

**California Transmission Planning Group Executive Committee Meeting  
Meeting Minutes  
August 5, 2010 – San Diego - 10 a.m. to 3 p.m.**

<b>Executive Committee - Representatives</b>			
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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	

<b>Executive Committee - Alternates</b>			
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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	

<b>Invited Guests</b>			
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
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	Jonathan Shearer	x	
SCE	Steve Havis	x	
TANC	Brian Greiss	x	

### **SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS**

1. The draft meeting minutes from the July 1, 2010 CTPG Executive Committee meeting were adopted unanimously, subject to minor corrections. The adopted final meeting minutes are attached.
2. The Technical Steering Committee (TSC) was asked that the final Phase 3 report:
  - a. Describe how shift factors were used and as a check on the engineering studies that identified high and medium potential needs.
  - b. Clarify that the CTPG Phase 3 study identifies high potential and medium potential “needs” but does not identify projects to address those needs.
  - c. Include a map(s) showing the transmission high and medium priority needs.
  - d. Clarify that the high and medium potential needs identified do not represent a statewide plan or a complete picture of the transmission needed to support the 33 percent RPS goal.
3. The Executive Committee agreed to extend the comment period on the Phase 3 report until August 18 and to extend the date of issuing the Phase 3 final report until September 2.
4. The Executive Committee asked TSC to proceed with a Phase 4 CTPG report with a goal of completing the draft Phase 4 report by mid December 2010. The Phase 4 report will build on 2 of the scenarios that CTPG completed earlier this year, specifically the high Northern California Pacific / Northwest scenario and the high Desert Southwest scenario. The Phase 4 study will support development of a CTPG conceptual statewide transmission plan which recognizes the potential for more a diverse renewable supply portfolio than the RETI study results imply.

5. The Executive Committee asked the TSC to develop a Phase 4 study plan that allows for more power flow cases and seek stakeholder input to help shape the Phase 4 assumptions and cases to be run.
6. Since the Phase 4 report will focus on the out-of-state resource scenarios, TSC is asked to review and determine if the three out-of-state projects submitted to CTPG in May by independent transmission companies should now be studied as part of Phase 4.
7. Recognizing that the new Phase 4 effort will be occurring when the TSC is scheduled to be conducting scoping for the 2011 CTPG studies, the Executive Committee concluded to the extent resources allow, both activities should occur in parallel.
8. After discussing the draft CTPG comments to the FERC NOPR on Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation, many members of the Executive Committee agreed that, subject to some language changes discussed at the meeting, they support the principles stated in the draft comments. However, Western, LADWP, and the ISO will not sign on to the CTPG FERC NOPR comments. The CTPG Legal Committee was asked to prepare another draft of comment for CTPG members to review and determine if a subset of CTPG members will submit.
9. The Executive Committee asked Steve Metague and Mo Beshir to provide background material so the Executive Committee can consider participating in WECC/TEPPC as a sub regional planning group. The Executive Committee would like the background material to answer: (1) what would it take for CTPG to become a sub regional planning group (SPG). (2) If CTPG were to become a SPG would the ISO's participation as a SPG be jeopardized, and (3) what are the obligations and expectations of a SPG at WECC?
10. Jim Avery will invite Gary Ackerman to the next CTPG meeting in San Francisco on September 2. Gary will be invited to attend part of that meeting to discuss how CTPG and Independent Transmission Companies can better coordinate and work together.
11. The Executive Committee has asked the CTPG website be enhanced so stakeholders can more easily comment and make suggestions regarding the assumptions that underlie CTPG studies.
12. The next CTPG meeting in Pomona will start at 10:30 am (instead of 10 am) to better accommodate flight schedules.

### **SUMMARY OF THE MEETING**

- All items on the August 5 CTPG Executive Committee meeting agenda (attached) were discussed.

- Mo Beshir provided an overview of the Phase 3 study work and results.
- There was a discussion of the August 4 CTPG stakeholder meeting that was held in San Diego. In the view of CTPG participants, the meeting went well. Many questions were answered and important input was received. There were approximately 40 stakeholders in the room and up to 63 on the phone.
- There was a lengthy discussion of the distinction between the high and medium potential “needs” found in the Phase 3 report and “projects” that could address those needs. The dialog between the Executive Committee and TSC clarified that when TSC ran power flow studies and reviewed the results some planning criteria violations appeared. The CTPG Phase 3 Study results identify those “needs” but Phase 3 does not specify projects to address the needs.
- The CTPG members observed that the Phase 3 work did not include a comprehensive study of Northern California when compared to the study of Southern California renewable regions. Since the Phase 3 study did not yield a comprehensive statewide plan, the Executive Committee discussed the need for a Phase 4 CTPG study. More renewable development in Northern California, along with higher imports from the PNW will be analyzed and, if needed, studied further in Phase 4 to provide a comprehensive look at Northern California transmission system needs. There was agreement that stakeholders should have an opportunity early to help shape the Phase 4 studies.
- Independent generators have expressed an interest in working directly with CTPG, and the TSC was encouraged to hold a workshop with independent generators for input into the Phase 4 studies.
- Al Pak of the CTPG legal committee summarized the work that the legal team has done in reviewing the FERC NOPR on Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation. He provided an overview of issues in the NOPR which are related to CTPG activities. He summarized the draft comments prepared by the CTPG legal team for consideration by the Executive Committee.
- LADWP provided an update on its progress on receiving board approval to sign the CTPG Membership Agreement.
- Keith Casey provided a summary of his understanding of the scope of the FERC RTPP Technical Conference which is scheduled for August 24 in Washington, DC.
- The Executive Committee discussed continued outreach to RETI and ITCs and concluded that this outreach is critical and should continue.

- Jim Avery summarized conversations he had with Rick Miles and Steve Williams of FERC.
- Keith Casey announced that Heather Sanders now has a new role in the ISO and she will be transitioning away from her project management role for CTPG. CTPG members have been asked to consider providing a new project manager to replace Heather.



C:\DATA\Katherine\ C:\DATA\Katherine\  
CTPG Minutes - 7-1-1CTPG August 5th Age