

Response to Comments – Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS)

BPA Transmission Business Practice

Version 16
Posted 9/2/2026

Response to Comments – Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS)

Version 16

This document contains comments and BPA responses regarding Version 16 of the Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS) Business Practice posted for comment from July 22, 2026, to August 5, 2026.

Previously the business practice was posted for comment from May 4, 2026, to June 9, 2026.

This is Bonneville’s final agency action in regard to this version of the business practice.

For more information on business practices out for comment, visit the BPA [Proposed Business Practices webpage](#).

Table of Contents

A. Portland General Electric.....	2
B. Avangrid.....	3
C. NITS Customer Group.....	11
D. Alliance of Western Energy Consumers	21
E. Bonneville Power Administration	24

A. Portland General Electric

Comments on BPA's proposed version 16 of the NITS business practice

PGE appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback in this extended comment period and supports BPA's efforts to clarify application of the Non-Trended Load Growth (NTLG) policy. Below are comments PGE requests be addressed in the final version 16 of the NITS business practice:

1. Section C.2.b.

PGE assumes the "request" in section C.2.b. refers to a specific element of the forecast – either a new or increased non-Federal resource, or New Network Load – rather than a TSR, or the BPA request for a NITS Data Exhibit. PGE suggests the following edits to clarify:

- b. If a NITS Customer does not provide the NITS Data Exhibit that meets requirements within the required timeframe, the request that element of the forecast will receive no further consideration. BPA will continue to review the LaRC without the request for only those elements of the forecast for which the NITS Customer has provided sufficient information.

BPA Response 1

BPA accepts PGE's proposed language change to Section C.2.b of the NITS Business Practice.

2. Section C.3. and E.4.

It appears that sections C.3. and E.4. require NITS Customers to forecast sufficient resource(s) to serve their forecasted load(s). PGE believes a NITS Customer is permitted to rely solely on non-designated resources to serve their loads if they so choose. BPA's OATT doesn't specify the ten year forecast of resource requirements must be equal to or greater than the ten year load forecasts, so PGE requests BPA clarify why NITS Customers must forecast resources sufficient to meet the forecasted loads; or describe how a NITS Customer can forecast use of Secondary Service from undesignated resources.

BPA Response 2

BPA requests NITS Customers provide forecasted resources via the LaRC to enable BPA to plan for the impacts of forecasted load and forecasted resources on BPA's Transmission System. In the sections referenced in PGE's comment, BPA needs this information to create FTSR(s) for future service needs and to effectively plan for New Network Load, respectively.

Secondary Network Service may be available on a transmission service provider's transmission system in the short-term on an as-available basis. Any shortfall in resources may contribute to risk for the NITS Customers that sufficient transmission is not available.

The NITS Business Practice Section K provides guidance for using secondary service. NITS Customers may inform BPA of their plan to use secondary service through ongoing dialogue between NITS Customers and BPA but it is not required in the LaRC at this time. If the NITS

Customer does not request Long-Term Firm service in their LaRC they are forgoing the ability to have BPA develop FTSRs and plan transmission for the NITS Customer's needs.

Additionally, it appears section E.4. incorrectly refers to section C.2 rather than C.3. PGE suggests BPA perform a cross-reference check of this business practice before finalizing.

PGE appreciates the efforts of BPA staff over the last two years to reach this proposed business practice update.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

BPA Response 3

BPA agrees with the suggested edit to Section E.4 and has made the revision referencing Section C.3 in the final NITS Business Practice v16.

B. Avangrid

Re: Avangrid Comments on Proposed Business Practice Changes

Avangrid Power, LLC ("Avangrid") appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Bonneville Power Administration ("Bonneville") proposed revisions to its Network Integration Transmission Service ("NITS") Business Practice.¹

¹Additional details regarding proposed business practices is available at <https://www.bpa.gov/energy-and-services/transmission/business-practices/proposed-business-practices>.

Avangrid appreciates that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") *pro forma* Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT") includes an obligation for Transmission Providers to plan for and serve the reasonably forecasted needs of its Network Customers and that NITS and Point-to-Point ("PTP") transmission service are governed by different tariff provisions and planning processes. Avangrid does not oppose reasonable mechanisms for incorporating legitimate, incremental load growth into Bonneville's transmission planning. The proposed Business Practice ("BP") nevertheless raises important questions regarding how Bonneville will accommodate incremental Network load growth during a period of significant transmission scarcity, particularly where similarly situated PTP customers may remain unable to obtain service, and the broader ramifications of such policy.

Avangrid therefore requests additional clarity regarding: 1) reasonable parity among customer groups; 2) the effect of incremental Network load growth on available transmission capability and pending PTP requests; and 3) the allocation of costs associated with facilities needed to serve such growth.

I. BACKGROUND

Bonneville's NITS BP governs how Network Customers submit load and resource forecasts and how Bonneville evaluates the transmission service needed to serve those forecasts. Bonneville's proposed revisions distinguish between trended load growth and Non-Trended Load Growth, establish procedures for evaluating large or discrete load additions, and provide for the creation of Forecasted Transmission Service Requests where additional transmission service may be required.

After discussion in numerous proceedings, Bonneville issued an initial proposal in May 2026 and received comments from several Network Customers and customer groups. Those comments generally requested clearer and more objective standards for Non-Trended Load Growth determinations, appropriate recognition of existing transmission encumbrances and historical load baselines, facility-level evaluation of large-load growth, and additional procedural protections. Bonneville issued a revised proposal on July 22, 2026.

The revised BP is particularly significant because Bonneville is considering how Network load growth will be incorporated into transmission planning while substantial PTP requests remain pending and broader reforms to Bonneville's commercial and future-state planning processes are still under development. The proposal therefore raises questions not only regarding the treatment of Network Customers, but also regarding the effect of forecasted Network load on scarce transmission capability, other transmission customers, and the allocation of upgrade costs.

II. COMMENTS

As described in more detail below, Avangrid respectfully requests that Bonneville revise the proposed BP, or provide accompanying written guidance, to:

- Clearly define the scope and operation of the threshold separating trended and Non-Trended Load;
- Explain how incremental Network load growth will be prioritized relative to pending and future PTP transmission requests;
- Describe the effects of such growth on short-term firm, and long-term firm transmission availability;
- Establish safeguards against segmentation of a single large-load development into multiple increments below the applicable threshold;
- Explain how the proposal will interact with Bonneville's paused commercial planning process and its future-state transmission planning reforms;
- Identify the cost-allocation and financial-security principles applicable to upgrades required to accommodate incremental Network load growth; and
- Provide a process for communicating material impacts on transmission capability to affected customers.

A. Bonneville Should Explain How the Proposed Treatment of Network Load Growth Will Affect Other Transmission Customers and Apply Meaningful Limits to Ensure a Fair Approach

As Avangrid understands the proposal, incremental load growth below the threshold for "Non-Trended Load" may be incorporated into Bonneville's transmission planning and treated

differently from other requests for transmission service. Bonneville should explain more precisely what this different treatment entails and how it compares to requests for PTP service.

