ColumbiaGrid
Elements for Planning and Expansion Functional Agreement[1]

Planning Process[2]

1. Goal

Facilitate appropriate expansion of the regional transmission system in a timely and equitable basis that meets regulatory requirements.

2. Overview

ColumbiaGrid will develop a comprehensive regional Biennial Transmission Plan (the Plan) that is in the best interest of the region. The Plan will be developed through an open, public, "single-utility" planning process, where staff provides leadership and coordination of study effort among Transmission Owner Planning Participants (TOPPs) and stakeholders. The planning process will identify preferred solutions and will seek voluntary agreement for sponsors and allocation of costs and benefits. The ColumbiaGrid Board (Board) will provide policy guidance to the Staff, and formally approve the biennial Plan. The Plan is a living document that should be expected to change over time as circumstances change and additional information is found.

ColumbiaGrid will be the independent third party for resolution of, but not limited to, disagreements on plan of service, cost allocation, sponsorship, transmission capacity rights allocation and schedule for needed projects. In cases where TOPPs cannot reach agreement, ColumbiaGrid will provide, via FERC a back-stop or forcing function for projects related to reliability and firm service obligations. Projects not related to reliability or firm service obligations can move forward through the ColumbiaGrid process by seeking sponsorship and participant cooperation through open processes.

3. Planning Methodology

3.1. **Single-utility planning concept**

3.1.1. System additions will be planned as if a single utility owned all relevant generating, transmission, and distribution facilities. This approach will

[1] At some point, a decision will be needed on whether ColumbiaGrid will assume any responsibilities regarding the NERC Functional Model. One concern of doing this is whether or not it would trigger FERC jurisdiction for ColumbiaGrid. Also, if ColumbiaGrid applies to be a Transmission Planner and Planning Authority, does that entail any compliance obligations? For now the assumption is that the obligation stays with the TOPPs.

[2] This description will ultimately be used by the Legal Drafting Team as the basis of the Planning and Expansion Functional Agreement. This draft relates only to planning section of the agreement.

maximize system efficiency and minimize duplication of facilities, environmental impacts, and costs.

3.2. Planning Criteria

3.2.1. The CG planning criteria will consist of:

3.2.1.1. The approved ERO/RRO Planning Standards, will be the minimum planning criteria,

3.2.1.2.Any common reliability criteria, Transmission Adequacy Criteria and/or guidelines that are developed and approved by the TOPPs.

3.2.1.3.Each TOPPS existing planning criteria applied to its own system.

3.2.2. ColumbiaGrid staff may participate in the development of regional and sub-regional planning standards.

3.3. Scope

3.3.1. The Planning Horizon is 10 years

3.3.2. The planning process is intended to meet the needs of the participants' systems.

3.3.2.1.All Transmission facilities are modeled and studied and are available for possible solutions to problems.[3]

3.3.2.2.Each TOPP is responsible for the planning necessary for its local load service.

3.3.3. Planning Frequency

3.3.3.1.System assessment will be performed at least annually

3.3.3.2.The Plan is produced at least biennially

3.3.3.2.1. The Board may approve more frequent updates for Plan

3.3.4. Both transmission and non-transmission solutions will be considered

3.3.4.1.Problem/Need statements should note the areas where non-transmission solutions are viable

3.3.5. The Staff shall evaluate and include in the Plan all solutions that address the problem need statement and mitigate all negative impacts.

3.4. Open Planning Process

3.4.1. Provide adequate opportunity for Stakeholders to participate in the development of the Plan.

3.4.1.1.Provide meeting notices for planning meetings

3.4.1.2.Provide study reports and electronic data files where appropriate and not limited by disclosure restrictions.

3.4.1.3.Provide comment opportunity for affected parties

3.4.2. Participation may be restricted at times due to critical infrastructure, FERC Standards of Contact and other FERC regulations.

[3] The rational for including all facilities in the planning process is that participants' lower voltage facilities or non-participants' facilities could be part of solution to a problem (it is the responsibility of the project sponsor to make arrangements with the owners) or negatively impacted by projects (which might need to be mitigated)

3.4.3. Alternatives for consideration should be suggested and developed at the earliest stages of the planning process for full analysis

3.5. Planning Coordination Duties:

3.5.1. Coordinate with appropriate organizations to exchange reliability data regarding members' system.

3.5.1.1. Serve as the WECC/RRO Base-case Data Area Coordinator for ColumbiaGrid planning participants.

3.5.1.2. Create master database with planned project start and stop dates

3.5.1.3. Develop planning cases as needed for annual assessments

3.5.1.4. Support common database platform for planning and operation

3.5.2. Coordinate planning process with appropriate regional entities.

3.5.2.1. The planning effort for ColumbiaGrid, shall not be duplicative of other regional planning efforts.

3.5.2.2. Staff to work within other regional planning processes and recommend improvements to accommodate, or consolidate with, those other planning processes.

