



**NTTG 2014-2015 Draft PPC Study Report  
Stakeholder Comment Form**

Open Comment period April 20, 2015 through May 4, 2015

Please submit comments to [info@nttg.biz](mailto:info@nttg.biz)

**Commenter Contact Information**

Date	5/04/2015
Name	Cameron Yourkowski, Fred Heutte
Organization	Renewable Northwest, NW Energy Coalition
Email address	Cameron@renewableNW.org, Fred@nwenergy.org
Phone number	503-223-4544, 503-757-6222

**Stakeholder Comments**

Section	Page/ Line #	Comment
1	4	Renewable Northwest appreciates NTTG accepting and moving forward with this study request. The process and dialogue has been a useful exercise from our perspective and has produced useful results. Although we recognize that this study identifies next steps (discussed more below), we are concerned that some of the disclaimer language in the study report could leave readers with the impression that study doesn't provide significant value. We suggest summarizing in lay terms what this study does tell us and then what additional questions remain.
3	4	The paragraph discussing the differences in station service loads and the impact that has on this study would benefit from a slightly expanded explanation, especially on how the station load differential impacts the study. We assume that the impacts are minimal. If that is correct it would be helpful to indicate such.
4	7	We appreciate the details provided on how to approach the next steps for a dynamic analysis. For the purposes of this public policy study request, which is to develop policy level information, we suggest that a reasonable path forward may be to glean relevant information from existing transient stability analysis conducted for prior interconnection study requests. A formal summary and professional opinion about what the existing studies tell us about how to generally address the ATR issues associated with our study request is a reasonable and efficient next step that would allow NTTG and stakeholders additional time to consider the merits and appropriate structure for any additional study work.
5	7	In the last sentence, would it be more clear if it said, "a double Colstrip-Broadview [contingency]"?

6	9	<p>Similar to our first comment above, we are curious if the conclusion could be framed to explain more what the study does imply rather than what it does not imply. For example, our understanding of these study results is that it does imply that, assuming the replacement wind can be tripped seamlessly with the existing ATR structure, all of the credible contingencies could be solved with some amount of tripping without violating any thermal or voltage limitations. If that is a correct statement, or whatever the correct positively framed statement is, we would suggest summarizing the study results in that way. After that, the study report could then go on to talk about the next steps required to confirm the assumptions about the ATR interaction.</p>
		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment!</p>