

## Grid Access Transformation Public Workshop, July 30, 2025 (2 of 2)

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

- 9:20 AM from Katie Sheckells | BPAT: August 6th for written comments
- 9:23 AM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Thanks for taking a step back for that process check.
- 9:27 AM from Matt Schroettig - NRU: Recommend that BPA provide several examples of what is sufficient evidence, while maintaining discretion to determine alternative means going forward. In lieu of attempting to identify all potential possibilities at this single point in time?
- 9:28 AM from Matt Schroettig - NRU: In light of Abbey's comments, retracting the above recommendation.
- 9:35 AM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: thanks for that clarification and the precision on the language
- 9:39 AM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: I think NIPPC had a really interesting proposal on the "reverse open season" which helps to address the queue position topic and is worth discussion.
- 9:41 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Is BPA open to finding a way to allow some amount of unstudied TSRs stay in the queue (and on a path to eventually receiving firm trx service) until they are commercially ready without taking interim service?
- 9:41 AM from Don Bain: Given the need to qualify for interim service when it's offered, whatever that is from now. Basically, a project has to be far enough along to start taking service when it's requested to commence. If that's 2 years out, for example, what steps does a project need for COD 2 years out which typically would be land use permitting completed and is ready for construction financing, local permitting & construction. Getting to the point of completed land use permitting means the developer has already spent \$Ms and years of work and many development risks are in the rear view mirror. So effectively a project could be deemed "mature" if it's past a particular development milestone such that COD aligns with interim service commencement. A maturity evaluation scale could be made that aligns substantial factual development milestones with lead time to interim service commencement.



9:48 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: These questions are great, Steve, please keep them coming!

9:56 AM from Blake Scherer - Benton PUD: Can you please clarify how queue position becomes "irrelevant" while still maintaining a first-come first serve tariff? In other words, why is tariff not now considered first-ready, first served?

10:03 AM from Don Bain: To be fully successful, all the sectors in the entire ecosystem will need to be doing things differently, so this is more than an education after GAT is finalized. This includes BPA et al working with each sector now, not just the people on this call & the PUCs. The analog of network seams exists between all of these sectors who have a role or substantial interest.

10:04 AM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Blake, the GAT vision is that there will no longer be a pending queue of TSRs waiting for service.; rather, only "ready" requests will be accepted and offered Interim Service as quickly as possible.

10:05 AM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: ... regional needs will be evaluated in Proactive Planning (outside the TSR queue).

10:06 AM from Mike Goetz - Renewable Northwest he/him: Agree with Don's comment above

10:11 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: It would be great to have a forum to hear from IOUs that run RFPs, PUC that monitor them, etc. before final rules go into place.

10:12 AM from Eric Christensen, PRITCA: Good suggestion, Sidney.

10:15 AM from Katie Sheckells | BPAT: <https://www.bpa.gov/-/media/Aep/transmission/Grid-Access-Transformation/Jul-10-TPR-Wrkshp-Presentation.pdf>

10:16 AM from Katie Sheckells | BPAT: slide 63 from last workshop has this diagram being presented

10:16 AM from Lon Peters: Where/when will the presentation for today be posted?

10:16 AM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: Blake, at this time, there is no intention to modify BPA's tariff to deviate from FCFS for TSR evaluation; rather, ready TSRs will be offered Conditional Firm/Interim Service in queue order



10:18 AM from Abbey Nulph | BPAT GAT Planning Program: ... how we'll allocate firm capacity enabled through the Proactive Planning process is still under development

10:21 AM from Jessica Zahnow - PSE: Is it possible to put Lauren's (PPC) last statement/clarification in the chat or repeat it? Thank you

10:21 AM from Katie Sheckells | BPAT: Slide 59 of the link above has a summary of current study and unstudied queue

10:22 AM from Sean Egusa BPA: @Lon After all feedback is added, we will post to the GAT web page. A Tech Forum will be issued to alert everyone when that content is live but expect no later than first thing tomorrow.

10:23 AM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Confirming Chris' response to Blake's question - the FY25 LaRCs will not have the 13MW threshold applied; BPA is going to be talking about how to deal with those... correct?

10:28 AM from Dugan Marieb - Pine Gate Renewables: Just to get this down in writing: if a studied TSR from the 2023 TSEP would like to change from their current offer from BPA to interim service, they would need to meet the readiness criteria described in this document. Correct?

10:39 AM from Erin Jensen - BPA: @Matt The application of New Network Load (13 MW threshold) does not apply to previously granted encumbrances of long-term firm transmission (pg 2 6.e). This was a concern that we heard from some Customer that this would be retroactively applied. For requests that are in STUDY status though the clarification to New Network would be applied.

10:40 AM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: @Erin, understood. Asking because it's my understanding that there have been no granted encumbrances from the FY25 LaRCs - Chris seems to imply this new process would not apply to FY25, whereas yesterday I heard BPA say that they were hoping to have the FY26 LaRCs supercede FY25 - hence my confusion.