3.5.3. Coordinate with and rely on Members, Non-Member Parties and Stakeholders for input and analysis as appropriate.

3.6. System Assessment (Screening) and Problem/Needs Statements for Load Service and Firm Obligations

3.6.1. ColumbiaGrid will perform assessments (screening study) of the system as needed.

3.6.1.1. Staff, TOPPs and Stakeholders in a coordinated effort will collect data, assemble cases, run outages, identify where a portion of the system may not be meeting planning criteria (per 3.2).

3.6.1.2. Although members are still responsible for compliance, the system assessments done at ColumbiaGrid can be used by member utilities to demonstrate Standards compliance.

3.6.2. As a result of the system assessment a Problem/Need Statement will be developed in coordination with the Staff, TOPPs and Stakeholders. The Problem/Need Statement will:

3.6.2.1. Describe system deficiency and need date

3.6.2.2. Identify which parties should be involved in the development of the solution

3.6.2.3. Identify conceptual alternative solutions for information only

3.6.2.4. Be submitted to Board for approval at the beginning of each planning cycle

3.7. Project Development Processes

3.7.1. Identify interest in voluntary development of capacity projects

3.7.1.1. ColumbiaGrid staff may seek interest for the study of congestion/transfer increase projects or a sponsor may bring a conceptual project for study

3.7.1.2. Staff will coordinate this effort with other regional and subregional planning entities

3.7.1.3. ColumbiaGrid will facilitate study groups were interest is sufficient

3.7.1.3.1. The study will be completed by project sponsors or on a fee for service basis by Staff.

3.7.1.3.2. Activities done in this process can help project sponsors meet Regional Planning requirements

3.7.2. Expanded Scope Projects – for proposed projects

3.7.2.1. Staff will facilitate an open process to determine if there is sufficient interest in expanding the scope of any proposed projects

3.7.2.2. All proposed projects will be considered

3.7.2.3. Staff will facilitate study groups were interest is sufficient.

3.7.2.4. The expanded scope projects will only be included in the Draft Plan when the additional parties are willing to participate in funding the incremental cost of the expanded project. The Staff must ensure that the party initially proposing the project receives equivalent service, or better service at an equivalent cost, than it would have paid under the original plan of service

3.7.2.4.1. Most of the work will be done by project sponsors or on a fee for service basis by Staff.

3.7.2.4.2. Activities done in this process can help project sponsors meet Regional Planning requirements

3.7.3. An open season process for subscribing capacity of developed projects is performed by project sponsors and is not the responsibility of ColumbiaGrid

3.7.3.1. Project sponsors have the lead for conducting this process

4. Development of the Draft Biennial Transmission Expansion Plan

4.1. Contents of Plan

4.1.1. Overall system assessment

4.1.1.1. Identifies Joint Load Service and Firm Obligation Concerns and potential involved participants in Problem/Need Statements

4.1.1.2. Identifies areas that may benefit from potential Capacity Increase projects. (CG or in coordination w/WECC and NTAC.)

4.1.1.3. Assessment to be submitted to the Board early in the Plan development process to receive feedback and facilitate Open Planning process.

4.1.2. The Plan that is submitted to the board will consist of three parts, those plans of service and projects that are ready for approval for implementation,

those studies that are underway but not ready for implementation and conceptual/preliminary studies.

4.1.2.1. Level of detail will be dependent upon the lead-time needed for a particular project (e.g. there would more detail earlier for a 500-kv line than a load-service substation addition, as the 500-kv line needs more lead-time to develop projects).

4.1.3. The Plan will include a List of Projects in the categories below. The projects ready for approval will include plan of service, cost allocation, schedule, any transmission rights allocation and sponsors.

