

Stakeholder Comments Template

Transmission Access Charge Options

September 30, 2016 Second Revised Straw Proposal

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
<i>Robert Kahn Henry Tilghman</i>	<i>NIPPC</i>	<i>10/28/16</i>

The ISO provides this template for submission of stakeholder comments on the September 30, 2016 second revised straw proposal. The second revised straw proposal, presentations and other information related to this initiative may be found at: <http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/TransmissionAccessChargeOptions.aspx>

Upon completion of this template please submit it to initiativecomments@caiso.com. Submissions are requested by close of business on **October 28, 2016**.

Second Revised Straw Proposal

1. The ISO previously proposed to allow a new PTO that is embedded within or electrically integrated with an existing sub-region to have a one-time choice to join that sub-region or become a separate sub-region. The ISO now proposes that an embedded or electrically integrated new PTO will become part of the relevant sub-region and will not have the choice to become a separate sub-region. This means that the new embedded/integrated PTO's transmission revenue requirements will be combined with those of the rest of its sub-region and its internal load will pay the same sub-regional TAC rate as the rest of the sub-region. Please comment on this element of the proposal.

NIPPC has no comment.

2. An embedded PTO is defined as one that cannot import sufficient power into its service territory to meet its load without relying on the system of the existing sub-region. Whether a new PTO is considered electrically integrated will be determined by a case-by-

case basis, subject to Board approval, based on criteria specified in the tariff. Please comment on these provisions of the proposal.

NIPPC has no comment.

3. The proposal defines “new facilities” as transmission projects planned and approved in an expanded TPP for the expanded ISO BAA. The integrated TPP will begin in the first full calendar year that the first new PTO is fully integrated into expanded ISO BAA. Projects that are under review as potential “inter-regional” projects prior to the new PTO joining may be considered as “new” if they meet needs identified in the integrated TPP. Please comment on these provisions.

NIPPC supports the proposal to the extent it is defined. NIPPC notes that the proposal defers much of the detail related to allocation of the costs of transmission expansion to other stakeholder processes, including the parallel governance process and a future Western States Committee. While NIPPC does not object to the decision to defer development of additional details of the proposal, NIPPC does note the challenge of supporting a portion of an integrated process while other portions are still relatively undefined.

4. The ISO previously defined “existing facilities” as transmission assets planned in each entity’s own planning process for its own service area or planning region, and that are in service, or have either begun construction or have committed funding to construct. The ISO is now simplifying the proposal to define “existing facilities” as all those placed under operation control of the expanded ISO that are not “new.” Please comment on the ISO’s proposed new definition of “existing facilities.”

NIPPC supports the proposal.

5. Consistent with the previous revised straw proposal, the ISO proposes to recover the costs of existing facilities through sub-regional “license plate” TAC rates. The ISO has proposed that each sub-region’s existing facilities comprise “legacy” facilities for which subsequent new sub-regions have no cost responsibility. Please comment on this aspect of the proposal.

NIPPC supports the proposal.

6. The ISO proposes to use the Transmission Economic Assessment Methodology (TEAM) to determine economic benefits of certain new facilities to the expanded ISO region as a whole and to each sub-region. Please comment on these uses of the TEAM.

NIPPC has no comment on the decision to use the TEAM for determining economic benefits.

7. For a reliability project that is narrowly specified as the more efficient or cost-effective solution to a reliability need within a sub-region, and has not been expanded or enhanced in any way to achieve additional benefits, the ISO proposes to allocate the project cost entirely to the sub-region with the driving reliability need, regardless of any incidental benefits that may accrue to other sub-regions. Please comment on this provision.

NIPPC supports the proposed default provisions for allocation of the costs of expanded transmission facilities. NIPPC recognizes that the default provisions would apply only in the event that the proposed Western States Committee did not approve an alternative cost allocation for specific project. NIPPC looks forward to continued detailed development of the role of the Western States Committee and its decision making processes.

8. For a policy-driven project that is connected entirely within the same sub-region in which the policy driver originated, the ISO proposes to allocate the project cost entirely to the sub-region with the driving policy need, regardless of any incidental benefits that may accrue to other sub-regions. Please comment on this provision

NIPPC supports the proposed default provisions for allocation of the costs of expanded transmission facilities. NIPPC recognizes that the default provisions would apply only in the event that the proposed Western States Committee did not approve an alternative cost allocation for specific project. NIPPC looks forward to continued detailed development of the role of the Western States Committee and its decision making processes.

