

Regional Transmission Adequacy Guidelines
Technical Workgroup
Mar. 29, 2005

Meeting Notes

I want to thank everyone who participated in the first technical workgroup meeting. The success of any process lies with the team members and their proactive participation and I am grateful for the opportunity to serve the team. Overall the meeting was productive and lot of great comments and discussions were heard.

Following are some of the comments related to transmission adequacy requirements that I heard during the meeting:

1. Adequacy relates to level of risk utilities are willing to take to preserve system reliability: Load dropping, generation re-dispatch...
2. Reliability Vs. Economics: System safety and security Vs. level of service issue
3. Cost component is an important issue – How much to spend (\$\$\$) for an adequate system → Ties into the level of service required by the customer
4. Cost recovery mechanism
5. Reliability standards exist for Planning and Operations of the system. Need to decide what makes sense to plan the system for and what should be deferred to system operations to handle in real time.
6. Some suggestion:
 - a. For Planning: Look for low probability and low exposure events → Meeting reliability standards is still required.
 - b. For Operation, re-dispatch is an option but if generation adjustment cannot be achieved, can controlled load shedding be an effective way to meet transmission reliability requirements.
 - c. Factors defining the choice depend on the cost of build versus the cost of an unmet load.
7. Principles: Guide key decisions making → This is dependent on time spectrum: Different level of decisions are made in planning versus operations (E.g., Maximize transfer levels Vs. risk exposure)
8. Transmission adequacy requirements should be well coordinated with resource adequacy.
9. Suggestion was made to review guidelines for other regions and whether any of the guidelines have enough merit to consider for NWPP region. Follow-up to be made with AESO and CAISO, two ISO's in the process of developing transmission adequacy guidelines for their respective region.
10. Evaluate market efficiency
11. Focus should also be made on un-served load evaluation (e.g., Cross Mountain – BPA Criteria for winter load service)
12. Initial focus should be placed on addressing load service requirements.
13. Investigate least cost Vs. reliable solution

14. Small publics → Concern over loss of load issue (Socio-eco effects of the outage – loss of energy)
15. Deterministic/Probabilities should be factored as a consideration
16. Lot of the issues requires upfront addressing. Operation can only handle so much.
17. Contingency → Probability → Affects
18. Need metrics → Capture lost opportunity, address reliability → Quantifiable (Optimization of transmission system)
19. Guidelines → Could be defined in terms of several levels dependent upon customer needs → Higher level of service requires higher transmission cost. Define parameters (boundary) for level of service → address commitment upfront including conditions for which the level of transmission service is guaranteed.
20. Threshold for consideration in the development of guidelines > or = to 115 kV
21. Prioritization of issues:
 - a. Load service issue (e.g., Olympic Peninsula – Energy Efficiency/DSM)
 - b. Minimum guidelines need to focus on customer requirement
 - c. N-1 and N-2 reliability
 - d. Native load Vs. firm transmission customers (PTP) → Eventually tie to transfers
 - e. Address Economic model by May 2005 end.
22. Prepare some example areas for next meeting

Note: Since the notes and the information package was delayed by couple of days, I am extending the comments due date from Apr. 5 to Apr. 7.

Action Items:

1. Send compiled issues list and timeline to the technical workgroup
2. Send principles document to the technical workgroup
3. Comments on issue list, timeline, and principles document due back by Apr. 7, 2005 to Chair and NWPP
4. For next meeting: Example areas that address issues 1 and 2 outlined in the issue list. Any other relevant examples would be helpful to start a discussion.
 - a. Marv Landauer: Examples on BPA system
 - b. Rich Bayless/Don Johnson: So. Oregon
 - c. John – Snohomish System
 - d. Others?
5. Next meeting: Apr. 27, 2005 PDX Conference Center – Logistics to be sent at a later time.