# Public Feedback on ATC Calculation Proposed Changes & Alternatives

Transmission Load Service Workshop

February 8, 2016

# Summary Feedback from Questionnaire 1 (Nov 20-Dec 4, 2015)

| Question | Mike Raschio | PSE | WPAG | NWCPUD | PNGC | Flathead | SNOPUD | SCL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Should BPA continue to use 1-in-2 NCP load forecasts? | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No concerns | Yes | No response |
| 2. Which assumption for wind? | 60% or 100% of contract demand | Other, capacity factor of each plant | Historical peaks, capped by contract demand | 100% of contract demand | 100% of contract demand | 100% of contract demand | Historical peaks, capped by contract demand | No response |
| 3. Which assumption for other non-Federal resources? | Lower of contract demand or historical peaks | Contract demand, capped by nameplate | Lower of contract demand or historical peaks | Lower of contract demand or historical peaks | No response | Contract demand | Historical peaks, capped by contract demand for resources operating for greater than 5 yrs; for others, model contract demand | No response |
| 4. Should BPA expand the FCRPS scenarios? | Yes, using adjusted nameplate | Yes, using historical peak | No response | Yes, using historical output coordinated with hydraulic constraints | Yes, using adjusted nameplate | No concerns | Yes, but only so long as such efforts produce meaningful results | No response |
| 5. How to balance the study? | Pro rata | Merit order | Pro rata | Other, don't know what to do now but would be ideal to use more realistic inputs | Pro rata | Pro rata | Not enough info | No response |
| 6. Is applying regional average load growth to ETC sufficient? | Yes | No, should model each county separately | Yes | No, should model large "spot" load growth individually and use the proposed method everywhere else | No, should model large "spot" load growth individually and use the proposed method everywhere else | Yes | Not enough info | No response |
| 7. How to determine uncertainty margin? | Percentage of TTC or difference between posted and highest ETC values | Other, use only MOD-008 compliant calculations | No response | Other, TRM already in TTC is sufficient | No response | Percentage of difference actual flows and ETC values | Other, use a margin reflective of errors in generation and load forecasts | No response |
| 8. What data would you like to see? | Output of test cases, based on 2017 ATC base case | No response | Magnitude of differences between various load forecasts | ATC results that send clear signals to the market | No response | Appreciate the detail released to date | See above | Outputs of powerflow studies with the various inputs proposed, reviewed w/ customers in a workshop |



Pre-decisional. For Discussion Purposes Only.

# Summary Feedback from Questionnaire 2 (Jan 20-Feb 3, 2016)

| Question | Mike Raschio | PSE | WPAG | NRU | PNGC | PGE | SNOPUD | Iberdrola |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How to model wind? | Contract or designated demand, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at 60% of nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at nameplate | High output | Historical peaks, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at nameplate |
| 2. How to model non-wind? | Historical peaks, capped at conract or designated demand | Contract demand, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at lower of nameplate or historical peak | Contract or designated demand, capped at lower of nameplate or historical peak | Contract or designated demand, capped at lower of nameplate or historical peak | N/A | Historical peaks, capped by contract demand for resources operating for greater than 5 yrs; for others, model contract demand, capped at nameplate | Contract or designated demand, capped at lower of nameplate or historical peak |
| 3. FCRPS at historical, adjusted nameplate, or nameplate? | Historical peak | Nameplate | N/A | Adjusted nameplate | Adjusted nameplate | N/A | Historical data post 2007, but only so long as such efforts produce meaningful results, and should take into account Oversupply | Should use an expanded range of FCRPS assumptions |
| 4. How to balance the Base Case? | Pro rata | Pro rata | Pro rata | Pro rata | Pro rata | More data needed to compare the results | Pro rata, shifted seasonaly | Pro rata |
| 5. How to select ETC from the range produced via scenarios? | Highest or or median | Median | N/A | Median | Median | Median | Highest, but should be informed by the probability of the events | Median |
| 6. Regional load growth rate applied to ETC? | Yes | Yes, but reevaluate as needed | Yes | Yes, but this should be revisited to accommodate large spot loads | Yes, with some consideration for large spot load growth | More data needed to compare the results | Yes, but should be reevaluated annually | Yes |
| 7. Difference between highest ETC and selected ETC = margin? | Yes | No, use MOD-008 | Yes | N/A | Yes | More data needed to compare the results | Yes, but should be informed by the probability of the events | Yes |
| 8. Release margin only as non-firm until a better process can be defined? | No, release as firm on a rolling four month basis | No, release in the STF markets | Too early to opine | No, release in the weekly STF market | No, release in the daily, weekly STF markets | No, release in the STF markets | Yes | Yes |
| 9. Encumber for NT resources using PTDFs? | Yes | More info needed | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes |



Pre-decisional. For Discussion Purposes Only.

# Thank You!

Your participation and feedback on this process are greatly appreciated!



Pre-decisional. For Discussion Purposes Only.

# Timeline for LT ATC Changes

- February – March 2016: decision(s) for these ATC changes
- March – April 2016: workshop to announce decision(s) & updated ATC Methodology documents posted for written comment period
- May – June 2016: updated ATC Methodology documents finalized
- July – August 2016: ATC process changes incorporated into LT Base Case Update



Pre-decisional. For Discussion Purposes Only.