4.1.3.1. Joint Load Service and/or Other Existing Firm Transfer Obligation Projects

4.1.3.1.1. Load service projects and/or projects to maintain transfer capacity for existing firm obligations (where present transmission capacity is insufficient to deliver the energy) where multiple TOPPs have responsibility for or are impacted by the transmission solution

4.1.3.2. Single TOPP Local Load Service Project

4.1.3.2.1. Load service projects where a single TOPP has responsibility for the transmission solution

4.1.3.3. New Interconnection and/or Transmission Service Requests

4.1.3.3.1. Projects developed as a result of a Queue request to a TOPP system where agreement is reached between the requestor and the TOPP to fund.

4.1.3.4. Capacity Increase Projects

4.1.3.4.1. Projects developed to move more economical resources to load (i.e. not required to meet load service obligations) where sponsorship and funding is decided.

4.1.4. Cost allocation will be included in the Plan although the contracts between parties to implement the allocation will not be.

4.1.5. For projects where consensus has not been reached, the Draft Plan will include the ColumbiaGrid Planner's recommendation along with minority opinions that were developed as part of the study process.

4.2. Responsibilities for each Project Type

4.2.1. Joint Load Service and/or Other Existing Firm Transfer Obligation Projects

4.2.1.1. From the system assessment process (see section 3.6) Staff will determine which load service problems involve multiple TOPPs

4.2.1.2. ColumbiaGrid will lead teams of involved TOPPs and other interested parties to develop the project

4.2.1.3. TOPPs are responsible for participating with Staff in study teams, planning and developing projects and submitting projects to staff

(including but not limited to Plan of Service, schedule, sponsorship, transmission capacity rights and cost allocation)

4.2.1.4. Staff will verify that the proposed solution corrects the Problem/Need Statement and does not introduce unmitigated negative impacts

4.2.1.5. Staff will monitor the team's progress and increase its involvement in studies and project development if the TOPPs fail to make adequate progress.

4.2.1.6. ColumbiaGrid makes recommendations to the Board for plan of service, cost allocation, sponsorship, transmission rights allocation, impact mitigation and schedule in the Draft Plan if TOPPs cannot resolve these issues in a timely manner.

4.2.2. Single TOPP Local Load Service Project

4.2.2.1. The CG assessment will likely identify local load service deficiencies on single TOPP systems.

4.2.2.2. CG Staff will verify with TOPP that they are aware of the problem and these problems will be listed in the assessment for information only.

4.2.2.3. Contractual issues will remain between the TOPP and its customers.

4.2.2.4. The TOPPs are responsible for planning and implementation of projects and submitting proposed projects to staff for inclusion in the Draft Plan and future basecase models.

4.2.3. New Interconnection and Transmission Service Requests from Queue

4.2.3.1. These requests will be processed on an ongoing basis as they come to TOPPs

4.2.3.2. Once it is determined by the TOPP that ATC is not available and a study agreement is needed, ColumbiaGrid works with the TOPPs to develop a study agreement for the requestor (that follows FERC requirements and includes other impacted systems)

4.2.3.2.1. Staff posts the request, which party(ies) is (are) involved, conceptual solution and study schedule (the latter two to be determined by study group).

4.2.3.2.2. TOPPs will perform studies and develop projects with participation of requestor

4.2.3.2.3. Requests will be clustered where practical

4.2.3.2.4. ColumbiaGrid ensure studies are completed in a timely manner and can hire contractors if necessary

4.2.3.2.5. ColumbiaGrid verifies project capability and assesses negative impacts

4.2.3.3. As projects agreements are formalized, these projects will be considered to be "plans of service" and added to the Draft Plan

4.2.3.4. With the institution of a ColumbiaGrid Common NW Queue, these requests are assumed to then come directly to ColumbiaGrid

4.2.3.5. ColumbiaGrid should recommend which of these should go through a Project Development Process (sec 3.7) to encourage and facilitate an expansion of the project

4.2.3.6. When responsible TOPPs and service requestors do not reach agreement in a reasonable time frame for new interconnection and service requests Staff will recommend a plan of service, transmission rights allocation, sponsorship, and impact mitigation; Staff will also verify that the Project Development Process was used.

4.2.4. Capacity Increase Projects

4.2.4.1. These are projects undertaken voluntarily by parties to increase transfer capability and reduce congestion.

4.2.4.2. There are five general duties of ColumbiaGrid staff for these projects:

4.2.4.2.1. Monitor regional planning studies and provide link to ColumbiaGrid studies.

4.2.4.2.2. Perform duties consistent with the Project Development Process (Section 3.7) and report the findings to the Board.

