

**California Transmission Planning Group Executive Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes
July 1, 2010 – Pomona - 10 a.m. to 2 p.m.**

Executive Committee - Representatives			
		Present	Absent
CAISO	Keith Casey	x	
IID	Brian Brady		x
LADWP	Aram Benyamin		x
PG&E	P. J. Martinez	x	
SCE	David Mead	x	
SCPPA	Bill Carnahan	x	
SDG&E	Jim Avery	x	
SMUD	Jim Shetler	x	
TANC	Allen Short	x	
TID	Larry Weis		x
Western	Tom Boyko	x	

Executive Committee - Alternates			
		Present	Absent
CAISO	Gary DeShazo	x	
IID	Steve Keene	x	
LADWP	John Dennis	x	
PG&E	Steve Metague	x	
SCE	Patricia Arons	x	
SCPPA	Gary Nolf	x	
SDG&E	Linda Brown	x	
SMUD	Vicken Kasarjian		x
TANC	Jim Beck	x	
TID	Casey Hashimoto	x	
Western	Pete Garris	x	

Invited Guests			
		Present	Absent
CAISO	Heather Sanders	x	
PG&E	Jon Eric Thalman	x	
LADWP	Tim Wu		x
LADWP	Mohammed Beshir	x	
SDG&E	Al Pak	x	
SMUD	Mike Deis	x	
SMUD	Craig Cameron		x
SCE	Bob Woods	x	
SCE	Jonathan Shearer	x	
SCE	Dana Cabbell	x	
LADWP	John Dennis	x	

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

1. The draft meeting minutes from the June 3, 2010 CTPG Executive Committee meeting were adopted unanimously. The adopted final meeting minutes are attached.
2. After hearing an update from the Technical Steering Committee on the Phase 3 report and discussing comments from ITCs who submitted projects for CTPG study, the Executive Committee decided the following:
 - a) Although several ITCs have asked studies of their project be rerun, the Executive Committee reaffirmed that CTPG will only study third party projects as defined by the project sponsor. CTPG will not run a variety of scenarios for third party projects based on different project configurations. CTPG has neither the time nor the resources for numerous runs to evaluate different third party project configurations.
 - b) The TSC will rerun the Great Basin project submittal with a new point of delivery South of Table Mountain now that we better understand the original Great Basin study request.
 - c) The Nevada Hydro Project study will be rerun and corrected since the original CTPG Study for Nevada Hydro did not include the requested transformer and phase shifter configuration.
3. The Executive Committee discussed the four methodologies for identifying “least regrets” needs that arise from the CTPG Phase 1, 2, and 3 studies. The Executive committee decided:
 - a) The ISO proposed methodology for identifying high priority and medium priority transmission needs is approved by the CTPG.

- b) The CTPG Executive Committee agreed to abandon the term “least regrets” and concluded that the term “high priority needs” better describe the project needs that were identified in CTPG studies.
4. Al Pak provided a summary of the FERC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) on transmission planning and cost allocation issued on June 17, 2010. The Legal Committee was asked to explore if CTPG should submit joint comments on the CTPG related issues in the FERC NOPR. The Legal Committee has been asked to have any proposed NOPR comments ready for Executive Committee review at the August 5 meeting.
5. The draft ISO talking points explaining the nature of ISO participation in CTPG are generally acceptable to the group; however, some additional wording changes have been proposed. Al Pak will finalize the talking points after including comments from the ISO and others. Comments on the ISO addendum talking points should be provided to Al Pak no later than July 15.
6. Al Pak reported that the CTPG antitrust policy is ready for signature and the Executive Committee unanimously adopted the antitrust policy. Members are asked to proceed with signatures and provide copies back to Al Pak.
7. CTPG Executive Committee agreed to the proposed meeting dates and locations for future meetings. A copy of that schedule is attached.

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

- All the items on the July 1 CTPG Executive Committee agenda were discussed, except road map on post Phase 3 Study CTPG work. That item was deferred until the next meeting.
- Jim Avery began the meeting with a brief overview of the Nevada Hydro phone call and a reminder that additional phone calls are planned between CTPG and StarTrans and ZGlobal. In addition, a follow up meeting with WITG is planned for July 9.
- Mo Beshir reported on key work and accomplishments of the TSC in June, including several TSC meetings regarding “least regrets” methodology and the ITC projects submitted for study. The four alternative “least regrets” approaches were reviewed by TSC and summarized for presentation to the Executive Committee at this July 1 meeting. Stakeholder conference calls have been held and more are scheduled. Work continues with RETI environmental scoring. A separate study group has been created for dynamic studies. TSC is preparing for a stakeholder meeting to discuss Phase 3 results in late July.
- Mo Beshir summarized the Phase 3 report. The Executive Committee asked that the Phase 3 report contain certain clarifications and caveats:

- a) The identified CTPG high priority transmission needs do not represent a comprehensive plan of all of the transmission needs for achieving the 33 percent RPS goals,
 - b) Just because a project or need area is not identified as high priority does not mean that the project lacks merit,
 - c) The identified high potential transmission needs are based on the scenarios we looked at, and the 19 scenarios CTPG studied are heavily influenced by the assumption that renewable resources required to meet RPS goals will be built largely in Southern California.
 - d) “High priority needs” means there is high confidence that transmission is needed in a given area as shown by the CTPG study results and the convergence with generator interconnection requests in the ISO queue. The “medium priority needs” suggest transmission additions in specific area show promise but more study is necessary.
- The Executive Committee concluded that high priority work for CTPG (after the Phase 3 report is issued) is to evaluate transmission needs for a more geographically diverse portfolio of renewable resources, including renewable resources from the desert Southwest, Northern California, and the Pacific Northwest.
 - Perry Cole from Energy Capital Partners and representing the Western Independent Transmission Group (WITG) joined the Executive Committee meeting via phone for approximately 30 minutes. During the conversation that followed, Jim Avery described the CTPG studies and noted that studies are not intended to pick winning projects or losing projects but instead provide a technical evaluation to determine where high priority transmission needs exist given the assumptions that underlie the CTPG studies. CTPG invited WITG to work with the Technical Steering Committee and develop a plan for working together over the next year. Perry expressed a concern that CTPG study assumptions could lead to conclusions which WITG members may not agree with. CTPG offered to provide clear explanations about modeling assumptions and the limitations of the studies performed. In conclusion, CTPG and WITG agreed to continue working together going forward.
 - LADWP provided an update on progress in securing authority to sign the CTPG Membership Agreement. The target date for LADWP signing is July 22, 2010.



C:\DATA\Katherine\ C:\DATA\Katherine\ C:\DATA\Katherine\
CTPG Minutes - 6-3-1CTPG July 1st Draft ACTPG 2011 Meetings.