Under the FERC *pro forma* OATT, both NITS and firm PTP service create obligations to plan for and expand the transmission system, but neither section provides incremental Network load an earlier or more effective route into transmission planning. The proposed BP appears to provide priority access to scarce existing or future capability—while PTP customers' corresponding expansion requests remain paused, queued, or subject to materially different readiness and commitment requirements. Bonneville should identify whether and under what circumstances incremental Network load growth will be accommodated before pending requests for short-term firm, Conditional Firm, or Long-Term Firm PTP service. Bonneville should also clarify whether this treatment will continue while other transmission planning or commercial study processes are paused or undergoing reform.

BPA Response 4

Thank you for your questions. Avangrid may be misinterpreting what is occurring with this proposed business practice change. BPA has historically planned its Transmission System for NITS Customers' forecasted load growth through the system assessment process or similar processes that pre-dated it. This latest system assessment practice has been in place for decades and its impacts have been discussed regularly since BPA adopted its (now retired) Long-Term Firm ATC Methodology. The system assessment worked well when nearly all of NITS Customers' load growth was on a moderate trajectory and forecasted use of the FCRPS as the resource. BPA clearly knew the locations of these FCRPS resources that would be serving the historical and forecasted NITS loads well in advance.

It became more challenging as NITS Customers began to forecast large amounts of Non-Trended Load Growth, often in relatively short timeframes. As a result, the focus of this business practice change is to limit the application of the historical NITS planning model and to define a line between what forecasted NITS transmission needs can reliably be planned for in this historical manner and what cannot.

The NITS threshold places a limit on forecasted load growth that can reasonably be planned for utilizing that historical model and defines the new NITS transmission needs that must be planned for through the commercial planning process (i.e., in addition to the system assessment planning process). This business practice update does not provide new flexibility but rather places a clear limitation on transmission planning needs that can be accommodated using the historical NITS planning model.

There is a substantial amount of posted material on this topic dating back to Spring 2024, when BPA initiated the public process on this topic, available to aid interested parties in better understanding the context and issues associated with this business practice.

Avangrid requests information regarding how similarly situated PTP Customers' incremental load growth is accommodated during a period of significant transmission scarcity, citing a concern that similarly situated PTP Customers may remain unable to obtain service. NITS and PTP Customers are not inherently "similarly situated." For NITS, BPA has taken on the responsibility to plan and build the transmission system to meet a range of weather-variable load conditions, ranging from the average transmission requirement to the peak transmission requirement. For PTP, transmission is based on the transmission right the buyer seeks to

purchase, and the PTP Customer takes on the responsibility to acquire sufficient rights to meet their needs.

The OATT also provides for redispach of the resources that are serving a NITS Customer, which BPA and its NITS Customers currently meet through redispach of the FCRPS. This difference in the structure of the service provides flexibility to serve NITS Customers' traditional load growth in a manner that is different than OATT service to PTP Customers.

A key function of the NITS threshold is that it discerns NITS transmission needs for which redispach is sufficient to enable the flexibility to provide additional transmission, and situations, based on magnitude of the forecasted transmission need, for which redispach is not sufficient to provide that flexibility without additional transmission infrastructure. The NITS threshold creates the meaningful limit that Avangrid requests BPA to effectuate.

Avangrid acknowledges that the tariff framework does not require NITS and PTP service to be identical. Nevertheless, the differences between those service types should not result in one customer group receiving effectively open-ended access to incremental transmission capability while another group lacks a meaningful or timely path to service. This concern is especially significant where PTP customers have submitted valid requests, demonstrated commercial interest, and remained in Bonneville's transmission queue for extended periods.

In order to accommodate load growth in a fair manner with meaningful limits, Bonneville should therefore explain the limiting principles applicable to the accommodation of incremental Network load growth. At a minimum, the final BP should identify:

- Whether the applicable threshold is cumulative, annual, or project-specific;
- Whether multiple increments of load growth may be accommodated at the same point of delivery;
- Whether related or commonly controlled loads will be aggregated when determining whether the threshold has been exceeded;
- How Bonneville will distinguish ordinary load growth from the phased development of a single large-load facility;
- How Bonneville will prevent the threshold from being used to divide a large or speculative load addition into smaller increments that receive preferential planning treatment; and
- Whether Bonneville will consider a similar approach to incorporating growth for PTP customers in the future.

Clear standards are necessary to ensure that the proposed BP does not create unintended advantages based solely on the form or timing of a customer's load forecast.

BPA Response 5

The NITS threshold is being proposed specifically so that there will not be "open-ended access to incremental transmission capability" as BPA cannot conduct reliable planning under such conditions. Instances of forecasted large load growth required this modification to NITS planning for that precise reason.

Responses to specific questions above:

- Whether the applicable threshold is cumulative, annual, or project-specific;

- BPA Response: The threshold is annual and facility-specific. It applies over the 10-year forecast period in the NITS Customer's LaRC (see Section E.6.a.ii).
- Whether multiple increments of load growth may be accommodated at the same point of delivery;
 - BPA Response: Multiple increments of load growth can occur at the same POD over the 10-year forecast period. Earlier in the development of the Non-Trended Load Growth policy, BPA shifted the proposal from identifying substantial load growth at the POD level to identification of substantial load growth at the facility level. When separate facilities are identified behind a single POD, each facility exceeding the threshold will be evaluated separately.
- Whether related or commonly controlled loads will be aggregated when determining whether the threshold has been exceeded;
 - BPA Response: BPA's review of the LaRC and NTLG Facility Evaluation form assesses forecasted load(s) to ensure that forecasted large loads are not disaggregated, such as among different legal entities, in an attempt to enable it to be under the NITS threshold.
- How Bonneville will distinguish ordinary load growth from the phased development of a single large-load facility;
 - BPA Response: When developing this proposal through public workshops, BPA considered potential manipulation that would allow a Customer to avoid a commercial planning assessment. This has resulted in a LaRC and NTLG evaluation process that allows BPA to plan transmission with the NITS Customer. The NITS Customers are required to provide Possible New & Growing Loads in their LaRC, including loads with phased development, that are above their ordinary load growth. The NITS business practice is clear that the facility determination will be made by BPA.
- How Bonneville will prevent the threshold from being used to divide a large or speculative load addition into smaller increments that receive preferential planning treatment; and
 - BPA Response: BPA's review of the LaRC and NTLG Facility Evaluation form assesses forecasted load(s) to determine if a forecasted load is composed of one or more facilities. BPA's determination ensures that forecasted load is not disaggregated, such as among different legal entities, to enable it to be under the NITS threshold.
- Whether Bonneville will consider a similar approach to incorporating growth for PTP Customers in the future.
 - BPA Response: BPA does not anticipate considering a similar transmission access model for PTP Customers. The inherent nature of the PTP transmission request (identifying a specific quantity from a specific Point of Receipt to a specific Point of Delivery) facilitates transmission planning relative to NITS for which only the POD location is known with a high degree of certainty – the amount of load at the POD varies with weather, time of year and time of day; there can be multiple Points of Receipt providing resource quantities greater than or less than the forecasted load at the POD, and NITS Customers do not request a specific network path.