10:41 AM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Could be my confusion, and I'm happy to chat offline, but if I'm not missing something there seem to be competing messages.

10:43 AM from Eric Christensen, PRITCA: How did BPA reach the 13 MW number and how does that square with the NLSL provision of the NW Power Act?

10:43 AM from Don Bain: RE a proactive planning process model such as conceived for the future state is unlikely to less complex and will need substantial staff & coordination with entities having planning and operations functions outside BPA. All LSEs



are already doing their own production or service cost analysis and planning to optimize their organizations' objectives which only partially overlap what's best for everyone else. So, for example, how is BPA's regional production cost analysis resolved when it disagrees with an LSE's or the sum of regional LSEs' planning?

11:00 AM from Dugan Marieb - Pine Gate Renewables: I wanted to re up my question in the chat that I am still hoping to get confirmed: Just to get this down in writing: if a studied TSR from the 2023 TSEP would like to change from their current offer from BPA to interim service, they would need to meet the readiness criteria described in this document. Correct?

11:09 AM from Blake Scherer - Benton PUD: Need to be more specific than "baseline" language. There are 2 LaRCs to be compared. Need a date for each.

11:10 AM from Tasha Bryan: @Dugan - customers previously studied in a TSEP may submit readiness requirements and request to be considered for an interim offer

11:12 AM from Dugan Marieb - Pine Gate Renewables: Thanks Tasha, would a customer that does that potentially face different upgrades to go firm if they did that?

11:13 AM from Dugan Marieb - Pine Gate Renewables: Like would they lose their previous plan of going firm and almost be treated like a new request?

11:19 AM from Erin Jensen - BPA: @Eric BPA provided three alternatives at the May 20 NITS Transmission Planning workshop series and at the staff leaning at the July 9 & 10 GAT workshop. Both of these workshops provided information on how the alternatives were developed. These workshops were recorded and materials are available on the BPA site.

11:23 AM from Eric Christensen, PRITCA: Thank you, Erin.

July 30, 2025 11:24 AM from Tasha Bryan: @Dugan - the previously studied TSRs retain their current plans of service

11:29 AM from Dugan Marieb - Pine Gate Renewables: Thanks!

11:42 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Would also like to reiterate my request from yesterday to provide examples of security throughout this process (i.e., for a 100 MW request, it would be x and then if y happens, it would be reduced to z, etc.). That would help clarify potential ambiguity.

11:45 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Noting that 15 Calendar Days seems very short to provide security. It is my understanding that most TPs allow 15-30 Business Days to make those arrangements.



11:47 AM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Hoping we have time to discuss section 10. I'm not sure I'm following what that means.

11:48 AM from Eric Christensen, PRITCA: We agree that 15 days is a serious problem.

1:01 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: folks are still collecting back in the RHR so will have slight delay to start - target of 1:05 pm

1:12 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: I'll admit not having much context for the timeline associated with obtaining a Letter of Credit, but the current TSEP includes a requirement of 30 days - What's the justification or need for the reduced timeline of 15 days?

1:33 PM from Chris Jones - NRU: If an NT customer requires transmission upgrades not related to new load but instead based on a change in forecasted resources, how will BPA calculate this security requirement? In this case, there would not be new large load or load-based revenue

1:42 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Hoping someone will make a flowchart with a 100 MW project example that includes amounts due.

1:46 PM from Dugan Marieb: Is the revenue estimate based on PTP rates or does that include other rates like VERBS?

1:47 PM from Robert Cromwell Consulting LLC: I would be very interested in hearing about a stranded cost alternative to up-front deposits.

1:51 PM from Christina Wyatt, Big Bend Electric Cooperative: I second Ryan Neale's comment on tying the 'facility' load to the NITS's security (8b section).

1:52 PM from Chris Jones - NRU: I agree with Christina re: Ryan's point on 'facility'.

2:29 PM from Laura Green - PGE: To follow up on Abbey's comment, it would be nice to have a future workshop on how curtailments will be reported out and how customers will be notified in advance of curtailments occurring. Thanks!

2:29 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: How will the curtailment order be handled between old CFS and interim CFS?

2:34 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: This is a very big clarification. Thank you!



2:36 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Will stakeholders have an opportunity to weigh in on that decision before it is made? I.e., whether to offer interim service?

2:43 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Really appreciate you linking it to the proactive planning least-regrets strategy there, thank you!

2:48 PM from Don Bain: Perhaps a traditional flow chart(s) that maps the process, milestones, options and decision points entities needing network delivery face.

2:49 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: In addition to process diagrams, we would really like to see a list of the tradeoffs considered when the draft proposal on each of these was put together.

2:50 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: @Don suggestion received, thanks.

2:50 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: The tradeoffs can help us understand alignment with the stated principles and objectives thank you.

2:50 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: @Sibyl suggestion received, thanks!

2:52 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Sorry one other thing, possible linkage to the proactive planning, like the example that was just used would be great to inform that discussion.

2:55 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Proactive planning/accelerate expansion/future state I mean.

