

RTO West
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT WORK GROUP MEETING (CM WG12)
 On August 22, 2000

RTO West at 5933 NE Win Sivers Dr.
 Portland and Telephone Conference Call
 8:30 am – 5:00 pm

Work Group Meeting Summary
Version 1 – September 11, 2000

Attendees (23 attendees in total):

FNAME	LNAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE	EMAIL
John	Anasis	BPA-TLB	360-418-2263	jganasis@bpa.gov
Don	Badley	NWPP	503-464-2805	don.badley@nwpp.org
Rich	Bayless	PacifiCorp	503-813-5739	rich.bayless@pacificorp.com
Eric	Carter	BPA-TBL	503-230-4201	ehcarter@bpa.gov
Warren	Clark	Avista Corp	509-495-4186	wclark@avistacorp.com
Angela	DeClerck	BPA-PBL	503-230-3886	ardeclerck@bpa.gov
Marshall	Empey	UAMPS	801-327-6605	marshall@uamps.com
Tara	Exe	BPA-TBL	360-418-2009	tdexe@bpa.gov
Brian	Gedrich	GDS Associates for UAMPS	770-425-8100	briang@gdsassoc.com
Wally	Gibson	Northwest Power Planning Council	503-222-5161	wgibson@nwppc.org
Roger	Grim	Idaho Power		rgrim@idahopower.com
Kurt	Granat	PAC Transmission	503-813-5744	kurt.granat@pacificorp.com
David	Hackett	KEMA Consulting	503-258-9000	dhackett@kemaconsulting.com
Coe	Hutchison	Snohomish PUD	425-783-8297	cmhutchison@snopud.com
Carl	Imparato	Power Marketers	510-558-1456	cfi1@tca-us.com
Larry	Nordell	Montana DEQ	406-444-6757	lnordell@state.mt.us
Dave	Perrino	Automated Power Exchange	408-517-2146	dperrino@apx.com
Chris	Reese	Puget Sound Energy	465-462-3055	creese@puget.com
Mike	Ryan	Portland General Electric	503-464-8793	mike_ryan@pgn.com
Brian	Silverstein	BPA-TBL	360-418-8678	blsilverstein@bpa.gov
Rick	Vermeers	Avista Corp.	509-495-8057	rvermeers@avistacorp.com
Steve	Walton	Enron	713-345-7793	steve.walton@enron.com
Linc	Wolverton	Industrial Customers of NW Utilities	360-263-3675	lwolv@worldaccessnet.com

Calendar:

May 24, 2000	Kick Off Meeting – Complete	RTO West Facility
June 6-7, 2000	CM Workshop - Complete	RTO West Facility
June 12	CM WG Meeting #2 - Complete	RTO West Facility
June 19	CM WG Meeting #3 - Complete	RTO West Facility
June 26-27	CM WG Meeting #4 - Complete	RTO West Facility
July 10-11	CM WG Meeting #5 - Complete	RTO West Facility
July 18	CM WG Meeting #6 - Complete	RTO West Facility
July 24-25	CM WG Meeting #7 - Complete	RTO West Facility
July 31-August 1	CM WG Meeting #8 - Complete	RTO West Facility

August 7-8	CM WG Meeting #9 – Complete	RTO West Facility
August 15-16	CM WG Meeting #10-Complete	RTO West Facility
August 18	CM WG Meeting #11 -Complete	Telephone
August 22	CM WG Meeting #12 -Complete	RTO West Facility

Highlights of Meeting by Agenda Topic

Agenda topic 1: Agenda

- Review agenda
- Losses
- Consolidated CM Model
- FDFs/Flowgates
- Idaho Phasing Proposal (R. Grim)

Agenda topic 2: Losses

Brian Silverstein described some of the thoughts associated with developing the RTO Loss calculation methodology. The team has formed and several documents have been distributed. Reviewing Postage Stamp, Scaled Marginal Losses, and Incremental Losses. Objective is to select a method that is accurate while providing advanced knowledge of consequences to a scheduler's action.

Agenda topic 3: Consolidated CM Model

Reviewed the Consolidated CM Model document that had incorporated scheduling changes from a subgroup of the WG on 8/15-16. Several key discussions arose from the review with the first being the NTR/RTR auction method being the highest losing bid clearing price auction.

The next discussion focused on the RTR release and auction. Two alternatives were reviewed and as the group understood the alternatives, the differences were small. Carl Imperato agreed draft the new scheduling model for review next week.

Agenda topic 4: Review IPC Proposal for Phased Implementation Scheduling

Roger presented the concept in a paper he distributed in today's meeting. It consisted of adding an interim step to employing a full flowpath implementation. After Roger presented the concepts, the WG requested a series of questions to be addressed prior to further consideration by the WG.

Agenda topic 5: FDFs/Flowpaths

The status of FDF and flowpaths was discussed with a focus of defining the criteria for flowpaths and de minimus thresholds. Assigned team collected some additional ideas to help create the evaluation criteria.

End of Minutes

Meeting ended at 5:00 pm

Next Meeting:

- Final meeting of collaborative process will be held on August 29 at the Kingstad Building in Portland, OR.

Minutes prepared by: D. F. Hackett

Handouts (Items not previously email in electronic form)

Situations which impact the firmness of FTRs	Who Pays / What Happens		
Type of Problem	FTR Holder	PTOs	All Grid Users/RTO (See note 1)
1. Outages of Significant Facilities - Published "States of the System" (tied to outages of significant facilities)	YES (FTR Derated or FDFs Change)	No, subject to Note 2	No - See Note 2
2. Other Forced Outages - Typically affect flowpath ratings or FDFs by a "small" amount.	No	No, subject to Note 2	YES (through Buyback or Redispatch)
3. Planned Maintenance, Large Construction / Rebuild (Where to draw the line between row 3 and row 4 needs more discussion (Is it based on the ability to plan one-year ahead? The definition of the event? Other?))	YES, up to limits described in term sheet, and only if greater than a de minimus level	To extent exceeds limit in Term Sheet and Except for specific "conditions beyond PTO control" (see Notes 3 and 4)	YES, to the extent it is not covered by PTOs and FTR holders (through Buyback or Redispatch)
4. Planned Maintenance (for "short outages", emergency maintenance (before outage), changes required by RTO, etc.)	YES, If greater than a de minimus threshold and only if sufficient advance notice, and only if FTR holders had an opportunity to pay for movement of maintenance	No	YES, to the extent it is not covered by PTOs and FTR holders (through Buyback or Redispatch)

<p>5. Commercial / Operations Gap - Approximations in methodologies (including impacts of load growth, temperature, loopflow, over-release of FTRs, de minimus thresholds).</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>YES (through Buyback, Redispatch or smaller FTR release)</p>
--	-----------	-----------	---

Notes:

1. To all RTO users by grid uplift charge, or to smaller group of users by allocation to Company Rates? (To Be Determined)
2. TOA should specify binding maintenance standards for PTO.
3. Conditions beyond PTO control could include the following: true "Force Majeure", vendor performance (?? Needs further thought vs. "Performance Standards")
4. Acceptability to IOUs is conditioned on PBR and limitation to direct cost and opportunity costs (no consequential damages); Publics cannot accept risk to revenue recovery.