

Grid Access Transformation Public Workshop, July 29, 2025 (1 of 2)

Disclaimer: Following is a capture of the chat transcript and does not include any additional commentary or response from BPA staff.

9:11 AM from Sanjay Bhatia - Savion: Will this presentation be shared?

9:12 AM from Sean Egusa BPA: This presentation will add the summary of feedback comments and then posted tomorrow afternoon. Please note that most of the content is re-purposed from the July 9-10 workshops

9:47 AM from Alex: Understanding why it is so hard to study the queue would be helpful, and why clearing it is essential to study the queue and provide LT offers

9:55 AM from Jake Stephens: We also don't accept the premise that BPA must harm, much less remove, or retroactively forcibly revoke the right to requested service by, some customers in order to continue studying some portion of the TSR queue. That is a falsehood.

9:56 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Any chance BPA could share/publish the draft deck acknowledging that it will be updated later? (so we don't have to simultaneously read + listen)

9:56 AM from Jake Stephens: If BPA *can* as they admit start studying ANY TSRs -- as they are plainly stating they can -- and a portion of the queue -- ditto and obviously true -- then they CAN.

9:58 AM from Jake Stephens: Offers that could be made based on some softer product -- such as CF or some curtailment risk profile or reassessment -- can still be made -- studied and considered -- without attacking and removing any TSRs -- or forcing products upon TSRs they did not request (i.e. at risk of removal from the queue if not accepted).

9:58 AM from Alexander Stewart - BPA: @Alex - Simplified explanation is the size of the queue studied in mass is not studiable and analysis of breaking into chunks and studying in smaller batches will take approximately 6-7 years to accomplish using the current process.

9:58 AM from Sean Egusa BPA: all of the existing content is published in the July 9-10 presentation. The only new content will be the feedback summaries. Note that the slide just shown with link to BP process is the same language at the preamble at the top of the draft language document.



9:59 AM from Jake Stephens: BPA's claims about "taking 6-7 years" is a red herring -- and inappropriate -- and not a justification for harming those that requested service already.

10:00 AM from Jake Stephens: All of those TCs KNEW when they made those requests how many GW were in front of them.

10:01 AM from Zeecha Van Hoose Clark PUD: I found a lack of consistency in the LaRC language referenced here and the POD increase language. If the trigger is at the aggregate forecast level and it only then cascades down to the POD as a secondary criteria, that is not clear in the business practice as written (at least not to me).

10:01 AM from Jake Stephens: Just because someone(s) showed up late to the party -- i.e. those LESS competitive, less knowledge, less ready, less properly anticipating needs -- does not justify BPA re-writing the rules in favor of the back of the line. Never mind the harm that does to all future. And that BPA would thus establish principles of re-writing rules of the road in favor of JUNIOR and FUTURE requests whenever they want.

10:02 AM from Jake Stephens: BPA also will harm power marketers use of TX system to request redirectable service all over the system. By limiting legitimate (and long-term common) use of system -- to go where traders wanna go through the system.

10:20 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Just an FYI, that the issues UEC has been discussing sounds largely applicable to the PTP proposals too. It sounds like BPA may be reinventing the wheel in a way that is not terribly consistent with how energy transactions have been occurring in the region, which is fine to discuss and eventually potentially transition to, but part of why I said this draft proposal feels more like a future state proposal that needs its own transition plan.

10:23 AM from Alex: How will BPA vet resources?

10:24 AM from Alex: How do you vet MIDC, the liquid hub in the region used for various purposes?

10:39 AM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Regardless of the medium (e.g., close-out letter, communication, email, etc.) ensuring customers receive confirmation from BPA that their LaRC was received and the requested service granted would be appreciated. That said, we appreciate the unnecessary lift that a full close-out letter may be in all cases.

11:04 AM from Blake Weathers UEC: One minor request to add to feedback: Can we drop the terms trended and non-trended load growth? It's unnecessary now that BPA has defined New Network Load. Trended vs non-trended means different things to different people



11:13 AM from Zeecha Van Hoose Clark PUD: I would concur around the different forecasting required for NERC requirements (MOD, TPL, Attachment K) and the LaRC processes and timing.

11:14 AM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: re: #9, why is BPA proposing to use the LaRC submission date for the queue placement, in lieu of the NITS contract date?

11:15 AM from Blake Weathers UEC: 6(d) seems in conflict with 3(a)--LLIRs are independent on one hand but evaluations in section 3 rely on an LLIR submittal

11:20 AM from Jake Stephens: when is "existing" defined as?

11:22 AM from Jake Stephens: How do relative TIMESTAMPS of LTF TSRs vs NITS & LARC work? seniority?

11:23 AM from Jake Stephens: i.e. will NITS timestamps behind existing (and surviving) PTP TSRs be studied in [TSEP] as junior to those?