B. Bonneville Should Provide Transparency Regarding the Effects on Available Transmission Capability

Avangrid also requests greater transparency regarding how the accommodation of incremental Network load growth will affect transmission capability available to other customers.

Incorporating additional Network load into Bonneville's planning models may reduce capability available for short-term and long-term PTP service. Conversely, facilities constructed to accommodate Network load growth may, in some circumstances, create additional capability or provide benefits to other transmission customers. The proposed BP does not adequately explain how Bonneville will evaluate or communicate these effects.

Avangrid asks that Bonneville consider describing to customers:

- How incremental Network load growth will be reflected in available transmission capability calculations;
- Whether accommodating that growth may reduce the availability of short-term firm transmission service;
- When accommodating Network load growth could affect the timing or availability of Long-Term Firm or Conditional Firm PTP service;
- How Bonneville will account for incremental Network load growth when evaluating existing PTP requests and future transmission awards; and
- Whether upgrades constructed to accommodate Network load growth are expected to create additional capability that may be made available to PTP customers.

Avangrid is not requesting disclosure of commercially sensitive customer information or detailed transmission models. Rather, Bonneville should provide sufficient process transparency for affected customers to understand whether and how the proposed treatment of Network load growth may affect their ability to obtain transmission service.

This transparency is particularly important while Bonneville is developing its Future State planning process and considering substantial changes to how scarce transmission capability will be studied and awarded. The treatment of Network load growth under this BP should be coordinated with those broader reforms rather than established in isolation.

BPA Response 6

- How incremental Network load growth will be reflected in available transmission capability calculations;
 - BPA Response: For BPA's flow-based paths, BPA only provides calculation of ATC in its Short-Term markets. BPA's calculation of Short-Term ATC begins with WECC base cases, which reflect forecasted load for NITS Customers as well as for PTP Customers for which BPA is the Assigned Data Maintainer.
- Whether accommodating that growth may reduce the availability of short-term firm transmission service;
 - BPA Response: Forecasted load provided by BPA Customers to BPA is an input to WECC base cases, whether for NITS or PTP Customers' load (see BPA's annual [Transmission Plan](#)). The WECC base cases, which are based on the Agency Load Forecast, are an input to Short-Term Firm transmission

availability. More information about BPA's Short-Term ATC calculations can be found in BPA's ATC Identification Document (ID).

- When accommodating Network load growth could affect the timing or availability of Long-Term Firm or Conditional Firm PTP service;
 - BPA Response: Accommodating Network load growth to meet BPA's NITS planning obligation could affect the availability of Long-Term Firm or Conditional Firm PTP service for PTP Customers. The NTLG policy places a limit on that for NITS Customers. It is also true that planning for PTP requests could also affect the availability of Long-Term Firm or Conditional Firm PTP service for other PTP Customers. There is no limit on the PTP requests that can be made.
- How Bonneville will account for incremental Network load growth when evaluating existing PTP requests and future transmission awards; and
 - BPA Response: PTP and NITS Customers that require a commercial planning assessment receive a queue number and are accounted for in queue order. NITS Customers' load requests that do not require a commercial planning assessment are included in the Agency Load Forecast once loads are $\geq 70\%$ probable. The Agency Load Forecast is used for the System Assessment. (see [NITS Transmission Planning Workshop March 2024](#)).
- Whether upgrades constructed to accommodate forecasted Network load are expected to create additional capability that may be made available to PTP Customers.
 - BPA Response: It is possible. However, the quantity of additional capability is both time-specific and project-specific. BPA accounts for forecasted load growth (NITS and PTP) as a foundation of its planning processes.

C. Bonneville Should Clarify Who Will Pay for Facilities Needed to Serve Incremental Network Load Growth

The most significant issue that has not been discussed is the allocation of costs associated with accommodating incremental Network load growth.

Bonneville should clearly explain whether upgrades required to serve such growth will be:

- Directly assigned to the Network Customer;
- Included in embedded transmission rates paid by Network Customers;
- Socialized across Bonneville's broader transmission customer base, including PTP customers; or
- Allocated through some combination of direct assignment and rolled-in rate treatment.

BPA Response 7

The allocation of costs associated with accommodating incremental Network load growth is not within the scope of the NITS Business Practice. Given the nature and gravity of the topic, BPA intends to host these discussions during upcoming tariff and rate proceedings.

The BP should also explain how Bonneville will address facilities that are initially constructed to serve Network load but later provide broader system benefits. Conversely, Bonneville should not broadly socialize the costs of upgrades that are primarily needed to accommodate a particular large or speculative load addition without demonstrating corresponding benefits to other transmission customers.

BPA Response 8

The allocation of costs associated with accommodating incremental Network load growth is not within the scope of the NITS Business Practice. Given the nature and gravity of the topic, BPA intends to host these discussions during upcoming tariff and rate proceedings.

The issues raised with large or speculative load additions prompted the Non-Trended Load Growth policy change as an initial modification of BPA's existing business practices. BPA's existing practice is to evaluate NITS Customer requests on a case-by-case basis to evaluate the benefit to the Network and determine the allocation of costs.

These questions are increasingly important as large-load customers consider locating within the service territories of different preference customers. A policy that permits substantial incremental loads to receive embedded-cost transmission treatment could shift material development risks and costs to customers that did not cause those costs and may not benefit from the resulting facilities.

Bonneville should therefore establish transparent cost-causation principles before implementing the proposed treatment. At a minimum, Bonneville should identify:

- The circumstances in which directly assigned versus rolled-in treatment will apply;
- Whether the size, certainty, or maturity of the underlying load commitment will affect cost allocation;
- What financial security or commitment will be required from the customer associated with the load growth;
- How Bonneville will address facilities that provide both customer-specific and regional benefits; and
- How any costs included in transmission rates will be allocated among Network and PTP customers.

BPA Response 9

Cost allocation for NITS Customers load growth is out of scope for the NITS Business Practice. Facility and cost assignment guidelines and cost causation are principles of BPA's Rapid Access Products & Interconnection Delivery (RAPID) program.

III. CONCLUSION

Avangrid supports Bonneville's efforts to improve the accuracy of Network Customer load forecasts and to plan for legitimate load growth. Those objectives, however, should be implemented through a transparent framework that reasonably accounts for the interests of all transmission customers.

Bonneville should ensure that the proposed BP does not allow incremental Network load growth to consume scarce transmission capability without meaningful limits, transparency regarding impacts, or clear responsibility for associated costs. Addressing these issues now will promote equitable treatment, improve customer confidence, and better align the BP with Bonneville's broader transmission planning reforms.

Avangrid appreciates Bonneville's consideration of these comments.

