

BP-20 Rate Case Workshop: Transmission Rates

August 22, 2018

Agenda

- SCD Rate Design
- Proposed Rate Schedule Changes
- Next Steps



Scheduling, System Control and Dispatch Rate Design

SCD White Paper

- In response to customer feedback at the July 18 BP-20 Rate Case workshop, BPA staff has written an SCD Rate Design White Paper and conducted a customer impact analysis of additional SCD rate design alternatives.
- The objective of the White Paper is to provide background on SCD and list the pros and cons of each SCD rate design alternative staff evaluated.
- This evaluation should give customers a better understanding of the topic and an opportunity to provide comments that will help inform the Initial Proposal.
- The White Paper and customer impact analysis are both posted to the <u>BP-20 Meetings and Workshops</u> page

Objective

- Our objective for reviewing the SCD rate design remains unchanged:
 - As part of Agency Strategy and the Transmission Business Model, BPA is in the process of reviewing its rates
 - We are exploring whether our products are priced at the appropriate level for the value of the service provided

How BPA Currently Calculates SCD

- The current SCD rate methodology was established in the TR-02 Settlement
- SCD is applied to both firm and non-firm transmission service and is charged for each segment of transmission used.
- PTP Billing Factor = Reserved Capacity
- NT Billing Factor = customer's Network Load on the hour of the monthly Transmission System Peak Load (TTSL)

What Alternatives did Staff Evaluate?

- Status Quo
- Base the SCD billing determinant on schedules and metered load
- Do not allocate SCD costs to the Southern Intertie or Montana Intertie (current billing determinants)
- "Roll-in" the SCD rate
- Base the SCD billing determinant on E-Tags

Status Quo

- Pros
 - SCD is billed on the same billing determinants as transmission reservations which simplifies billing and customer understanding of bills
 - Rate design uses billing determinants that largely align with industry standard across WECC
 - Does not require development of new forecasting methodologies
 - Does not result in costs shifts
- Cons
 - Does not eliminate the "pancake" rate

Alternative 1: Do not allocate SCD costs to the Southern Intertie or Montana Intertie

- Pros
 - Simple to implement
 - Uses the same billing determinants as the status quo rate design
 - Eliminates the "pancaking" of SCD charges
- Cons
 - Creates large cost shifts. Customers that only have Network transmission will see a 1-3% rate increase in their overall transmission costs in addition to any upcoming rate pressure
 - It is possible to use Intertie transmission without using Network transmission, which may lead to free-rider issues

Alternative 2: Base the SCD billing determinant on schedules and metered load and only charge SCD once

- Pros
 - Eliminates the "pancaking" of SCD charges
- Cons
 - Creates large cost shifts across customers
 - Methodology is more complicated and less transparent
 - Customers have raised concerns whether moving to scheduled energy and metered load is better aligned to the costs of providing SCD
 - Would require the development of new forecasting models and methodologies

Alternative 3: Base the SCD billing determinant on schedules and metered load, and continue to charge SCD on each segment

 The rate impact of this alternative was conducted per customer request and can be found in the supplemental workbook; however, this alternative was not considered as one of the proposed alternatives to the SCD rate design.

Alternative 4: "Roll-in" the SCD rate

- Pros
 - Simple to implement
 - Uses the same billing determinants as the status quo rate design
 - Customers see something close to actual price on OASIS
- Cons
 - Does not eliminate the "pancaking" of SCD charges
 - Would allocate SCD costs based on "net plant" instead of sales and it is unclear if there is a strong cost based reasoning to do so
 - Utility Delivery is not currently charged SCD costs

Alternative 5: Base the SCD billing determinant on e-tags and charge SCD only once

- Pros
 - Eliminates "pancaking" of SCD charges
 - E-tags may more closely align with the scheduling costs of SCD
- Cons
 - Creates large cost shifts across customers
 - The majority of NT service is not tagged, so BPA would need to develop a different a way to allocate costs between customers that have scheduled tags and customer that have unscheduled service.
 - E-tags may align closer to the usage of the scheduling portion costs of SCD, but not the control and dispatch aspect
 - BPA is still analyzing the costs associated with providing SCD and whether e-tags are the proper metric to measure use of the systems and costs associated with SCD
 - Methodology is more complicated and less transparent
 - Would require the development of new forecasting models and methodologies



Proposed Rate Schedule Changes

Proposed Rate Schedule Changes

- An updated draft redline version of the proposed changes to the BP-20 Transmission Rate Schedules is posted on the <u>BP-20 Meetings and</u> <u>Workshops</u> page. The updated draft includes changes to the following:
 - Removal of Hourly firm in the PTP, IS, IM and ACS rate schedules

Next Steps

- By September 5:
 - Please submit comments on the SCD White Paper
 - Please submit comments on the proposed rate schedule changes
- Please submit your comments to techforum@bpa.gov

Next Steps

- The next BP-20 Rate Case Workshop is September 12, 2018. Transmission Rates topics will include:
 - Staff's SCD proposal
 - Proposed rate schedule changes

Future Customer Meetings

Date	BP-20 Rate Case Workshops	Other Meetings
Aug 21 (T)		• TC-20 Tariff Customer Workshop
Sept 12 (W)	Transmission Rates	ACS Practices
Sept 26 (W)	 BP-20 Rate Case (tentative/if needed) 	