



Meeting Notes

Meeting Description: WestConnect Planning Subcommittee Meeting
Meeting Date: March, 14 2017, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. (MDT)
Notes Prepared by: Kathleen Fraser and Brooke Kimball
Approval Status: Draft

1. Introductions – All

A list of meeting attendees is provided in Attachment 1.

2. Review Agenda – Green

The agenda was approved.

3. Review Prior Notes – Green

The March 2, 2017, meeting notes were approved.

The February 14, 2017, meeting notes were approved.

4. Status Update on Dynamic Data Verification – Nail

Colorado entities are currently reviewing the data. It was noted that Energy Strategies intends to use the updated dynamics for power flow (PF) analyses after March 17th.

5. Regional Needs Assessment – Green

Mr. Green distributed the most recent version of the Regional Needs Assessment Report (or “report”) to the PS on March 8th.

On page 7, line 23 of the report, EPE indicated they felt that contingency definitions are confidential, and EPE does not want them posted with the results. It was noted that contingency definitions were posted in the 2015 cycle.

Robin Nuschler reiterated that EPE felt that this information should be treated as confidential, since it was obtained from non-public sources. Mr. Brownlee proposed that

the contingency definitions be housed in a separate location that would require a login, which would only be available to persons having signed the WestConnect NDA. The Planning Subcommittee agreed on this approach and the list of contingencies will be protected by the WestConnect NDA.

It was noted that there is now a place in Appendix C for TOs to add comments and address issues if they wished.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE REGIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT REPORT	
March 22 nd	Comments due
March 24 th	Distribute a redline and clean version of the report to for final comment from the PMC
April 4 th	Comments from the PMC due
April 5 th	Final Regional Needs Assessment Report posted for approval
April 19 th	Present the report to the PMC for approval

6. Interregional Stakeholder Meeting Comment

During the February Interregional Stakeholder meeting, a stakeholder commented that the number of hours of congestion on Mead-Bob are similar between WestConnect and CAISO studies, but the congestion cost is different by about a factor of three. The stakeholder asked why the costs were different, why this issue was not identified in WestConnect, and how it is handled in the interregional process.

NV Energy provided additional information on the issue of congestion on Mead-Bob, which can be found on [slide 8](#). Alex Fratkin clarified that the last bullet on slide 8—which indicates that opening Bob-Eldorado or Bob-Mead lines eliminates the Mead-Bob overload—should not be taken as conclusive. Mr. Fratkin said WestConnect should coordinate with the CAISO and SCE to better understand this issue.

WestConnect and CAISO are currently comparing PCM assumptions to determine the solar capacity by area in California and the curtailment costs of hourly wind, solar, and hydro resources. It is possible CAISO's curtailment cost of hourly wind, solar, and hydro resources is set at a lower value than WestConnect. In addition, CAISO may have made updates to the amount and location of solar resources, and WestConnect lacked the information to update their models accordingly. It is anticipated that a new version of GridView will be made available that will enable flow analysis of Mead-Bob in the WestConnect PCM.

It was noted that once these inputs become available, WestConnect will incorporate them, not to rerun the base case, but to confirm Energy Strategies' hypothesis about the drivers of the congestion.

Mr. Moyer noted that VEA and GridLiance submitted comments on this issue, and these comments will be posted. It was also noted that CAISO is aware of this issue and has

proposed congestion management on the Mead-Bob line on a reliability basis (not economic basis).

7. Scenario Assessments – Brownlee/Comegys

An analysis had been conducted on the scenario cases with the feedback that was submitted by March 9th, and “interim cases” had been created to provide a status update. Mr. Brownlee reviewed the updates that were implemented in the interim cases, noting that Non-WestConnect thermal and hydro dispatch matched well between the February 26th PF Cases and the PCM snapshots, but the PF headroom is nearly 3 times the desired level (see [slide 12](#)). A summary of the contingency analysis results from the March 9th interim cases can be found on [slide 14](#) and the transient stability run observations on [slide 15-26](#).

It was noted that the interim cases had not been posted; however, Mr. Brownlee indicated he would send a cleaned-up version of the spreadsheet showing the high voltage issues.

Mr. Comegys reviewed the transient stability runs conducted (see [slide 17](#)), noting that the results from the runs indicated that they were all stable with no voltage dips or recovery violations. Some participants indicated that they intended to submit additional proposed simulations.

Mr. Green commented that Friday, March 17th was the official deadline to make changes to the reliability case. It was noted that four sets of comments had been received thus far.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE SCENARIO CASES
Finish review of Scenario PF Cases and requested analyses and provide comments by Friday, March 17, 2017.
Post the next version of the Scenario PF Cases and run PF analyses
Compile a list of economic and reliability issues.
Determine which issues constitute regional opportunities

8. Backcast Study

Mr. Moyer reported that work on the backcast study, including data collection, had commenced. Mr. Moyer indicated that a list would be distributed to confirm the contacts at their respective organizations.

Mr. Moyer explained that selecting a study year is one of the initial steps the PS must take in conducting a backcast study. Selecting the year to study is important, because it has implications on which data to collect. A table comparing the various years’ data availability can be found on [slide 30](#). The years from 2014 and beyond are preferable; however, wind data is not readily available. The year 2012 has the best public data availability, but this year is not as recent.