BPA Response 10

This revision to the NITS Business Practice aims to do what Avangrid is suggesting: implement limits that prevent the consumption of scarce transmission capacity. The process to revise the business practice is the culmination of several years of collaboration and deliberation, including multiple BPA and customer-led workshops attended by PTP and NITS stakeholders. The Planning for NITS Loads and Resources effort pre-dates current transmission planning reform efforts but is in alignment with them. BPA solicited multiple rounds of comments and shifted aspects of the proposal in response to comments before doing so again in Bonneville's Business Practice Process. It is our hope that review of this history of collaboration with stakeholders will alleviate concerns raised in Avangrid's comments, while BPA's current and future transmission planning reforms will look to address those aspects that the NITS NTLG policy did not attempt to address, such as allocation of costs for upgrades driven by large loads.

C. NITS Customer Group

I. Introduction and Summary

The NITS Customer Group¹ appreciates BPA's extensive Response to Comments issued July 22, 2026, and the Agency's decision to extend the comment period for Version 16 of the Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS) Business Practice (BP).

¹The NITS Customer Group includes: Benton PUD, Benton REA, Big Bend Electric Cooperative, City of Forest Grove, Clark Public Utilities, Clatskanie PUD, Columbia River PUD, Eugene Water and Electric Board, Klickitat PUD, Lewis County PUD, Mason PUD 3, McMinnville Water & Light, Northern Wasco PUD, Northwest Requirements Utilities, PNGC Power, Snohomish PUD, Umatilla Electric Cooperative, and the Western Public Agencies Group.

By accepting many of the recommendations made by the NITS Customer Group in our comments of June 9, 2026, BPA materially improved the proposed BP and provided much needed clarity for NITS Customers.² Notwithstanding such improvements to the initial draft BP, when taken as a whole, the NITS Customer Group continues to view the proposed NITS BP as an overall degradation of BPA's NITS product. This is due in large part to BPA's continued inclusion of the Non-Trended Load Growth threshold, which effectively bifurcates NITS customer load for planning purposes in manner that will (i) make it difficult to enable a common interpretation of the BP among BPA and its customers, (ii) create confusion and new hurdles for end-use consumers whose investment decisions will depend on it, and (iii) likely have foreseeable and unforeseeable negative impacts on load growth and economic development in the service territories of BPA's NITS customers.

²We explicitly note our appreciation for BPA agreeing to: (1) change the NTLG determination from BPA's "sole discretion" to "reasonable discretion"; (2) remove proposed section E.6.c regarding subjecting 13-MW or greater increases at any Point of Delivery to potential NTLG review; (3) add clarifying language to note that CONFIRMED FTSRs will not be subject to additional commercial review; (4) restore collaborative forecasting language in section B.1.b;

(5) extend the deficiency cure period from 5 to 10 business days; (6) remedy the circular definition of “Non-Trended Load Growth” and “New Network Load”; (7) strike proposed section O.5; and (8) add clarifying language in Section E specifying that residential and commercial load growth should not be treated as NTLG. These are meaningful enhancements that clarify BPA’s provision of NITS.

That being said, our overall objectives have not changed since our June 9th submittal. Like BPA, and notwithstanding our concerns regarding the BP, we urgently need BPA to resume processing load and resource forecasts (LaRCs), a process now paused for approximately two years.

Despite all parties’ interests in making the proposed NITS BP effective as soon as possible, we nevertheless submit the remaining concerns below for the sake of both future reference and possible improvement by BPA of the BP before it is finalized.³ The NITS Customer Group intends to follow these comments with a separate letter in the near future that further highlights our concerns with the overall trajectory of BPA’s NITS offering.

³BPA’s Response to Comments alternates between the section numbers in BPA’s draft and the renumbered sections in the NITS Customer Group’s redline. Unless otherwise indicated, references in these comments are to the section numbers in BPA’s posted draft of Version 16. Where ambiguity is possible, we identify both.

II. Remaining Concerns

1. Codify and Clearly Articulate How BPA Will Apply Existing Encumbrances to LaRCs

BPA stated in its comments that there are “a multitude of ways” existing firm transmission encumbrances can be attributed and that “BPA is concerned that attempts to capture every possible load and resource encumbrance and designation scenario in the business practice will do more harm than good” (BPA Response 7). BPA’s updated NITS Business Practice also makes clear its intent to tie specific resources to Non-Trended Load Growth (NTLG), which signals further degradation of the underlying purpose of NITS.

The NITS Customer Group does not understand BPA’s response since currently there are only three discrete options for using existing firm transmission encumbrances: CONFIRMED FTSRs; existing designated Network Resources (DNRs); or forecasted Behind-The-Meter resources codified in a LaRC Close Out Letter. BPA’s proposed business practice (Responses 7; 8; 20; 32) fails to address existing DNRs even though its New Network Load form already contemplates that existing DNRs may be applied to New Network Load (of which NTLG is a defined element) as shown in the table below.

BPA New Network Load Form — Fourth Table

NETWORK RESOURCE(S) TO SERVE LOAD
Resource Name:
☐ New Network Resource DNR Aref:
☐ Existing/Modified Network Resource DNR Aref:

Additionally, existing DNRs, including Behind-The-Meter resources, are superior to CONFIRMED FTSRs since both alternatives are already contracted for or owned by the NITS Customer — in other words, the likelihood of the NITS Customer using these resources to serve an NTLG is significantly more likely than a forecasted resource.

BPA Response 11

Section J.1 states that Section J, including the requirement to fill out the New Network Load form, is not required for NTLG. This was to ensure that NTLG does not have to pay a Deposit and Processing fee.

Section C.3 shows that existing resources (existing DNRs) may be used to serve forecasted load, and in that case the request for service would likely pass a commercial planning assessment. However, a commercial planning assessment (which includes sub grid and the Line and Load Interconnection requirements) would still be required in order to determine any work necessary to maintain reliability and serve the load.

BPA's review of a NITS Customer's LaRC does not verify behind-the-meter resource forecasts submitted by the NITS Customer. BPA is still obligated to plan for all load behind a NITS POD based on the 10-year load and resource forecast.

The NITS Customer Group also does not understand BPA's reluctance to bypass a commercial evaluation for an NTLG that is explicitly tied to a resource that already has an existing firm transmission encumbrance. As noted above, BPA's response states that articulating the ways that customers can apply existing firm transmission encumbrances to an NTLG will "do more harm than good"; but the real harm will actually result from BPA's inability to clearly establish these procedures. For example, if a NITS Customer is deemed to have a 100 MW NTLG, then BPA's proposed business practice would require the creation of a new FTSR for the NTLG. If that customer had a CONFIRMED FTSR or existing DNR of an equal or greater amount and elected to assign that existing firm transmission encumbrance to the NTLG, then BPA will unnecessarily evaluate and potentially study an additional 100 MW for the NTLG FTSR in addition to the CONFIRMED FTSR or existing DNR that has already gone through a commercial evaluation via BPA's Commercial Technical Panel. If BPA were to run the newly created NTLG FTSR through its commercial evaluation process, then BPA may ultimately build unnecessary facilities or over-encumber its transmission system by 100 MW under this example, which would result in undue costs or forgone transmission revenue for all customers.

An acceptable alternative would be for BPA to discuss with the NITS Customer its then current portfolio of CONFIRMED FTSRs, existing DNRs, Behind-The-Meter resources, and PTP service arrangements before defaulting to pushing the customer into the queue for an unnecessary commercial planning evaluation. We strongly encourage BPA to seek planning efficiencies in this manner and revise the NITS BP accordingly.