9. For a purely economic project with benefit-cost ratio (BCR) > 1, cost shares will be allocated to sub-regions in proportion to their benefits, and because BCR > 1 this completely covers the costs. A purely economic project is one that is selected on the basis of the TPP economic studies following the selection of reliability and policy projects, and is a distinct new project, not an enhancement of a previously selected reliability or policy project.

NIPPC supports the proposed default provisions for allocation of the costs of expanded transmission facilities. NIPPC recognizes that the default provisions would apply only in the event that the proposed Western States Committee did not approve an alternative cost allocation for specific project. NIPPC looks forward to continued detailed development of the role of the Western States Committee and its decision making processes.

10. For an economic project that results from modifying a reliability or policy-driven project to obtain economic benefits greater than incremental project cost, the ISO proposes to first, allocate avoided cost of original reliability or policy-driven project to the relevant sub-region, then allocate incremental project cost to sub-regions in proportion to their economic benefits determined by TEAM. This is called the “driver first” approach to cost allocation. The proposal also illustrated an alternative “total benefits” approach. Please comment on your preferences for either of these approaches.

NIPPC supports the proposed default provisions for allocation of the costs of expanded transmission facilities. NIPPC recognizes that the default provisions would apply only in the event that the proposed Western States Committee did not approve an alternative cost allocation for specific project. NIPPC looks forward to continued detailed development of the role of the Western States Committee and its decision making processes.

11. The proposal outlined two scenarios for policy-driven projects involving more than one sub-region. In scenario 1, where a project built within one sub-region meets the policy needs of another sub-region, costs would be allocated to sub-regions up to the amount of their economic benefits (per TEAM) and the remaining costs would be allocated to the sub-region that was the policy-driver. Please comment on this cost allocation approach for scenario 1.

NIPPC has no comment.

12. In scenario 2, where a policy project meets the policy needs of more than one sub-region, costs would be allocated to sub-regions up to the amount of their economic benefits (per TEAM) and the remaining costs would be allocated to the relevant sub-regions in proportion to their internal load for project in-service year. Please comment on this cost allocation approach for scenario 2.

NIPPC has no comment.

13. Competitive solicitation to select the entity to build and own a new transmission project would apply to all new transmission projects rated 200 kV or greater, of any category, regardless of whether their costs are allocated to only one or more than one sub-region, with exceptions only for upgrades to existing facilities as stated in ISO tariff section 24.5.1. Please comment on this proposal.

NIPPC supports competitive solicitation for transmission projects.

14. The ISO proposes to drop the earlier proposal to recalculate benefit and cost shares for sub-regions and the proposal to allocate cost shares to a new PTO for a new facility that was planned and approved through the integrated TPP but before that new PTO joined the expanded ISO. Please comment on the elimination of these proposal elements.

NIPPC supports the decision to abandon the proposed recalculation of benefit and cost shares of sub-regions when new transmission projects come on line. Eliminating the proposed recalculation mechanism should provide greater cost certainty for parties considering joining an expanded regional energy market.

15. The ISO proposes to establish a single region-wide export rate (“export access charge” or EAC) for the expanded region, defined as the load-weighted average of the sub-regional TAC rates. Please comment on this proposal.

NIPPC supports the proposal for a single region-wide export rate.

16. Under the EAC proposal, non-PTO entities within a sub-region would pay the same sub-regional TAC rate paid by other loads in the same sub-region, rather than the wheeling access charge (WAC) they pay today. Please comment on this proposal.

NIPPC has no comments on this portion of the proposal.

17. The ISO proposes to allocate EAC revenues to each sub-region in proportion to their transmission revenue requirements. In the August 11 working group meeting the ISO presented the idea of allocating EAC revenues to each sub-region in proportion to its quantity of exports times its sub-regional TAC rate. Please comment on these two approaches for EAC revenue allocation, and suggest other approaches you think would be better and explain why.

NIPPC has no comment on this portion of the proposal.

18. Please provide any additional comments on topics that were not covered in the questions above.

As noted above, NIPPC supports elements of the Second Revised Straw Proposal on Transmission Access Charge Options.

NIPPC also recognizes that the proposed Western States Committee will play a significant role determining the allocation of costs of new transmission facilities. NIPPC looks forward to continued detailed development of the role of the Western States Committee and its decision making processes.