



## *FINAL NOTES*

### **NW TRANSMISSION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (NTAC)**

**February 11, 2004, 8:30 AM-3:30 PM**  
**Portland, OR – PDX Conference Center**

#### **Introductions, Arrangements, and Agenda Changes**

Chris Reese, PSE, NTAC Chair, presided over the meeting. The attendance list is Attachment 1. There were no changes to the agenda, which is Attachment 2. Those participating by phone included Bill Pascoe, Mark Stauffer, Ray Brush, and Perry Cole.

#### **Meeting Notes – January 6, 2004**

No changes to the notes. The notes may be found on the NTAC page of the NWPP website ([www.nwpp.org](http://www.nwpp.org)).

#### **Regional Queue**

Scott Waples, AVA, explained his current proposal (previously distributed via e-mail) is a discussion starter, something controversial to provoke thought. The current proposal would require NWPP to become FERC jurisdictional, which he does not want. Scott proposes to put this proposal on the shelf and revisit in about 6 months. Prior to the meeting, he received a few comments, which he did not work into the document. If others have comments, please forward those to Scott. A similar proposal surfaced at SSG-WI. The feeling is that it is not time for something like this but it does form a bookend.

Lon Peters encouraged the group to work through solutions now and then put a more developed proposal on the shelf. He feels the proposal as it stands is too preliminary and that we need something more developed for regional planning. If we come back to a preliminary proposal in 6 months, it will be like starting over. He is hopeful we can find a way to establish a regional queue without triggering FERC issues.

Armie Perez, CAISO, suggests the other bookend that should be considered does not require a developer to come up with money up front. The region should have a plan that everyone can plug into. Then project can be screened by doing a quick power flow analysis to see if it makes sense. If so then sponsor needs to fund. If not it's dropped.

Don Johnson thought NTAC should not be doing individual requests but should be bringing several requests together to find plan that is the best way to meet requests.

Jerry Rust, Scott Waples and Armie Perez will develop the other bookend. That product will be sent out to the small group for comments and then the revised document will be sent out to the big group.

## 2004 NTAC Products and Schedule

Chris talked about the seven work products and timeline (Power Point document previously distributed via e-mail.) We will need ideas on what is needed on each of the products. The outline is a general guide. Does this fit the general sense of where we're headed for 2004? The first three were discussed on February 10.

A package of these documents will be distributed at a later date.

### *TPC/NTAC Screening Studies*

Marv Landauer, BPA, briefed the group on the TPC Screening Process document that was developed at the February 10 meeting of TPC (see Attachment 3.) NTAC asked the TPC and the TPC agreed to do a study that brings together all of the plans that are out there. The goal is to be sure all of the plans work well together. Marv emphasized that we would not be able to do everything this year due to time constraints, but we hope to do more in future years. This year's study will feed off of a screening study BPA did last year, but will need some additional updates (outage data, etc). The document will be out the end of this week. There are some issues to work through for non WECC members.

One issue that causes delay in developing cases is a problem with cutting and splicing cases. The result is that bus names are not consistent. One proposal is to put the branches into a consistent format that would allow someone to pull out a case readily. Don will present the concept to the TPC. Participants in the Northwest will take the lead on this issue within WECC.

The BPA budget case is intended to be the same as the WECC case. Don points out that this type of case is different from a WECC case. The latter case may assume different loads in order to stress the system. But the topology would be the same. The loads will vary depending on the purpose of the study. Chris says the goal is to find a common starting point.

Marv also discussed the ultimate goal ("The Full Monty") which he hopes NTAC can implement next year.

### *High Level Path System Studies and Sponsor/Advocate Path Studies*

Chris Reese briefed the group on the discussion, on high level studies, that occurred February 10. His timeline suggests that NTAC needs to figure out what needs to be done over the next couple of months. We can find ways to assess the system in terms of what can be done and what it might cost. We may need to look at some studies and will want to know the major contingencies.

Ron Schellberg, IPC, summarized his views of what constitutes a high level study (see Attachment 4.) He bases his thoughts on insights gained while working with the SW intertie upgrade. The base assumption is that there is no capacity left on a path. Capacity is added and the load and generation is increased (injection-withdrawal pairs) to bring the system back to the same power flows. This analysis provides a rough measure of the value of additional line capacity and provides a way to develop a short list. This method does not easily assess non-wires alternatives, which would require economic analysis.

Marv proposes to work with Natalie to develop a document of "how the pieces fit together".

Marv talked about updates to the spreadsheet and graph. Marv has attempted to group the paths. We are looking for project leads and hope to get all interested parties for each path to help with studies. If the right transmission owners are involved, the results will be more meaningful. Some of the studies are handled in RMATS or SSG-WI and we may not need to tackle them. Potential project leads were added to the list.

Marv will distribute a revised document and requests comments within a week. Then we will look for specific people to do study work.

### *Path Utilization/Path Availability Analysis*

Gordon Dobson-Mack, PWX, relayed the discussions that Chris Reese, Marv Landauer, and he had on how to improve this analysis. Six questions (alternatives) were considered in refining the analysis. The attempt is to incorporate periods of duration on a path when calculating the percentage of line loading. There is more interest in those paths that are curtailed significantly below their ratings. SSG-WI is looking to refine its analysis in a similar manner. If NTAC agrees on a method, we hope that it will be adopted for SSG-WI so that the analyses are consistent.

### *Local Area Plans*

The goal is to collect the plans of each utility into the NTAC annual report. We would need permission from each utility to publish that utility's plan. WECC, BPA, and RMATS either have published or do publish similar compilations. A standard format is desired. NWPP staff will work with John Martinsen to compile the plans of all TPC participants.

### *Non-Wires Alternatives*

There is uncertainty on how to proceed with integrating non-wires alternatives into the studies. One approach might be to develop the transmission additions and then look at how these alternatives can replace or delay the transmission additions. Mike Kreipe thinks they show up in loads (reductions) or generation (at site). Natalie McIntire thinks it factors in at the economic level.

It was suggested to have a non-wires group develop a list of alternatives and costs. Dean Perry will provide the URL for a web site that gives more information on this topic. SSG-WI considered shadow prices in its analysis as a way to address these alternatives.

BPA had a "round table" group to assess non-wires alternatives. Chris will draft a letter to this group to request input from them. He will circulate the draft to a few NTAC members before sending it out. Bill Pascoe (who attends the round table meetings) comments that the round table is more of an advisory group; BPA staff does the actual work. Non-wires alternatives are easier to deal at the local load service level than at the regional transfers level. Marv Landauer and Natalie McIntire will work on a document of how the analysis non-transmission alternatives fit into the overall transmission studies.

### *Economic Assessment*

Chris Reese talked about this item in Micheal Dewolf's absence. Due to lack of staff availability, it appeared that no one who had the expertise would be available to work on these studies. Manpower may be available about June 1. The work will take about 4 months to complete. The group running these studies will best use their time if they are provided with specific details as to what scenarios they are to run.

### **Other Topics**

At some point, NTAC will want to examine the work of RMATS, to integrate their economic analysis and learn from their experience.

Armie Perez announced a meeting of STEP on March 8 & 9 in San Diego. Contact Armie (916-351-4444 or [aperez@caiso.com](mailto:aperez@caiso.com)) for details. He thinks it would be valuable for NTAC to see how the STEP process works.

Dean Perry mentioned that the Western Governors Association (WGA) will be holding a North American Energy Summit April 4-16 in Albuquerque, NM. WGA has encouraged SSG-WI to have an exhibit. Dean is encouraging the sub-regional groups to participate with SSG-WI. NTAC will want to review its brochure.

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be March 16, 2004.