BPA Response 12

At this point, BPA will not waive the right to evaluate large load increases on its system. The application of existing resources to serve an NTLG is contemplated in the business practice, and if there are sufficient existing resources for the requested load the request for service would likely pass the commercial planning assessment. A commercial planning assessment will still be required to determine if other transmission planning issues need to be addressed.

As has been BPA's historical practice, BPA intends to plan transmission with the NITS Customer collaboratively. When questions arise based on the information provided by the NITS Customer, BPA will reach out to the NITS Customer for clarification.

2. Behind-The-Meter Resources

BPA's comment (Response 7) that Behind-The-Meter (BTM) resources are identified in the generation integration processes and thus will not provide further articulation of how NITS Customers may apply these BTM resources to Network Load is irrelevant, especially given that the proposed Business Practice specifically references BTM resources in Section H.8 for the purpose of specifying requirements for designating Network Resources.

It is understood that BTM resources do not encumber FTSRs, or require TSRs, as the resources do not use the Network. Nevertheless, there is no reason why the LaRC process, including LaRC Close Out Letters, should exclude BTM resources. In fact, excluding BTM resources undermines the assurance that a NITS Customer has adequate resources to serve its Network Load. Further, BPA states that "BPA's review of a NITS Customer's LaRC does not verify behind-the-meter resource forecasts submitted by the NITS Customer" (BPA Response 8). This is factually incorrect — for at least one customer, BPA has analyzed BTM resources via its Commercial Technical Panel, including data exhibits, and included BTM resources in that NITS Customer's LaRC Close Out letter. We urge BPA to continue this practice, and revise the NITS BP accordingly.

Furthermore, in addition to BTM resources, many large loads are beginning to develop the capability to reduce load under certain conditions. We encourage BPA to include consideration of load flexibility as well as BTM generation in the LARC process and in the planning process.

BPA Response 13

BPA's review of a NITS Customer's LaRC does not verify behind-the-meter (BTM) resource forecasts submitted by the NITS Customer. BPA is still obligated to plan for all load behind a NITS POD based on the 10-year load and resource forecast. This ensures BPA can plan the physical transmission grid to support the full load in the event the BTM generator suffers an outage or the NITS Customer can utilize a different resource.

BPA's Rapid Access Products & Interconnection Delivery (RAPID) program is exploring the use of BTM resources. Customers are encouraged to engage in RAPID workshops.

3. Point-To-Point Service and Discrete Points of Delivery

BPA continues to ignore the inherent flexibility that NITS Customers enjoy from being able to use Point-to-Point (PTP) transmission service in addition to Network Resources. As permitted by BPA's Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) (1.60) and consistent with FERC policy, NITS customers may serve load with PTP service which does not involve FTSRs. More specifically, while a NITS Customer may include all load served with Network Resources designated by the customer in the calculation of its "Network Load", a NITS customer may instead "elect to designate less than its total load as Network Load" as long as the non-designated load is "*at discrete points of delivery...*" (emphasis added) and secures PTP transmission service that may be necessary for the non-designated load. In the latter case, the NITS Customer's Network Load is reduced by the non-designated load being served with PTP service.

The proposed business practice (Response 19) (1) does not clearly articulate the ways that NITS Customers may use PTP transmission to serve loads at discrete points of delivery, and (2) erroneously imposes double charges on NITS Customers that choose this arrangement. Thus, we request that BPA revise the NITS BP to ensure consistency with BPA's OATT, and work with NITS Customers to develop a definition for "discrete points of delivery", which addresses the fact that all loads meeting the NTLG definition will be discrete; i.e., separately metered and clearly distinguishable from Network Loads.

BPA Response 14

Thank you for the on-going engagement. BPA will continue to allow the use of PTP service to serve Network Load consistent with its OATT and with FERC policies, but the suggested changes are out of scope for this revision of the NITS Business Practice version 16.

The NITS business practice is not ignoring any flexibility in the combined use of NITS and PTP. The existing language addresses this situation when it is at a common point of delivery. This topic has not been a focus of the Non-Trended Load Growth effort, but we acknowledge that it will only grow in importance to Customers and will consider further clarification to this portion of the business practice in the future.

4. Deficiency Notification Timeline Remains One-Directional

BPA's response (BPA Response 12, Section B.7 of the NITS Customer Group Proposed BP) notes that it declines to commit to notifying customers of LaRC deficiencies within 15 Business Days of receipt of the LARC, stating that the OATT's 15-day period attaches to a completed application and that the LaRC falls outside that provision, and that it will continue working to improve response times.

Although we appreciate the distinction, we disagree with BPA's interpretation. Both sections 30.2 (Designation of New Network Resources) and 31.2 (New Network Loads Connected with the Transmission Provider) of BPA's tariff contemplate that such actions (designating new resources and designating new Network Loads) must be made through a modification of service pursuant to a new Application. Each of these sections also require that the NITS Customer provide BPA with as much advance notice as practicable. Further, section 31.6 (Annual Load and Resource Information Updates) notes that the annual updates of Network Load and Network Resource forecasts must be consistent with those included in its Application.

BPA's NITS Customers provide such advance notice via the LaRC. We therefore maintain that the LaRC contains the forecasted designation of new Network Resources and new Network Loads requiring evaluation by BPA, which constitute a modified service Application that should be processed consistent with section 29.2.

Moreover, BPA itself relies on Section 29.2 as the source of the LaRC information. Invoking a provision for the obligation it imposes on customers, while declining its reciprocal notification timeline, is difficult to explain to our members and regulators.

The practical result is a BP in which every deadline runs against the customer and none runs against BPA. A customer must return the LaRC within a window of not less than 30 Calendar Days; must remedy a LaRC within 10 Business Days; must remedy a Data Exhibit within 5 Business Days; must return an NTLG Facility Evaluation Form within 10 Business Days; must

submit a NITSDNR the same Business Day the TSR is QUEUED; and must remedy NITSDNR deficiencies the same day. BPA's own notification obligations carry no deadline. A customer may wait months, receive a deficiency notice, and have ten days to respond.

BPA's concern that extending cure periods delays evaluation is well taken, and it answers its own point. A customer given timely, particularized notice of deficiency reduces the need for latitude for the customer to respond, and significantly reduces the likelihood of extending the LaRC evaluation period as a whole.

The NITS Customer Group identifies two changes that would address this concern:

- A stated objective in B.7 that BPA will endeavor to notify a NITS Customer of LaRC deficiencies within 15 Business Days of receipt, and that it will notify the customer if it will miss that objective.
- A provision that the customer's cure period begins upon BPA's notice specifying with particularity the information that is deficient, which BPA has already said is its practice.

BPA Response 15

BPA does not accept the proposed changes. BPA has made changes to the FY27 LaRC workbook format that should help facilitate faster evaluations of NITS Customers LaRCs. At this time, it would require significant staffing, automation, and process changes to accommodate the requested timeframe. While BPA appreciates the proposed language, this would also require that BPA create an additional process to notify NITS Customers that there is a delay in processing rather than dedicating staff time to processing the NITS Customer's LaRC.