A participant from the transmission developer sector stated his strong preference for use of the highest natural gas price year for the backcast because of his concern of whether GridView would or could dispatch thermal generation properly in a low natural gas price year (sharing his observation that getting the dispatch right in GridView during low natural gas price conditions is especially difficult). Mr. Moyer responded that a countervailing consideration would be that using a low natural gas price year for the backcast would serve to challenge the PCM, so the backcast can successfully reveal problems, including dispatch issues, that need to be addressed.

Mr. Brownlee commented that Peak Reliability is a good source of data; however, data from Peak Reliability would be subject to Peak Reliability's data sharing constraints and only utility members of Peak Reliability would have access to it.

Mr. Moyer commented that the approaches for obtaining data to consider are: (1) WestConnect members provide wind and solar information; (2) Collect Peak Reliability data if possible; (3) Use a combination of Peak Reliability and member-supplied data to enhance the model. Each approach has advantages and disadvantages, and these potential approaches will be further discussed at the PMC meeting.

9. Next Meetings – Green

- April 6, 2017, 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. MDT (Webinar)
- April 18, 2017, 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. MDT (Denver, Tri-State)

10. Action Items

- PS: Provide comments on the PF cases by March 17th.
- PS: Provide comments on the Regional Needs Assessment Report by March 22nd.

11. Adjournment – Green

Mr. Green adjourned the meeting.

Attachment 1: Attendees

First	Last	Affiliation
Gurudatta	Belavadi	AZCC
Ron	Belval	TEP
Cliff	Berthelot	CSU
Zachary	Branum	AZCC
Dan	Brickley	SRP
Ben	Brownlee	Energy Strategies
Gordon	Comegys	Comprehensive Power Solutions
Gerald	Deaver	Xcel Energy
Jose	Diaz	LADWP
Tom	Duane	PNM
Christopher	Duch	LADWP
Eric	East	Black Hills Corp.
Steve	Eckles	EPE
Roberto	Favela	EPE
Chris	Fecke-Stoudt	APS
Kathleen	Fraser	Energy Strategies
Alex	Fratkin	NV Energy
Omar	Gallegos	EPE
Roy	Gearhart	WAPA
Joseph	Gillette	
Tom	Green	Xcel Energy
David	Gutierrez	EPE
Chris	Hagman	ATC
Cynthia	Henry	EPE
Ryan	Hubbard	Tri-State
John	Jontry	SD&E
Katie	Kaplan	Exelon
Brian	Keel	SRP
Kim	Lighthart	NV PUC
Caitlin	Liotiris	Energy Strategies
Dennis	Malone	EPE
Akhil	Mandadi	APS
Jose	Martinez	EPE
Joseph	Meier	Navigant
Keegan	Moyer	Energy Strategies
George	Nail	PNM
Robin	Nuschler	EPE
Heidi	Pacini	PAC Energies
Charlie	Pottery	NV Energy
Brian	Rahman	ZGlobal

First	Last	Affiliation
Jenika	Raub	SRP
John	Reasoner	Tri-State
Michael	Rein	Xcel Energy
Charlie	Reinhold	WestConnect
Phil	Sanchez	TANC
Robert	Smith	TransCanyon
Matthew	Stoltz	BEP
Sirisha	Tanneeru	Xcel Energy
Blane	Taylor	Tri-State
David	Tovar	EPE
Gary	Trent	TEP
Boris	Tumarin	AEPCO
Wes	Wingen	Black Hills
Tom	Wrenbeck	ITC Holdings
Jeff	Wyman	ITC Holdings
Janice	Zewe	SMUD

ADDENDUM

Brooke Kimball

From: Green, Thomas W <Thomas.Green@XCELENERGY.COM>
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2017 5:30 PM
To: Keegan Moyer; Blane Taylor; Charlie Reinhold; Heidi Pacini; Robert Smith
Subject: Fwd: EPE's corrections to March PS and PMC meeting minutes

----- Original message -----

From: Robin Nuschler <fercsolutions@aol.com>
Date: 4/4/17 5:24 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: "Green, Thomas W" <Thomas.Green@XCELENERGY.COM>, bkimball@energystrat.com
Subject: EPE's corrections to March PS and PMC meeting minutes

XCEL ENERGY SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender.

Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether you know the sender. For more information please visit the Phishing page on XpressNET.

Tom and Brooke,

Set forth below are El Paso's corrections to the drafts circulated of the March PS and PMC meeting minutes. Thank you.
- Robin

Minutes of March 14th PS meeting:

Missing from the minutes is the lengthy discussion that took place during the meeting of high natural gas price years vs low natural gas price years, and the issues in GridView of dispatching thermal generation in low natural gas price conditions. One participant from the transmission developer sector (from ATC?) stated his strong preference for use of the highest natural gas price year for the backcast because of his concern of whether GridView would or could dispatch thermal generation properly in a low natural gas price year (sharing his observation that getting the dispatch right in GridView during low natural gas price conditions is especially difficult). Keegan Moyer responded that a countervailing consideration would be that using a low natural gas price year for the backcast would serve to challenge the PCM so that the backcast can successfully reveal problems, including dispatch issues, that need to be addressed.

Minutes of the March 15th PMC meeting:

Delete the word "other" in Section 15 ("best practices in other RTOs/ISO").
WC is not an RTO or ISO.

Robin M. Nuschler, Esq.
P. O. Box 3895
Fairfax, VA 22038-3895
(202) 487-4412

This email is confidential and may be an attorney-client communication, attorney work product or protected by other privileges. If you believe it has been sent to you in error, please reply to sender immediately then delete this email.
Thank you.