



## Common Queue for Long-term TSRs *Proposed Approach*

February 24, 2009

### GOALS / OBJECTIVES

- Facilitate PEFA compliance by identifying TSRs that result in Requested Service Projects prior to:
  - i. The issuance of a System Impact Study Agreement, or
  - ii. The beginning of a Cluster Study under BPA's Network Open Season (NOS).
- Once identified, the involved PEFA Transmission Providers (TPs) become obligated to complete their portion of the study within the same timeframe that the host TP is obligated under its OATT. This obligation or acceptance of a quasi *Common Date Stamp* by the involved TP (Affected Party) could be accomplished through:
  - a) the Affected Party agreeing to become a signatory to a joint SIS or Cluster Study, or
  - b) through having its OASIS queue re-stacked to include the host TP's TSR.  
*[Re-stacking the queue would require a tariff amendment]*

*(Note: TPs who are non-signatories to the OASIS Functional Agreement (e.g., NTTG members) would be formally notified and asked to participate in the study, but would not be obligated under the aforementioned procedure.)*

- Impacts are addressed concurrently on respective systems and reported within one comprehensive study that will shorten the overall timeframe that would otherwise be encountered if the studies were conducted one after another in a serial fashion.
- Daisy-chain requests (related project TSRs that cross one TP and continue on another, including over an Intertie) are identified; the respective studies on each TP's system are coordinated with the Transmission Customer (TC). *(need to further define ColumbiaGrid's role, especially the opportunity to coordinate requests over co-owned Interties)*
- Additional workload or cost to the host TP is minimal or in-fact lessened by the upfront collaborative process; the host TP's ability to meet its OATT timeline is not impaired.
- TPs seek ColumbiaGrid' assistance in *next steps* (e.g., WECC's Rating Process) as long as the TC decides to remain in queue.

### PRIMARY PROCESS STEPS FOR ACCOMPLISHING THE ABOVE

- ColumbiaGrid's OASIS is updated with the functionality to simultaneously receive TSRs (and status changes) submitted to OASIS Parties. This combined or aggregated *real-time*

queue serves as a platform for addressing potential Request Service Project requests and for identifying daisy-chain requests. *(Determine whether the TSRs sent to ColumbiaGrid's OASIS are available for public view or only for OASIS Parties to view)*

- OASIS Parties adopt business practice informing TC that its requests will be shared with ColumbiaGrid for the purpose of identifying and studying Requested Service Project requests.
- Using system model data and established criteria, ColumbiaGrid runs an initial analysis (Requested Service Assessment) to confirm which TSRs have potential multi-system impacts.
- OASIS Party representatives (from Transmission Services and/or Planning) agree to participate in periodic (twice per month or as needed) phone conferences hosted by ColumbiaGrid to discuss requests in queue and to confirm Requested Service Project requests.
- ColumbiaGrid facilitates the issuance of a joint System Impact Study Agreement among the host TP and involved TPs.
- Pursuant to the PEFA, ColumbiaGrid leads Requested Service Project Study Teams; a process continuing as long as the TSR remains in *Study* status in the host TP's queue.

## CONTRACT LANGUAGE SUPPORTING ABOVE PROCESS

### Planning and Expansion Functional Agreement (PEFA):

#### **Appendix A, section 6.2 - Requested Service Assessment; Formation of Study Teams**

*When a TOPP has a completed transmission service application, determines that it does not have sufficient capacity to serve such request and reasonably believes that the requested service may impact a transmission system other than that of such TOPP, and the customer has indicated to the TOPP that it wants to pursue further study, such TOPP shall notify ColumbiaGrid that it has a request for a study. ColumbiaGrid shall perform a Requested Service Assessment to determine which transmission systems, including those of non-Planning Parties, are affected.*

#### **Definitions:**

**Section 1.1 "Affected Persons"** *with respect to a Project means those Planning Parties and Persons that would bear Material Adverse Impacts from such Project or are otherwise materially affected by such Project.*

**Section 1.23 "Material Adverse Impacts"** *with respect to a Project means a reduction of transmission capacity on a transmission system (or other adverse impact on such transmission system that is generally considered in transmission planning in the Western Interconnection) due to such Project that is material, that would result from a Project, and that is unacceptable to the Person that owns or operates such transmission system. For purposes of this Agreement,*

*Material Adverse Impacts of a Project are considered mitigated if there would not be any Material Adverse Impacts due to such Project.*

**Section 1.49 “Requested Service Assessment”** means, with respect to a request to a TOPP for study related to a transmission service or interconnection, an assessment of the effect of such request on such TOPP’s Transmission System and on other transmission systems.

**Section 1.50 “Requested Service Project”** means any modification of the Regional Interconnected Systems that

- i. is for the purpose of providing service pursuant to a transmission service or interconnection request made to a TOPP; and
- ii. involves more than one Transmission System.

### **OASIS Functional Agreement dated April 1, 2008:**

#### **Section 1.6 – Common Queues for Interconnection Requests and Transmission Service Requests**

*Beginning in 2008, ColumbiaGrid shall work with the OASIS Parties in a process to develop methodologies for a Common Interconnection Service Request Queue and a Common Transmission Service Request Queue to recommend to the OASIS Transmission Providers. The Parties shall endeavor to implement such Common Interconnection Service Request Queue and Common Transmission Service Request Queue methodologies within two years from the Effective Date. The Parties may implement the Common Interconnection Service Request Queue and Common Transmission Service Request Queue methodologies under a separate functional agreement(s) or amendment(s) to this Agreement. The Parties recognize that implementation of such common queue methodologies will probably require modification of the OATTs of the OASIS Transmission Providers.*

### **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM / BENEFITS TO ADOPTING ABOVE PROCESS**

System Impact Studies are typically completed by the host TP prior to the host TP sharing study results with potentially impacted adjacent TPs (Affected Parties). This results in the Affected Party issuing a new System Impact Study with the TC, thereby prolonging the study process. The TSR remains in the host TP’s queue or the host TP refuses to accept schedules from the TC until impacts are mitigated on Affected Party systems.

The primary benefit of adopting the above process accrues to the TC through receiving a faster, more efficient, and likely more comprehensive response to its TSR. Joint study costs should be less than if the studies were performed serially and independently. TPs benefit also. Their work product should be more comprehensive and accurate as studies would be processed collaboratively and any findings discussed when fresh in the minds of planners performing the work. In the long run, TSRs would ‘clear’ the queue faster and TPs would be better situated to meet OATT timelines and queue reform initiatives; or at least establish a better line of communication with the TCs and regulators on why certain studies may necessitate an extension of time to complete.