Section B.7 specifies when the cure period begins and that the NITS Customer will be notified of the information that must be corrected.

5. Documentation of BPA's Intent

The following concerns share a common structure: BPA has explained through its Response to Comments certain intentions with its NITS policies (which we largely accept and support). However, BPA has not specified these provisions within the BP itself. This raises concerns where the passage of time or staff turnover will eventually obscure these underlying intentions. We believe BPA can make significant improvements by documenting in its BP the intentions it included in its responses.

A. The "reasonable discretion" standard for NTLG determinations lacks a procedural hook (Sections E.6.b.iii and C.5; BPA Responses 3, 13, 14, 16)

We appreciate that BPA agreed to change determinations of NTLG from BPA's "sole" to "reasonable" discretion. BPA's response states that NTLG determinations will in most cases be self-evident from the MW amount; that a group of subject matter experts will review the information; that no question on the NTLG Facility Evaluation Form is weighted more heavily than another; that BPA "will continue to provide response letters to NITS Customers detailing the reasons for decisions"; and that the OATT Dispute Resolution Procedures are available to a customer who disagrees.

We accept each of those statements as a description of BPA's intent; however, none of them appears in the BP itself. As drafted, a customer receiving an NTLG determination has no stated entitlement to know which of the Facility Criteria drove it, no identified decisionmaker, and no step between disagreement and formal dispute resolution.

Routing every disagreement to Dispute Resolution, an adversarial and post-hoc mechanism poorly matched to an annual forecast cycle, converts routine forecasting friction into formal disputes that needlessly consume BPA and customer legal and staff resources. Lastly, and most practically: if BPA is in fact going to explain its determinations in Close Out letters, as it says it will, then declining to say so in the BP gains BPA nothing while forfeiting the credibility such commitment would earn.

We therefore suggest the following modifications:

- In Section C.5, provide that BPA's response letter will identify each facility determined to be NTLG and state the basis for the determination, including which Facility Criteria BPA relied upon.
- In Section E.6.b, state that a designated group of BPA subject matter experts makes NTLG determinations, and that BPA will communicate with the customer before making a final NTLG determination.
- Add a defined reconsideration step: within 10 Business Days of a determination, a NITS Customer may request review, which BPA will address through the Transmission Account Executive within 20 Business Days, without prejudice to the OATT Dispute Resolution Procedures.

BPA Response 16

Thank you for the comments and suggestions. At this time BPA does not accept the modifications but has added Section C.6 to address NITS Customer Group's concerns on how they can gain further information on their LaRC evaluation results. BPA relies upon all the factors provided in the NTLG Facility Evaluation form and the LaRC in order to evaluate the need for a commercial planning assessment.

C.6.

NITS Customers can contact their Transmission Account Executive with questions regarding the outcome of their LaRC evaluation.

Per Section C.5.c BPA will provide a list of any identified NTLG facilities and their associated forecasts. The response letter is the notification to the NITS Customer on the results of their LaRC evaluation.

B. The zero-MW baseline continues to lack clarity (Sections E.6.a.iii and O.3; BPA Responses 21, 31, 32)

BPA declined to adopt a carve-out for existing facilities not previously itemized in a LaRC. BPA explains that "[w]hen a NITS Customer submits LaRC information for a Possible New and Growing Load or a NTLG, it is for the forecasted increase that they are requesting, not the total peak for a facility that is already in existence," and that comparing the forecast increase against zero allows accurate identification of NTLG.

However, BPA's explanation and the drafted text describe two different operations. Section E.6.a provides that "[a] comparison is made of each year of the NITS Customer's load forecast to the same year of the load forecast for the prior accepted forecast (the baseline forecast)," which is a forecast-to-forecast comparison. Section E.6.a.iv then provides that where a facility "has not been previously identified in the LaRC, the baseline forecast is assumed to be 0 MW. This provision will not apply to any existing Network Load taking LTF service." Although we appreciate BPA's acknowledgment that existing Network Load should not be identified as NTLG, it is unclear what baseline forecast it will use instead.

The NITS Customer Group therefore requests that BPA provide additional clarification regarding what baseline forecast it will use for existing Network Loads taking LTF service. We continue to recommend a baseline forecast for existing facilities that considers historical operation, for example by metered load history.

BPA Response 17

For New Network Load, this includes new loads or loads expanding at existing facilities, NITS Customers are asked to provide the delta between the current peak usage of a specific load and the forecast peak usage in the Possible New & Growing Load sheet and to update the OATT Load and the MOD31-Load Data sheets of the LaRC workbook to reflect the increase (see Section E.2). The delta between last year's forecast (the baseline forecast) and the current forecast is what BPA will evaluate to determine if there is NTLG (see Section E.6.a). Only the increased amount is considered for the evaluation.

BPA has modified Section E.6.a.iv and added Sections E.6.a.v and E.6.a.v.1 to address concerns as follows:

E.6.a.iv.

If the facility has not been previously identified in the LaRC, the baseline forecast is assumed to be 0 MW. ~~This provision will not apply to any existing Network Load taking LTF service.~~

E.6.a.v.

Increases to existing Network Load taking service are subject to evaluation.

E.6.a.v.i.

Example: An existing industrial facility taking service (considered Network Load) with a peak load at 50 MW is expanding and is forecast to grow to 65 MW in 3 years. The Customer should indicate 15 MW in their LaRC for the respective years that the growth is occurring. BPA only evaluates the 15 MW expansion.

C. Deficiency consequences should be confined to the deficient element (Sections B.7.a and C.2; BPA Responses 10, 11, 29)

BPA declined to delete the language in B.7.a, stating it needs to retain the original language "to make clear what forecast BPA will use if a NITS Customer does not remedy deficiencies in their LaRC" and to preserve a record of the requested change. BPA declined the proposed change to C.2, noting a Data Exhibit may be required to enable review. BPA added language to C.2.b providing that where a Data Exhibit is not timely provided, "the request will receive no further consideration" while "BPA will continue to review the LaRC without the request."

While BPA's addition to C.2.b approaches the right principle, we are unsure what BPA refers to by "without the request" in the context of the LaRC. A LaRC contains many different

components – does BPA’s revised language suggest that it will continue to process the remaining satisfactory loads and resources but omit the single deficient element? Or, as in Section B.7, does BPA intend to not consider the entire LaRC for commercial planning because of a single deficient component?

The example we offered in first-round comments remains unanswered. A forecast of a new non-federal resource that satisfies every information and attestation requirement should not be prohibited from participating in a commercial study due to an unrelated informational deficiency concerning an entirely different resource.

NITS Customer Group therefore requests the following change: conform Section B.7.a to the principle BPA adopted in C.2.b. Specifically, the consequence of an unremedied deficiency will be limited to the discrete deficient load or resource element, with the balance of the LaRC processed as submitted, including in any necessary commercial evaluations.

BPA Response 18

BPA is working to have the appropriate balance of streamlining processes with the NITS Customer’s ability to remedy any deficiencies found in the LaRC.

