

## Stenehjem, Carlene R - DKC-7

---

**From:** on behalf of BPA Public Involvement  
**Subject:** FW: TransAlta Bridge Tool Comments

Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 9:42 AM  
To: BPA Public Involvement  
Subject: FW: TransAlta Bridge Tool Comments

comments regarding the interim approach for managing new nonfirm and hourly firm transmission requests

TransAlta Comments

Scheduling Procedure: Interim approach for limiting nonfirm and hourly firm schedules for the hour following an OTC excursion

-- The procedure's title mentions "schedules" when it really concerns denying requests. TransAlta suggests a more appropriate title, such as, "Criteria for denying hourly transmission requests during and after OTC excursions". And because the procedure does not involve scheduling, shouldn't this be considered as a proposed Business Practice Open for Comment?

-- The procedure targets transmission requests that "contribute to congestion". How does BPAT determine the level of congestion on a problem flowgate in future hours? Using the example in the proposed procedure's description: During an OTC excursion at 1010 clock time (CT), no new transmission requests will be approved for HE12 and HE13. How does BPAT calculate the level of congestion for HE12 and HE13? Is BPAT proposing to deny transmission requests on the presumption of congestion?

-- Do all OTC excursions require dispatcher action, or are they evaluated for action, "as determined by BPA"? TransAlta understood that all OTC excursions required dispatcher action, but the proposed procedure's description implies that each event undergoes an evaluation. If so, what are the triggers for action, and are they the same for each flowgate in the procedure?

-- Were the source and sink pairings for this proposed procedure taken directly from Curtailment Calculators? What criteria was used to narrow the combination of sources and sinks for each flowgate?