4.2.4.2.3. Assure that negative impacts of proposed projects are mitigated

4.2.4.2.4. Assist in Resolving transmission capacity rights if parties cannot resolve themselves.

4.2.4.2.5. Sponsored Capacity Increase projects would be added to Draft Plan

4.3. Decision-making for Draft Plan

4.3.1. Endeavor for consensus – facilitated by Staff

4.3.2. If consensus is reached among TOPPs, that plan of service, cost allocation, rights allocation, schedule and sponsorship is included in the Draft Plan as long as it corrects Problem/Need Statement and has no unmitigated negative impacts

4.3.3. If consensus cannot be achieved to solve a specific Problem/Need Statement, Staff will make a recommendation for a solution. Such recommendation will be consistent, by project type, with section 4.2. The Staff's recommendation in these issues will be included in the Draft Plan submitted to the Board.

4.3.3.1. The standard for best solution is based upon costs, reliability improvement, and consistency with transmission adequacy criteria or guidelines.

4.3.3.2. The staff must select from the disputed alternatives unless none solves the defined system problem.

4.3.4. The Draft Plan is not subject to reconsideration (only the approved Plan can use the reconsideration process).

4.4. Confidentiality of Process

4.4.1. Mechanisms will be put into place to allow Staff and the Board to protect confidentiality based on Critical Energy Infrastructure Standards, FERC Standards of Conduct and other FERC regulations.

4.4.2. Mechanisms will be put into place to allow Staff and the Board to respect Standards of Conduct issues which might also require posting of some sensitive data

4.5. Mitigation of negative impacts

4.5.1. ColumbiaGrid will provide a process for affected parties to voice concerns about negative impacts of new projects.

4.5.1.1. Original system assessment will identify potential affected parties who would be expected to participate in studies.

4.5.1.2. These study groups would be open to all parties

4.5.1.3. ColumbiaGrid will perform an assessment of all proposed projects to ensure that they solve the Problem/Need Statements and to evaluate any negative impacts

4.5.1.4. ColumbiaGrid will coordinate with non-member planning processes to ensure that impacts of others systems are monitored and resolved

4.5.1.5. The process must allow for reasonable impacts to interconnected system.

4.6. Cost allocation principles

4.6.1. The cost allocation process is a general process and is not prescriptive as rigid guidelines would stifle negotiation.

4.6.2. Principle of cost allocation is that Costs follows defined system needs (Problem/Need Statements from the ColumbiaGrid Assessment) that are met by the project

4.6.3. Potential future system benefits cannot be allocated

4.6.4. In absence of agreement by those responsible for projects on costs, rights, ownership, etc (with facilitation of ColumbiaGrid), Staff will, consistent with section 4.2, develop cost allocations for that project to be included in the Draft Plan.

5. **Biennial Transmission Expansion Plan Approval Process**

5.1. Draft Plan.

5.1.1. The Draft Plan is submitted to Board for review and approval every two years.

5.1.2. Updates/addendums should be submitted to the Board as necessary for short lead time projects

5.1.3. The Board should be kept informed of significant disputes within the planning process. The information provided to the Board should include the alternatives under consideration and the points of dispute.

5.1.4. The Draft Plan should be prepared and made public with sufficient time for review before the Board approval process begins.

5.1.5. The Draft Plan should include a reasonable amount of detail some confidential material may be excluded.

5.2. Review Process

5.2.1. The review process is an open process, all stakeholders would have opportunity to supply information and input to Board

5.2.1.1. Provide meeting notices

5.2.1.2. Provide opportunity to comment

5.2.1.3. Provide study reports and electronic data files

5.2.1.4. This is a public process to obtain public input on the Draft Plan (written or oral at Boards discretion). It is not a formal legal process creating rights of litigation.

5.2.1.5. Participation may be restricted at times due to critical infrastructure issues, standard of conduct concerns and other direction from FERC regulatory directions.

5.3. Basis for Plan Approval

5.3.1. Plan approval should be based on the technical merits, cost considerations and system improvements as opposed to permitting or siting issues.

5.3.2. Process should consider overall system needs in the selection between plans.

5.3.3. Board can only select from alternatives that have been fully vetted for performance and potential impacts within the planning process. New alternatives that are proposed must be sent back to the Staff and study teams for analysis.

5.4. Plan Approval.

5.4.1. The Staff will work with TOPPs and Stakeholders to get agreement on specific plans of service that are included in the Draft Plan. However at times the urgency of a system problem may require that the Staff include in the Plan a specific plan of service that does not have full agreement among the involved parties. When this occurs the Staff will note this as a Staff recommended plan of service.