Based on BPA’s historical experience when NITS Customers do not respond to BPA’s inquiries, BPA needs to have a mechanism in the NITS Business Practice so that BPA can continue to move forward in the transmission planning process.

BPA has modified the originally proposed Section B.7.a and Section C.2.b language to address concerns about a single element impacting the entire LaRC as follows:

B.7.a

If efforts to remedy all identified deficiencies are unsuccessful, ~~the NITS Customer’s LaRC will be processed as identified in Section B.6.~~ BPA will notify the NITS Customer ~~that their LaRC will not be considered for commercial planning evaluation of the elements of the LaRC that will not be considered for commercial planning evaluation or if the Customer’s LaRC will be processed as identified in Section B.6.~~

C.2.b

If a NITS Customer does not provide the NITS Data Exhibit that meets requirements within the required timeframe, ~~the request that element of the forecast~~ will receive no further consideration. BPA will continue to review the LaRC ~~without the request for only those elements of the forecast for which the NITS Customer has provided sufficient information.~~

D. The asymmetric treatment of non-federal resources should be narrowed and its basis stated (Section F.7; BPA Response 26)

In its response, BPA states the NTLG policy is resource neutral, that new resources introduced to the transmission system require commercial analysis regardless of their nature, and that the requirement reflects “the basic requirement to review anything that proposes to add a new incremental flow to the transmission system.” BPA further explains that transmission service for typical load growth served from the FCRPS “is assumed to be planned for through annual system assessments (i.e., Attachment K),” and that enabling integration of non-federal resources was a principal driver of the forecasting process.

BPA's response confirms the asymmetry and leaves it undocumented. Under F.7.b, the same increment of trended load growth receives a different process depending on the resource serving it: served from the FCRPS, it runs on the customer's existing AREF with no new FTSR and is handled through the annual reliability assessment; served from a nonfederal resource, it generates a new or modified FTSR with potential STUDY status and a commercial study process.

BPA's rationale, that a new non-federal resource could introduce incremental flow requiring analysis, has merit in many cases. That rationale supports a targeted trigger. Applied broadly, it loses much of its force: where a customer's non-federal resource presents a POR already modeled, existing transmission rights already modeled, and a MW amount within a previously evaluated envelope, the incremental-flow premise falls away, and the commercial process becomes a procedural cost devoid of analytical purpose.

The NITS Customer Group asked BPA to document the basis for this asymmetry in the BP and to describe limited triggers. BPA supplied a rationale in the Response to Comments while leaving both the rationale and any narrowed trigger out of the text.

NITS Customer Group therefore requests two changes:

- State in F.7 the basis for the differential treatment that BPA articulated in its Response, namely that trended load growth served from the FCRPS is addressed through the annual system assessment process. A stated rationale gives customers something to plan against.
- Limit the STUDY FTSR trigger in F.7.b.i to defined circumstances: a POR not previously modeled or evaluated; existing firm transmission not demonstrated; or a MW amount exceeding a previously evaluated quantity. Where none applies, process the forecast through the reliability assessment as in the federal case.

BPA Response 19

Thank you for highlighting this question.

When a NITS Customer forecasts a non-federal resource, the resource may or may not already be modeled in system assessment planning cases. Further, if firm PTP transmission rights exist from a POR integrating that resource, those rights may continue to exist (even if modified by redirect) unless the firm PTP transmission does not contain rollover rights or the PTP Customer chooses to end that service.

An evaluation of a forecasted NITS non-federal resource allows BPA to discern those two key factors – (1) whether the non-federal resource is modeled (i.e. either is in service or has a plan of service), and (2) whether the resource is already subscribed by other transmission service. Such evaluation therefore serves a key analytical purpose, precisely because the assumptions noted in the statement above are indeed relevant to reliable NITS planning processes but may not be true in a specific instance.

Also, because a NITS Customer forecast of trended load served from the FCRPS does not get a specific FTSR does not mean that a commercial evaluation is not done. BPA PS is required to submit FTSRs (on behalf of all NITS Customers) for incremental resources integrated into the FCRPS. Therefore, all incremental resources serving NITS load are evaluated in a comparable manner.

III. Conclusion

At the end of the day, the NITS Customer Group and BPA desire the same operational outcome: a NITS BP clear enough to administer, and a LaRC process that is once again running after two years. On the specific provisions addressed above, the remaining distance appears to us to be manageable. For many of these issues, BPA has already articulated an intent we can accept. The question is whether that intent appears in the operative text, or whether it is limited to the Response to Comments.

More broadly, and as we stated in the outset, we continue to hold reservations with BPA's provision of NITS. And though we agree with the importance of BPA restarting its evaluation of LaRCs, the NITS Customer Group does not believe that this version of the NITS BP is a suitable long-term framework to ensure efficient, dependable load service. We intend to follow these comments with a separate correspondence describing these reservations in the near future.

Finally, we also support the request made by the Eugene Water & Electric Board in their original comments requesting that BPA consider convening a focused workshop on the final revisions.

We reiterate our appreciation for BPA's decision to extend the comment period and its engagement in response, and thank you for this subsequent opportunity to comment.

BPA Response 20

BPA appreciates its relationship with NITS Customers and is committed to working with them to plan for their increasing transmission needs in a reliable manner and values NITS Customers' commitment to working with BPA to support that mutual goal. The process leading up to this business practice has vastly improved common understanding of transmission planning processes and BPA recognizes that there is need for continued dialogue, but business practices are not intended to house policy rationale.

BPA will of course continue to work to ensure dependable load service for NITS Customers. It must be acknowledged, though, that planning for and providing service to large loads has presented new challenges that may not always merge seamlessly with the provision of NITS.

Due to individual NITS Customer complexities BPA has found that individual Customer meetings often better address Customer concerns rather than workshops. Please contact your transmission Account Executive with specific questions so BPA can make sure that the right subject matter experts are available.

D. Alliance of Western Energy Consumers

Re: Alliance of Western Energy Consumers' Comments regarding Updated Network Integration Transmission Service & related BP Acronyms and Glossary

The Alliance of Western Energy Consumers ("AWEC") appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on Bonneville Power Administration's ("BPA" or "Agency") draft Network Integration Transmission Service ("NITS") Business Practice, including related changes to BP

Acronyms and Glossary, updated on July 22, 2026. AWEC is a trade organization whose members include many of the Region's largest employers and consumers of electricity and natural gas. AWEC's members are responsible for providing tens of thousands of highly paid, technical, family-wage jobs across a broad range of industry sectors such as agriculture, aeronautics, air products, metals, pulp and paper, and more. As such, AWEC's members provide significant economic benefits to the communities in which they are located. AWEC's members are also significant consumers of electricity and include loads designated as Contracted For, Committed To ("CF/CT"), which are incumbent large loads on BPA's system, as well as New Large Single Loads ("NLSLs"). They take service from both public power customers of BPA as well as regulated investor-owned utilities who purchase transmission services from BPA. AWEC members' host utilities take both NITS and Point to Point ("PTP") service products from BPA Transmission. Given the energy-intensive nature of many industrial processes, AWEC members are focused on both costs associated with electricity service, including transmission, and reliability.