11:27 AM from Chris G: @Jake Stephens - the LaRC submission date/time is the queue time for an FTSR. The TSEP CS processes FTSR and TSRs in queue order.

11:30 AM from Zeecha Van Hoose Clark PUD: I look forward to hearing more about how the LaRC process links to LLIR submission requirements, etc., what the preference for timing of submission of those, whether there are changes in the LaRC formatting coming to accommodate these modifications coming, inclusion/exclusion of anticipated load growth is included in the MOD-031 forecast or as an outside adjustment, and so forth.

11:58 AM from Jake Stephens: It is important for BPA to quantify the rough scale of TSR queue clearing that is necessary in order for BPA to get to a "solvable model" (per BPA's language/assertions).

11:59 AM from Jake Stephens: The region should understand that as it proposes to engage in removal of regional investments (and/or destabilizing the safety of existing TSRS, often waiting for years, maybe a decade).

12:02 PM from Jake Stephens: If BPA needs to clear out 50,000 or 60,000 MW of TSRs to "get the model to solve", then the majority of investments will be wiped out, with commensurate consequences to when any *financeable, long-term PTP rollover-rights service* will be available -- including removal of senior TSRs waiting since 2016, 2017, ...2020, 2021, 2022 TSEPs -- and their ability to serve the region. In favor of "maybe future service for those behind" (but now subject to backward-looking rules rewrite risk.



12:02 PM from Jake Stephens: The number of affected stakeholders -- directly and indirectly -- varies with these "minimum sufficient queue clearing" volumes that BPA must have.

12:04 PM from Jake Stephens: Those are the same TSRs currently used to justify the business case for BPA's current builds, including Evolving Grid -- which BPA would drive out of the queue. They are also the most future viable -- including through redirects, power trading, and ability to be sold, transferred TRANSASSIGNED, etc (normal use of TSRs) -- on the paths the region most needs service on (like to PGE and PSE systems, Portland and Seattle, for example).

12:06 PM from Jake Stephens: Those TSRs' TC -- and those that might currently, or in the future transact with those TCs (i.e. current and future PPA counterparties-- deserve to know, as BPA proposes new rights, authorities, and/or practices -- what their end exposure is to BPA gutting them -- including after years of waiting, contracts signed w/ BPA, etc.

12:08 PM from Jake Stephens: Because no new projects are going to get financed on 2-year reassessment w/o rollover rights -- and if BPA creates "sorry, can terminate you later" provisions and practices. Banks don't like it if they can't rely on ability to sell the power to the customer (i.e. if TX can be revoked). Which is a problem for the region if BPA actions undermines investability of power supply broadly, particularly for IPP - - and particularly if BPA Power is unlikely to successfully procure resources.

12:11 PM from Jake Stephens: CONVERSELY, if BPA is going to go through this process and it only clears out 1/4 to 1/2 of what BPA "needs" to (supposedly) study ANY TSRs after 8/2022... And there will still be 30, 40, 50, 60 GW in the queue PLUS new LARCs etc... Then the net result will not be functional -- not escape the core issue being blamed for the supposed problem -- and/or will still take years to study. But BPA will only be "measuring" the sufficiency of its harmful actions to existing, *performing* TCs/ICs AFTER it harms and removes folks.

12:11 PM from Jake Stephens: Meaning there is a pretty clear path here to harm of immense scale, whichever way this goes, that isn't understood or measured, before BPA proposes to implement the harm.

12:12 PM from Jake Stephens: It can't be that BPA proposes this kind of radical change, that either (a) harms WAY more folks, directly and indirectly, than is understood; and/or (b) doesn't even solve the problem, or have the "desired" results, while then also having harmed those best able to serve regional needs... those who've invested in in Gen Dev & TX rights.



12:13 PM from Jake Stephens: It seems like lots of folks are just assuming it'll be "someone else" that will be harmed here, not THEM.

12:15 PM from Jake Stephens: But that is a bad assumption. BPA already basically told us that they didn't think they could study more than ~20 GW... which means they can reasonably be assumed to be proposing to clear 2/3 of the entire TSR queue. Including lots of gendevs, ICs, TCs, etc that currently seem to believe it'll hurt everyone else. Ditto re: LSEs that will lose LTF that might be usable (directly and/or through redirects) to serve their needs someday -- even COU LSEs that might benefit from redirectable service granted to different PODs.

12:18 PM from Jake Stephens: It remind me of Bob Dylan's World War III Blues, where he describes a dream in which he's walking around after a nuclear explosion, and He is the only one left. But then realizes that everyone else is having the same dream... that the bomb goes off, and they are the Ones that survived, weren't harmed, but not everyone else. Because *of course* it'll be okay for them, even if others are hurt. (Bonneville would never harm ME in these -- or future -- changes, rewrite rules to harm the stuff that MY company/LSE wants...)