2:57 PM from Don Bain: Such charts may be different between the interim process we're discussing and the future state. The latter charts should start early enough in the resource development cycle it includes input into the proactive planning and market-based decisions about type of service needed.

3:01 PM from Brian Johnson: Current and Proposed process flows overlayed on a calendar with simple MW and \$ examples for NITS and PTP would satisfy the boat example

3:06 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: @Don I agree, I think I just mean more about how the future state was considered in the design tradeoffs, and want to make sure we are not missing opportunities for greater linkage or data need/collection during the reset period here that will support and inform that process, particularly given BPA's resource constraints.

3:06 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: @Brian Thank you



- 3:06 PM from James Dykes - Grant PUD: I second Brian Johnson comment and request
- 3:14 PM from Robert Cromwell Consulting LLC: +1 support for the flowchart suggestion from Don and Brian above.
- 3:14 PM from Sean Egusa BPA: @James @Robert duly noted
- 3:20 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: It's my understanding that 6NN is currently not eligible for Congestion Rents in the M+ DAM because it is not longer than 1 year. Following up on Blake's question, does BPA anticipate that this longer term "Enhanced Priority 6" will be eligible?
- 3:21 PM from Rebecca Fredrickson: @Matt this would need to be address in the future discussion
- 3:22 PM from Rebecca Fredrickson: Congestion Rents is a rates and/or tariff discussion
- 3:22 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: @Rebecca, recognize that this may not be something BPA doesn't have unilateral control over, but understanding whether that is one of the intended goals of this product is essential if we're to provide the level of feedback being sought.
- 3:23 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: Which is to say, I do think we need to understand the motivations here, before entering into any tariff discussions.
- 3:24 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: It would be helpful to see if listing in the contract or other items would support implementation of that if it was changed in M+ design. Would like to have the building blocks in place to be able to implement it in the market congestion allocation as well as on the BPA/OATI side.
- 3:28 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Can you remind me what the functional disadvantage is?
- 3:30 PM from James Dykes - Grant PUD: When the priority for NT is higher than any PTP priority, how is there a teeter totter?
- 3:33 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Has anyone compared the take-or-pay aspect of the PTP rate to better compare it to the NT rate? I'd be curious to see how much PTP is not utilized (and then made available for ST sales) and how those rates compare when that is taken into account.
- 3:34 PM from James Dykes - Grant PUD: I agree Sidney. I have not





3:39 PM from Matt Schroettnig - NRU: To confirm, existing system functionality would support Network CF - correct? The only impediment is the TC20 removal of the relevant tariff language?

3:49 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Any idea when/where the next iteration of the congestion rent conversation might occur?

3:53 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: The congestion rent task force is on hold for the foreseeable future until there is some performance data and post implementation/go-live information to inform the discussion and any needed evolution to the design. That said, BPA is a big player in the market and with the SPP model could theoretically submit a revision request to trigger another discussion on this topic, or to Lauren's point, there may be ways to pursue this that don't require a tariff change.

3:56 PM from Rebecca Fredrickson: @Sibly and Lauren, thank you. I am going to do more research and may reach out to you if you are okay with reaching out to you?

3:57 PM from Lauren Tenney Denison, PPC: @Rebecca - sounds great. Thank you!

3:57 PM from Don Bain: While I'm unclear about feasibility for NT & NITS: There needs to be a mechanism for a LT PTP TSA holder who finds they don't need/want the full MW amount to transfer a MW portion of their TSA to another party with the same rights/obligations as the original TSA holder. Naturally such a transfer would frequently require a feasible redirect and maybe that could be accomplished with a commercially feasible network upgrade cost that'd be simpler or less than a new original TSR for those same MW. This capability would release unused TSA capacity and at a higher value than into non-firm uses which effectively make a resource operation on a merchant basis. A marketplace mechanism would facilitate seller-buyer match. To the extent this works it'd increase network utilization and reduce MW seeking new BPA service - and could save \$.

3:57 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Absolutely Rebecca, thanks!

4:00 PM from Robert Cromwell Consulting LLC: Thank you for the last two days of discussion. One additional thought, in light of a planning process that looks like ~ year and the Administrator's goal of getting new projects energized within 5-6 years, it may be worth looking across the agency at how each part of the process needs to be streamlined/accelerated to hit that 5-6 yr. goal.

4:01 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Agree that Aug 6 is a difficult flip given the broad nature of the discussion, and especially if you are going to flip another draft.





4:01 PM from Don Bain: Much appreciation for your creativity and willingness to create a major new strategy!

4:01 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: Thank you BPA for these discussions. Great work.

4:02 PM from Sibyl Geiselman PGP: Agree, it may also be more efficient if we can see a redline first and then comment?

4:03 PM from Sidney Villanueva - Blue Skies Law: We appreciate you, BPA. We get that this is a big task and we are asking you to move quickly and to slow down.

4:07 PM from Lauren Tenney Denison, PPC: Thank you team BPA for the materials and discussion.

4:07 PM from Enoch Dahl FPUD: Thanks so much!