5.4.1.1. Agreement between parties – When the involved TOPPs and other affected parties agree on a specific plan of service and it is submitted to the Board in the Draft Biennial Plan, the Board may either approve the plan of service or it may remand the plan of service back to Staff. When the Board

makes such a remand it shall include specific questions or concerns that it wants to have answered or further researched before it ratifies the plan of service for inclusion in the Biennial Plan. The Board may make the following determinations based upon the type of plan of service involved.

5.4.1.1.1. For Joint Load Service and/or Existing Firm Transfer Obligation Projects, the Board approves the plan of service, sponsorship, schedule, cost allocation, transmission rights allocation, mitigation of negative impacts and verification of Open Planning Process for Project Development.

5.4.1.1.2. For New Interconnection and/or Transmission Service Request Projects, the Board approves the plan of service, transmission rights allocation, sponsorship, mitigation of negative impacts and verification of Open Planning Process for Project Development.

5.4.1.1.3. For Capacity Increase Projects, the Board approves the mitigation of negative impacts and verification of Open Planning Process for Project Development. For these types of projects the plan of service, sponsorship and schedule information is developed by the study team (sponsors, participants and Staff) and is included for information purposes in the package submitted to Board for approval.

5.4.1.2. Approving a Staff recommended plan of service – When the involved TOPPs and other affected parties are unable to agree on a specific plan of service the Staff may include a recommended plan of service in the Draft Biennial Plan. In these situations the Board may make the following determinations based upon the type of plan of service involved.

5.4.1.2.1. For Joint Load Service and/or Existing Firm Transfer Obligation Projects, the Board approves the plan of service, sponsorship, schedule, cost allocation, transmission rights allocation, mitigation of negative impacts and verification of Open Planning Process for Project Development.

5.4.1.2.2. For New Interconnection and/or Transmission Service Request Projects, the Board approves the plan of service, transmission rights allocation, sponsorship, mitigation of negative impacts and verification of Open Planning Process for Project Development.

5.4.1.2.3. The Board may also remand a Staff recommended plan of service back to the Staff and the disputing parties. When the Board makes such a remand it shall include specific questions or concerns that it wants to have answered or further researched before it ratifies the plan of service for inclusion in the Biennial Plan.

5.4.2. For Single TOPP Local Load Service Projects, the plan of service is included in the Plan as information.

5.5. Reconsideration Process.

5.5.1. Timing. Within 10 business days of the Board's decision the affected TOPPs have the right to ask the Board to reconsider a specific decision regarding project plans of service, rights, cost allocation, schedules, allocation of transmission rights and sponsorship.

5.5.2. After input from the staff and impacted parties, the Board will reconsider and may revise its decision. The Board shall make its final decision known within 90 days of the request for reconsideration, unless the Board provides a statement of good cause for an extension of time.

5.5.3. If, as a result of Reconsideration, the Board changes its decision, the changed decision is subject to the provisions of section 5.5.

5.6. **Post Board-Approval Project Modifications**

5.6.1. Sponsors may modify an approved plan of service as projects move through siting and environmental review processes (consider other routing options, non-transmission alternatives, etc.)

5.6.2. The Staff will evaluate the proposal in an effort to ensure that it adequately satisfies the Problem/Need Statement and does not create unmitigated negative impacts. Stakeholders will be involved in this process.

5.6.2.1. Staff will provide a Statement of Change to the Board when such changes are found by Staff to resolve the problem, mitigate negative impacts and have sponsor, participant and stakeholder support.

5.6.2.2. Staff will make a recommendation to the Board for approval if Staff finds any of the following:

5.6.2.2.1. the plan of service being implemented does not resolve the problem need statement,

5.6.2.2.2. there is disagreement between the sponsors and participants as to the plan of service, sponsorship, schedule, cost allocation or transmission rights allocation,

5.6.2.2.3. mitigation of negative impacts is lacking or,

5.6.2.2.4. the Open Planning Process for Project Development has not been adequately considered and if necessary implemented

5.7. **Constructing projects without a CG approved plan.** Approval by ColumbiaGrid of a plan of service is not a precondition for a sponsor(s) to implement a project. However, the sponsor(s) must recognize that implementation of an unapproved project may have consequences to subsequent Plans and obligations, including those of the sponsor(s).

