WI would be studying (roughly 5 and 10 years out). There was also a lot of support for looking at today's system. Kurt Granat pointed out that he would not be available to build a separate database and it would take considerable effort to build a database to study today's (2003) system. A base case year should be chosen such that generation and transmission would not change from one scenario to the next. Jim Eden comments that load forecasts can vary widely from one year to the next.

Scott Waples proposed a process of taking various hypothetical projects through the process as a means to test it. He suggests completing the wordsmithing first.

Scott also questions the study tools that would be used. He says production costs are non-linear as shown by the fact that small changes in gas prices can yield widely different results. Therefore we should look at scenarios in broad terms. Ron Schellberg says that we can learn a lot from production cost studies, but adds that "we can not learn it all."

Ultimately, the sponsoring parties would do the study work. Not everyone needs to be involved in every study effort. Each party with an alternative would bring the studies to support that alternative and the studies would then be compared.

During a break, Chris received many comments that suggested that not everything proposed in the Scope document could or should be accomplished and the Committee should look at prioritizing certain tasks. The first assessment should focus on those things that are doable.

Work groups were formed as outlined in Attachment 4 (also previously e-mailed.) It was also decided that everyone should evaluate the proposed Process. Lon Peters is to start a "chain e-mail" that would be the accumulation of such evaluations.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Tuesday, November 4, 2003 from 8:15-3:30 at the Portland Airport Conference Center.