

**Grid Access Transformation Customer-led Meeting, September 10, 2025**

Materials available on the [GAT webpage](#).

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

Michael Deen (NWCPUD) 9/10/2025 9:15 AM • Appreciate your thoughts Mike - we agree that many of the most key issues here agnostic to transmission product

James Dykes - Grant PUD 9/10/2025 9:24 AM • Appreciate your thoughts and sharing them Mike. We also agree with you on many of the key issues mentioned and that the reality is more transmission being built is the goal. The reality is that to investors need certainty invest, the region needs more capacity and resources to be built for resource adequacy and to meet policy driven requirements, and all of us need BPA, as the primary TSP in the area, to be efficient and effective in moving the region off of pause as soon as possible while also creating a future state that can also keep up in a cost effective way with the requirements placed on all LSEs it serves.

Don Bain 9/10/2025 9:33 AM • The point about investor certainty shows how the situation is multi sectorial - each relevant sector has related needs, commercial practices and constraints. BPA represents a crucial sector in an interrelated complex system. A good future state will depend on each sector evolving in a coherent way. It's a bridge too far to expect the situation to be resolved by BPA acting alone.

Robert Cromwell Consulting LLC 9/10/2025 9:48 AM • How is Tacoma distinguishing between "retail load" and "Commercial" use of tx under TACs PTP contract on the planning slide? Similarly, what is the policy or legal basis for distinguishing "retail load" PTP and other use of BPA PTP?

Jeff Kugel - GDS 9/10/2025 9:50 AM • I second Robert Cromwell's comment and also offer that Transmission customers can have both NT transmission and PTP Transmission. If Tacoma is worried about securing Firm PTP Transmission, exploring an NT Transmission contract for that load growth is an option

Ryan Neale 9/10/2025 9:58 AM • WPAG is supportive of an opportunity for customers to change products.

Sidney Villanueva 9/10/2025 10:21 AM • Shoot, realizing I missed one of my four: Rahul, should we interpret the willingness to consider product conversions through the GAT process a confirmation that NT load growth may inevitably be prioritized over PTP growth



due to product differences, historic trends, etc. (acknowledging the goal to balance discrimination against undue discrimination)?

Laura Green- PGE 9/10/2025 10:23 AM • PGE appreciates Tacoma's proposal around proactive planning for PTP load growth. As an IOU we don't have access to federal power, so we would like to further explore how this proposal would work encompassing PTP TX for both federal and non-federal power. Would the load growth concept apply the 2-5% load growth per year, per PTP path we have existing inbound rights on? Again, we appreciate your brainstorming approach for PTP load growth.

Leslie Tacoma 9/10/2025 10:24 AM • Laura, I think that needs to be part of the larger conversation.

Leslie Tacoma 9/10/2025 10:27 AM • Sidney, thanks for raising that question.

James Dykes - Grant PUD 9/10/2025 10:31 AM • I lowered my hand intentionally and will hold my question for my AE.

Alex Swerzbin 9/10/2025 10:32 AM • Important to include in the conversation those entities that are taking service from both products and why they need to take service from both products.

Don Bain 9/10/2025 11:12 AM • & financing is only one involved sector...

Ryan Neale 9/10/2025 11:41 AM • As described by Jake, the due diligence criteria used by a bank before financing a potential project to establish a "bullet proof box" free from risk are similar to the commercial readiness criteria (CRC) that BPA is proposing to use to similarly evaluate TSRs. Looking ahead, it appears that New Sun argues that CRCs should not be applied to transition offers or to evaluate business models. Given that the investment that BPA (and its ratepayers) intends to make in the transmission system, why isn't it appropriate from New Sun's perspective for BPA to apply CRC to ensure that its prospective business partners business models are viable and sustainable to protect that BPA investment, just like a bank?

Don Bain 9/10/2025 1:21 PM • A # of PNW renewables projects have gone on line as merchant or partial merchant generation. Affording these projects' risk profile is more feasible by the very largest, most well funded and aggressive developers, and those who can use balance sheet financing, which also favors larger projects. Systematically, these developers have more financial flexibility that other market participants don't. Their #s are few enough that if they were the only bidders arguably price competition would be impaired and ratepayers would consequently pay more. And a limited bid pool may not offer the optimal locations, sizes and project configurations needed by LSEs.