6. Roles within Planning Process

6.1. Role of Staff

6.1.1. Implement planning process to facilitate regional planning
6.1.2. Develop Draft Plan for Board approval
6.1.3. Assist in Board approval process

6.2. **Role of Board**

6.2.1. Provide review and policy guidance to Staff and planning process
6.2.2. Review and approve Problem Need statements
6.2.3. Review and approve Draft Plan
6.2.4. Work with Staff for any individual project modifications from Draft Plan
6.2.5. Help TOPPs resolve disputes
6.2.6. Provide adequate opportunity for stakeholder participation in Plan Approval process
6.2.7. Respond to inquiries from those regulatory and governmental entities with authority to cause projects to be built and/or the authority to approve cost recovery if such project should be completed.

6.3. **Role of Transmission Owner Planning Participants (TOPP)**

6.3.1. Provide data
6.3.2. Provide review of data sets compiled by staff
6.3.3. Participate in study groups as needed
6.3.4. Run studies
6.3.5. Make good faith efforts to resolve the project development issues prior to Plan approval process by Board
6.3.6. Implement projects

6.4. **Role of Stakeholders (interested persons)**

6.4.1. Voluntary participation
6.4.2. Should supply resources to help with own study requests
6.4.3. Participation may be restricted at times due to confidentiality concerns and critical infrastructure, as determined by Staff or Board.

7. Term of Contract

7.1. Contract Length: To be determined
7.2. Party may withdraw upon providing written notice of its withdrawal to the Board
7.3. Notwithstanding notice of withdrawal, all approved final projects and final request for transmission services or interconnection shall be followed to completion by withdrawing Party and other affected Parties

Definitions

Sponsored project:
Any type of project where an entity (or entities) has made a decision to implement.

Sponsor:
Party responsible for construction and/or ownership of a transmission project.

Transmission Owner Planning Participant (TOPP):
Transmission Owner that signs the ColumbiaGrid Planning Functional Agreement

Stakeholders (non-TOPPs):
Interested persons or groups who have a legitimate interest in the development of the transmission system including: Merchants, Merchant function of TOPPs, IPPs, Advocacy groups, Governmental representatives.

Qualified Non-Members
Adjacent Transmission owners that have not signed the ColumbiaGrid Functional Agreement for Planning

ColumbiaGrid Staff
Independent staff hired or contracted for by ColumbiaGrid to perform the planning functions outlined.

ColumbiaGrid Board
Three person independent

Draft Biennial Transmission Expansion Plan:
Transmission Expansion Plan that is submitted to the Board by the Staff.

Biennial Transmission Expansion Plan
Posted aggregated expansion plan of the TOPPs and that of other adjacent Transmission owners that might impact TOPPS systems- revised at least once every other year and approved by the ColumbiaGrid Board.

System Assessment or screening:

Plan of Service:
Technical system modifications that need to be made to the system to address a Problem/Need Statement

We need to watch the terms – plan, plans of service and project) I would suggest that we use Plan for the Biennial Plan, projects to mean what we develop to solve a problem, and Plan of Service to indicate a recommended project to solve a particular problem. Do you think we can make that work?

Joint Load Service and/or Existing Firm Transfer Obligation Project:
Load service projects and/or projects to maintain transfer capacity for existing firm obligations (where present transmission capacity is insufficient to deliver the energy) where multiple TOPPs have responsibility for or are impacted by the transmission solution

Single TOPP Local Load Service Project:
Load service projects where a single TOPP has responsibility for the transmission solution

Congestion/Transfer Increase Project:
Projects developed to move more economical resources to load (not required to meet load service obligations.

New Interconnection and/or Transmission Service Request Project
Projects developed as a result of a Queue request to a TOPP system where agreement is reached between the requestor and the TOPP to fund.

Infrastructure Technical Review Committee (ITRC):
Committee created to review of business case of BPA transmission projects over $10 million, currently facilitated by NWPP TPC.

Cost Allocation:
Cost responsibility for entire Plan of Service split either by percentage or by specific facilities.

Problem/Need Statements:
A description of a system deficiency that is identified during the system assessment (screening).

Project Development Process
Open planning process for interested parties to pursue project development in areas of mutual interest (similar but not limited to WECC Regional Planning Procedures)

Load Service:
The physical ability of the transmission facilities to serve firm load regardless of the cost of energy (RTOWest Definition).

Negative Impacts:
Impacts due to a system change that reduces needed system capability. Must accommodate reasonable interconnected system impacts.