12:19 PM from Jake Stephens: Sayin, Hey I've been havin' the same old dreams
But mine was a little different you see

I dreamt that the only person left after the war was me

I didn't see you around

Well, now time passed and now it seems

Everybody's having them dreams

Everybody sees themselves walkin' around with no one else

Half of the people can be part right all of the time

Some of the people can be all right part of the time

But all of the people can't be all right all of the time

I think Abraham Lincoln said that

I'LL LET YOU BE IN MY DREAMS IF I CAN BE IN YOURS

I said that"



1:33 PM from Mike S: Someone asked if it was possible to add LLIR info to a TSR in OASIS. Yes, the customer should be able to add comments to the "Customer Comments" field for TSR in any status.

1:34 PM from Leslie Tacoma: I'll jump in here about opening up the conversion window. It seems that having a new product shouldn't be the criterion for opening the window. What we're seeing is new congestion and standards to handle NITS load that may cause PtP customers to rethink product choice. This separation in products should be the trigger to open a conversion window, not if there's a new product.

1:42 PM from Dugan Marieb: Sorry for missing the beginning of this call, will a recording of this call be posted following the meeting?

1:42 PM from Katie Sheckells | BPAT: Dugan - yes

1:49 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Following up on Chris's comment, is there a look-back or comparison of forecasts and actual use included in the 13 MW per year per POD? I'm assuming the new forecast increase would be compared to the higher of forecast and/or actual use... (?)

2:22 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Addition to the first section - Jeff K's comment on use of 20MW in lieu of 13MW for resources, consistent with 1(c) in the NITS Line and Load Requirements.

2:23 PM from Brian Johnson: Seconding Leslie from Tacoma's comment about opening a conversion window. If these changes substantively change the architecture of the PTP contract we signed up for, it isn't the same product. That should trigger opening a conversion window because the architecture of the PTP product will have changed.

2:24 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: What is LLIP? Large Load Interconnection Process? Or is that slide title supposed to be LLIR?

2:24 PM from Martin Wick BPA: LLIR = Line & Load Interconnection Request; LLIP = Line & Load Interconnection Procedure

2:24 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Thank you.

2:35 PM from Don Bain: What is the time horizon of "interim service"?

2:37 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: Now starting conversation on FTSR/TSR Data Validation Readiness Criteria

2:37 PM from Dugan Marieb: Just want to confirm FTSR/TSR Data Validation Readiness Criteria does not apply to TSRs in the 2022 TSEP that have a TSA? Does it apply



to 2023 TSEP TSRs that are technically still in study status on OASIS given they were not offered a service yet but have been studied?

2:38 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Don, the intention is that Interim Service will be offered to "ready" customers and this "less than firm" service will be used if/until firm service is offered

2:38 PM from Chris Stolz: To confirm, these requirements do not apply a TSR request studied in the 2023 TSEP but yet to receive a TSA?

2:40 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Dugan and Chris, we will cover this in detail tomorrow, but Lauren's response to Henry holds true for you as well... these requirements will be applied to unstudied requests

2:43 PM from Don Bain: Abby: So the time horizon for interim service could be as long as it takes to perform all network upgrades needed to provide requested the requested type of service (if it's a higher grade of service than what can be provided on an interim basis) - this could be, what, the 5-6 yr goal or a decade+?

2:46 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Don, you are correct -- the goal is to eventually achieve the 5-6 year goal, but service could be "less-than-firm" for a longer duration

2:54 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Slides 29-34 from our previous workshop contains additional context for our Interim Service proposal

2:54 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program:
<https://www.bpa.gov/-/media/Aep/transmission/Grid-Access-Transformation/Jul-10-TPR-Wrkshp-Presentation.pdf>

3:09 PM from Dugan Marieb: How will security be specifically calculated for the FTSR/TSR bilateral transaction maturity requirements? Is it your portion of the plan of service or the calculation on page 10 of this proposal?

3:11 PM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: please hold until we reach that page of the document

3:23 PM from Don Bain: So if an IPP has had its security drawn on and later has a change of circumstances which allow it to use some of the 5 years of service, does BPA capture of the security provide any equity in the remaining years of service?

3:39 PM from Alex: We agree with the comments by Sidney



3:44 PM from Matt Schroettig - NRU: Does BPA have a sense of how many requests would fall under section 2(e)(i), and would need to conform to a different source/POD at the time of offer or be declined?

3:46 PM from Dmitry Batishchev, TEA: Does the removal of MIDCREMOTE point from LTF queue serve as an attempt to pinpoint the physical location of the source to be used in a LTF study process?

3:48 PM from Tasha Bryan: From a POR - 20TSRs

3:48 PM from Tasha Bryan: From a POD - 42 TSRs

3:48 PM from Matt Schroettig - NRU: Thank you, Tasha.

3:50 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Is NWHUB a physical point?

