Resource Adequacy Technical Committee Meeting
October 20, 2006 – 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
851 SW 6th Ave, Suite 1100
Portland, Oregon
Call in number 1-877-848-1997
Guest Code: 318 (Host: 312)

Agenda

9:30 – 9:45 Introductions & Review of September 22 Meeting Notes

9:45 – 10:00 Outcomes from October 3 Steering Committee Meeting and October 17- 18 Council Meeting

10:00 – 10:30 PNW Resource Adequacy Forum Work Plan

- Concurrent processes mean PNUCC reporting process will probably change over time as Capacity Adequacy Standard finalized and changes made to Energy Adequacy Standard

10:30 – 10:45 **BREAK**

10:45 – 12:00 Discussion regarding revised PNUCC Reporting Process (see Attachment #1: Preliminary List of Questions & Issues)

12:00 – 1:00 **LUNCH**

1:00 – 2:00 Discussion regarding revised PNUCC Reporting Process

2:00 – 2:30 Interim conclusions for PNUCC Reporting Process

2:30 Schedule next meeting

ATTACHMENT #1

PRELIMINARY LIST OF QUESTIONS & ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION:

1. How should sustained hydro peaking capacity be defined? In previous meetings, the FCRPS sustained hydro peaking capacity was assumed to be the minimum sustained peaking capacity over the 50 hour duration. This assumption assures that the system is operated to maximize capability without much output deviation over the entire duration. Should it be the aMW over the 50 hour duration? It is assumed that purchases can be made during hours outside the 50 hour duration, but not during the 50 hours. These purchases help meet "shoulder" load obligations; should purchases be further limited?

2. Should BPA report the entire FCRPS generation and sustained hydro peaking capacity for summer and winter? Or should BPA just report on the share of FCRPS generation/sustained peaking capacity used to meet the load of BPA's non-slice customers? Or just that part of FCRPS generation/sustained peaking capacity used to meet the load of the full-requirements customers?

3. How should wind be reported? In the regional sustained peaking analysis, wind was counted at a 15% capacity factor. The energy calculation used wind generation based on historical average generation. Should each utility estimate their wind resources (energy and capacity) based on their particular wind regime, or should there be some agreed-upon approach?

4. How should thermal resources be reported? Are there environmental constraints such as air-quality permits that limit the annual energy from thermal generation? Currently, the assumption for the capacity analysis is that thermal generation is available at full capacity over the 50-hour sustained duration. Should thermal generation be derated in the summer analysis to account for decreased operational efficiencies during high temperatures? Should its ratings be increased in the winter analysis to account for increased operational efficiencies?

5. How should contracts be reported? What constitutes a firm contract? Does it have to be multi-year contract, or just firm during the year, delivered over firm transmission? Should Schedule C and/or other contracts from non-specific resources be reported?

6. Is there a common methodology for estimating expected, or 1 in 2 loads?