

## ACS Practices Forum – Summary Meeting Notes

February 5, 2013

Meeting was held in the Umatilla Room at the PDX Airport Conference Center. Overall, robust discussions were had among in-person and online attendees. BPA emphasized that all the discussions are predecisional and were meant to establish a frank and productive dialogue. The following topics were addressed:

### **Committed Scheduling BP**

BPA Staff reviewed the Committed Scheduling business practice working document. Henry Tilghman voiced concern over being unable to detect BPA's completion level and support for portions of the working business practice. BPA staff responded that although some sections in the business practice were still being analyzed internally staff valued the stakeholder discussion to help inform the outcome.

Other concerns raised by customers concerned the scheduling accuracy and the provision that after two unwaived notices during the rate period, parties would be required to use automated scheduling. Parties stated that two unwaived notices over the full rate period seemed too restrictive and may cause parties to not try for a forecast better than persistence. Parties asked that BPA consider relaxing the number of "strikes". BPA staff explained how strikes were more generally considered and assigned to broad periods of failing to meet targets rather than incurring a strike for each miss. Furthermore, BPA assured customers that it employs a reasonable and sensitive waiver plan to address disagreements over identified failures.

Snohomish and PGE both expressed that they are under the current Intra-hour scheduling and that meeting the metrics in the BP is not difficult, and that BPA has been good to work with in granting waivers.

There was also customer concern expressed over moving parties to automatic scheduling or a higher level of committed scheduling. The parties asked if there was any way to demonstrate the ability to comply and get back to the lower committed scheduling. BPA staff responded that we do allow a similar demonstration in the DSO 216, and that we would take a look at the issue.

This discussion also included a debate over the importance of examining ramp rates as a metric. BPA Staff agreed to look into this.

### **Self-supply**

BPA Staff presented BPA's current thinking on self-supply. Customer posed a number of questions about timing of obtaining this service. Although varying upon a number of factors, including the customer readiness to deploy resources, BPA staff estimates that setting up a new self-supply customer would take four to six months. And, setting up a non-Federal resource would take somewhat longer.

There were also questions about customer's ability to self supply all Types of acquisitions, which further led to a discussion on ESS.

There is an outstanding question posed by Jeff (SCE) concerning load self-supply and why they can only supply the regulation and frequency response?

### **Dynamic Transfer**

BPA Staff presented the current BPA thinking on Dynamic Transfer. This turned out to be a relatively brief discussion that emphasized timing and process. BPA Staff clarified some aspects of how DTC supports the balancing efforts and what aspects of its services offered require DTC.

There is uncertainty and concern over when parties need to make elections and when they need to request DTC. BPA communicated that if a customer is thinking about taking one of the services that would need DTC to support it, or if they plan to Dynamically Transferring out of the BA that is important to let BPA know before 4/1/13 in order to facilitate the request. BPA informed customers that it is unnecessary to revise the current Dynamic Transfer business practices.

### **Tokens**

BPA Staff continued the previous discussions on the subject of tokens. In follow-up to the last ACS Forum where the group discussed the NWPP Token process and the pending vote, an update on how BPA voted was given.

Further discussion clarified the need for some mechanism for wind generators interconnected to BPA's BA to inform all parties via e-tags about the balancing product characteristics. BPA indicated that BPA staff is interested in the use of Tokens to help provide the visibility needed. BPA staff asked if there were other methods that the parties would prefer instead of the use of Tokens? Parties did not have any suggestions.

Jeffrey Nelson (SCE) was very supportive of the use of Tokens and wished to better understand why the region wasn't demanding it. PGE said from the operation side they would probably like the token use, but the marketing side might have an issue with it.

Raj from Powerex (on the phone) wanted to reduce the understanding of tokens to be simply used to identify "interruptability" and to inform users as to whether reserves are required by the sink BA. As the chair of the Power Pool task force he invited a formal BPA proposal on the matter. It was said that it is possible to have a Power Pool token along with additional tokens from BPA. Further legal analysis is required on this matter.

Lastly, some meeting participants believed that subject of tokens did not need to be placed on the next meeting's agenda. Action – It will not be on the next agenda.

### **Customer Elections**

BPA Staff presented a review of changes to the prospective Elections business practice. Misunderstandings about the second election date were clarified. Many meeting participants did not want to move the election date away from July 1; they requested the BPA deliverables earlier. BPA responded that BPA will need to determine whether that time line was achievable - i.e. defining Full service and ESS by June 1.

A discussion also took place on whether customers should be asked to elect on April 1, if they would (commit to) changing to a more exacting level of scheduling for the second half of the rate period (i.e. move to 30/15). Parties do not want to have to make the decision April 1 regarding a service that they know little about. They would like a mid-rate period reelection of the level of scheduling. There was some discussion on cost recovery if BPA allows a mid-rate period reelection of level of scheduling- without discussing Rate Case-related issues.

Customer's asked for a mid period "opener" (either a mid period election or pilot) for 15' scheduling. BPA needs to determine will we 1) offer committed 15 min, 2) allow mid-rate period reelection, 3) make parties elect April 1, or 4) make an estimate of 15 min. usage and reflect that estimate in the rate calculation.

**Firming up part of Base Service**

BPA had committed to discuss this topic in its Initial Proposal. Stakeholders did not wish to address this in the ACS Forum. (Most felt that the BOATT discussion was sufficient to show that it would not work).

**March 1, 2013 Deliverables**

Parties express that the highest priorities to them in making their April 1 elections is –

- First an understanding of the CIH BP, and
- Second understanding the Type 1 and 2 purchases and how they will be dispatched.

**Action Items/Next Steps**

- Prepare for ACS discussion on the use of the parties Wind Forecast in the CIH program
- Prepare for deeper discussion on Type I & Type II acquisitions
  - Philosophy and mechanism
  - Considerations among energy versus capacity
  - Pre-qualifications and award
  - Dispatch
  - Other