1. *AWEC maintains its prior comments to exclude CF/CT loads from Non-Trended Load Growth Facility Determinations.*

As AWEC has stated in prior comments, AWEC continues to support principled, transparent, and legally sound options that allow BPA to begin processing transmission service requests as soon as practicable while ensuring that BPA meets preference customers' statutory rights to delivered power. However, AWEC again renews its position in prior comments that CF/CT loads should be excluded from Non-Trended Load Growth ("NTLG") facility determinations up to historically designated CF/CT amounts. BPA's comments in response argue that CF/CT designations, while offering price protection on the power side, "does not require special treatment or exemption from generally applicable transmission planning processes."¹ As a matter of policy, BPA raises concerns about the amount of CF/CT designated load that could return "with minimum notice and without consideration of the impact to the transmission system threatening system reliability."²

¹BPA's Response to Comments – Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS) version 16 at 2 (July 22, 2026).

²*Id.*

AWEC respectfully disagrees that excluding CF/CT loads results in special treatment from generally applicable transmission planning processes. Effectively, a NTLG-facility determination can only be applicable to two types of loads – returning CF/CT load and New Large Single Loads. As such, there is no "generally applicable" transmission planning process when it comes to facilities forecast to be at or above 13 MW for a NITS customer. As AWEC's comments have previously argued and demonstrated, different treatment for CF/CT loads and NLSLs is warranted.

Additionally, as a practical matter, AWEC questions whether CF/CT designated loads would return with "minimum notice" and "without consideration of the impact to the transmission system threatening system reliability." Before increasing load, CF/CT customers must both engage in internal planning processes and work with their serving utility in order to ensure that service requirements can be met. If BPA's concern is truly about notice, then BPA should work with customers and interested stakeholders to discuss more targeted

approaches to address this concern that do not result in subjecting CF/CT loads to commercial planning.

BPA Response 21

Thank you for your comments and continued engagement. BPA is maintaining its position that there is no exemption from the Non-Trended Load Growth policy for CF/CT loads. While AWECC's points related to the history of CF/CTs are appreciated, it should be acknowledged that BPA is working to adapt to the current environment. This means that in developing NITS policy, BPA must consider the large load forecasts that are now common and cannot use NITS planning processes and the NITS Business Practice to create routes to bypass evaluations BPA deems necessary to maintain reliability.

BPA continues to welcome the exchange of information with NITS Customers to enable it to plan for projected growth. If any AWECC member is anticipating load growth that may be implicated by the Non-Trended Load Growth policy they are encouraged to work with BPA Transmission and Load Forecasting.

2. *NTLG Facility determinations should be made pursuant to objective, transparent criteria.*

AWECC acknowledges the improvement in BPA's language regarding NTLG facility determinations, moving from "sole" discretion to "reasonable" discretion and appreciates the additional detail on how information in the Non-Trended Load Growth Facility Evaluation ("NTLG Facility Evaluation") form will be considered. However, AWECC renews its comments that NTLG determinations must be made pursuant to defined criteria applied consistently among similarly situated customers in a clear and transparent manner. Review of the updated NTLG Facility Evaluation form in conjunction with NITS Business Practice, Section E, do not by themselves provide necessary transparency or clarity. BPA's additional guidance and clarifications should be included in the Business Practice itself.

Furthermore, the NTLG Facility Evaluation also provides that "NITS Customers may be requested at BPA's discretion to submit a NTLG Facility Evaluation form for a facility load increase of less than 13MW, or for a LaRC forecast at a Point of Delivery that exhibits a 13MW or more increase from the previously accepted forecast." AWECC would like to better understand why this information would be required given the limitation of NTLG to a facility determination where load growth is forecast to increase by 13 MW or more, and what impacts this may have to transmission service requests.

AWECC renews its recommendations that the NITS Business Practice should: (1) be amended to more substantively describe how NTLG Facility determinations will be made, including whether that determination will be solely based on the NTLG Evaluation Form, and if so, how that determination will be made, and (2) be amended to include a dispute resolution provision in the event that the NITS Customer has concerns with BPA's determination.

Finally, while AWECC maintains its position that there should be an explicit carve-out for CF/CT loads from NTLG facility determinations as the most streamlined and clear way to address legacy loads that have paid to build the existing transmission system, AWECC has also reviewed the comments submitted by the NITS Customer Group and echoes the concerns raised and supports the recommendations therein.

BPA Response 22

BPA has removed the language below from the Instructions section of the NTLG Facility Evaluation form:

“NITS Customers may be requested at BPA’s discretion to submit a NTLG Facility Evaluation form for a facility load increase of less than 13MW, or for a LaRC forecast at a Point of Delivery that exhibits a 13MW or more increase from the previously accepted forecast.”

BPA relies upon all the factors provided in the NTLG Facility Evaluation form and the LaRC in order to evaluate the need for a commercial planning assessment for NTLG. The NTLG Facility Evaluation form helps ensure equitable treatment of load requests.

It is not common practice for BPA to have a dispute resolution provision that differs from the OATT. BPA has added language to Section C.6 that encourages NITS Customers to contact their Transmission Account Executive with questions regarding the outcome of their LaRC evaluation.

E. Bonneville Power Administration

BPA updated the Non-Trended Load Growth Facility Evaluation form to provide submittal information and made other clarifying changes to the form as described below.

BPA Actions 1

- BPA replaced “TBD” with a form submittal email address
- Section 2.c “...~~as~~ by a single-end use consumer...”
- Section 2.e “...Computational Load Entity Owner or Operator...” to align with NERC
- Section 2.g “...NITS Customer customary retail bill”
- Paragraph one of the Instructions section “...increases ~~load~~ by 13MW”
- Language was removed from the Instructions section of the form that was redundant with the NITS Business Practice

BPA made clarifying and ministerial changes to the NITS Business Practice as described below:

BPA Actions 2

BPA revised Section E.6.b.iii to remove the language “based on information provided in the NTLG Facility form.” BPA would consider other additional information provided by the NITS Customer.

Ministerial changes:

- Changed “a” to “an” in front of all uses of the NTLG acronym where appropriate
- E.6.b.i and ii corrected the title of the referenced form
- E.7 removed the word “a” in front of NTLG
- E.8 added the word “Section” in front of the reference to E.6.a
- F.7.b.i added the word “forecast” as follows: “...for each Non-federal Network Resource forecast requiring...”
- G.1 added a comma in two locations to offset “if applicable”

- G.1.c corrected section title reference to plural “Short-Term and Hourly TSR Processes”
- G.1.c corrected section title reference from “Reservation Timelines” to “TSR Submittal Timelines”
- G.1.d changed “deadline” to “timeline”
- G.2 changed the period at the end of the paragraph to a colon
- H.2.b.iii changed “NT Customer” to “NITS Customer”
- H.2.c.iii changed the word “field” to “fields”
- O.1 deleted the word “the” in front of “V16”
- O.2 changed two FTSR status references from “with a/with” to “in”