Leslie Tacoma 9/10/2025 1:24 PM • I think it would be helpful for BPA to provide a comparison of projects in the GI queue compared to those in the TX queue so we know how much overlap there is between the queues. Presumably the GI queue results, when they come out, will include TX upgrades.

Don Bain 9/10/2025 1:26 PM • Is BPA saying CRC are not used when evaluating a NITS request for transmission from a specific resource? I've heard it said there's an evaluation of the probability the resource is sufficiently real enough to justify BPA doing the needed upgrades.]

Sidney Villanueva 9/10/2025 1:28 PM • Eric, could you please also identify who PNRICA members are?

Ryan Neale 9/10/2025 1:30 PM • BPA's current NT Business Practice requires NT Customers when submitting a LTF NT TSR or STF NT TSR to designate a Network Resource to attest that: a. The NT Customer owns the resource, has committed to purchase generation pursuant to an executed contract, or has committed to purchase generation where execution of a contract is contingent upon the availability of Transmission Service under Part III of the BPA OATT. b. The Network Resource does not include any resources, or any portions thereof, that are committed for a sale of one (1) year or more to non-designated third party load or otherwise cannot be called upon to meet the NT Customer's Network Load on a non-interruptible basis, except for purposes of fulfilling obligations under a reserve sharing program.

Those attestation requirements look very similar to the CRCs that BPA is now proposing.

Sidney Villanueva 9/10/2025 1:40 PM • Avangrid would support "un-pausing" processing of redirects with de minimis impacts and/or discussing whether additional product concepts (e.g., Abbey's "inflatable" redirects) are also appropriate during the reform.

Dmitry Batishchev, TEA 9/10/2025 1:47 PM • Question to Dynasty: What sources did you use for PTP prices and for flowgate ATC?

Don Bain 9/10/2025 1:57 PM • Ryan: Regardless of the NT BP language, I've several times heard BPA staff in workshops talk about the internal evaluation of NITS requests to enable import of a new specific resource. I've heard staff say they evaluate the likelihood of the transaction's actual use, which goes beyond evidencing advance paper and necessarily includes probability the project will be built, and that it's difficult to reduce that evaluation to a few simple objective criteria. Presumably the LSE has already done its own review of the resource and arguably more is redundant. Naturally BPA wants sufficient justification to invest big \$ in the needed network upgrades to support a preference customer's import of



the resource, I've heard at least a ~70+% probability. So evidently BPA is doing CRC of such requests, even if it's not clear in BP.

Sidney Villanueva 9/10/2025 2:02 PM • Order 890!

Ryan Neale 9/10/2025 2:08 PM • @Don Bain - Agreed. A new load for a NITS customer must have a 70% probability of coming on line (as determined by BPA) before BPA will include it in its Agency Load Forecast. Accordingly, BPA already imposes CRCs on both the load and resource sides for NITS. <https://www.bpa.gov/-/media/Aep/transmission/Grid-Access-Transformation/70percentile-load-forecast-criteria-final.pdf>

Sidney Villanueva 9/10/2025 2:29 PM • Thinking out loud: BPA could also facilitate some ad-hoc workshops that stakeholders could decide whether they want to participate in.

Marie Barlow 9/10/2025 2:50 PM • I would be interested in this as pertains to the Pine Gate proposal

Sibyl PGP 9/10/2025 3:20 PM • If it is going to take time to build out the system in the future state, it seems there are likely components of this that will still be needed given how long it takes to build transmission, even when a planning process and related system plan is established that meets everyone's needs.

Michele Patterson - Mason 3 9/10/2025 3:47 PM • When it comes to the statement of making sure to take time to get it right. There also can be consideration for the visual provided by Michael at the start of the meeting today and that is Success might end up take a few iterations. We could move forward, determine adjustments need to be made, make those adjustments and keep moving forward. Recognizing that need to make adjustments especially given shortening the timeframe. Thank you for a great meeting.

Blake Scherer, Benton PUD 9/10/2025 3:53 PM • I was great to have real-time interaction from BPA

Jerod Vandehey - Cowlitz PUD 9/10/2025 3:53 PM • thank you bpa

Zeecha Van Hoose (Clark PUD) 9/10/2025 3:53 PM • I appreciate the conversation.

