

Long Term Competition BPA Assignment for the July NAESB OS Meeting

Mike Norris/Rebecca Berdahl

Customer Workshop July 16th, 2014

From the NAESB OS June 2014 meeting, BPA took on the following tasks and drafted new language in the Long Term Competition (LT C) Straw Man to address the comments we received. The sections that have been modified in the Straw Man are noted below in the green font.

- 1) Create a revised LT C Straw Man that addresses:
 - a. Need to include language that protects the Defender from having capacity recalled until the Challenger has confirmed its reservation. **(001-mn.1.4, 001-mn.1.5)**
 - b. Needs to include language that is used by the TP in **the** determination of a valid Challenger (modification to existing section 'Challenger Criteria') **001.mn.1.5**
 - c. Language that protects displacing a 100MW Defender by a 1 MW Challenger (modification to existing section, 'Challenger Criteria') **001.m n.1.6**
 - d. Replace specific timing requirements with reference to Table 4.2 **(001-mn.6.1.1 and replaced sections of the documents that referred to 'timing requirements' to timing associated with Challenger actions)**
 - e. Acknowledge that although the tariff is silent on capacity, there needs to be some criteria around 1) don't take capacity away from the Defender and the Challenger walks away and 2) how to treat the capacity issues associated with:
 - i. If the Defender has less capacity than the Challenger (how to treat the Challenger, e.g., partial service vs. full service) **001-mn.1.6**
 - ii. If the Defender has more capacity than the Challenger (how to treat the Defender) **001-mn.1.6**
 - f. Gap Issue - Start Date issue _ In order to be a Challenger the Challenger's start date must be on or before the Defender's end date – BPs must add criteria that an overlap of service is necessary to avoid the gap issue. **001-mn.4.5**
 - i. Align the Straw Man language to be consistent with a standard Business Practice level (i.e., not implementation guide level) **completed**
 - g. How a TP handles a potential LT Challenger/Defender if that Challenger/Defender is already involved in a SIS, NOS, etc... yet is still in a pending status. Key Issue: If a Long Term Reservation is engaged or has agreed to a Facility/Cluster/System Impact/Network Open Season Study should the TP exclude them from the Long Term Competition process? (BPA will argue that they should be excluded) **001-mn.1.4 and 001-mn.1.5 in combination probably cover this from a Challenger viewpoint – 'Key Issue' does not apply to the Renewal Request (e.g., Defender) as it will never be involved in the system impact study process**
- 2) Conduct industry wide webinar(s) for the interested OS stakeholders **completed**