## PACE Bubble Discussion Points

**Issue #1: Hold BP #68 Webinar/training**

1. Held on 9/3/14 from 1:30-3:00 PPT
2. **BP #68 posted for public comment on March 18, 2014**
3. **BP #68 effective date of May 2, 2014**
4. **We didn’t receive any comments from customers during comment period**

**Issue #2: Will PACE bubbles affect how imbalance is calculated? Will there be 1 or 3 imbalance charges?**

**Answer: One imbalance charge for all of PACE at this time and for the foreseeable future with EIM implementation;** **there will be multiple LMPs (locational margin pricing) within the PACE BA that will roll up to one LAP (load aggregation point)**

**Issue #3: Explain why SOURCE/SINKs can’t be used to manage the constraints**

**Answer: Because constraints are managed by paths, and not by SOURCE/SINK in all of WECC by all Transmission Providers. Scheduling software is developed to manage constraints and curtail as appropriate via paths and not by a SOURCE or SINK. It is imperative to have a method to track schedules across constrained transmission paths.**

**Issue #4: Produce a more detailed map, showing actual physical boundaries.**

**Answer: See the “Visio-Clover\_Bubble\_8 22 14.pdf posted at the following link.** [**http://www.oasis.oati.com/woa/woa-home-show-secure-doc.wml?ProviderDocsID=450560552&Provider=PPW**](http://www.oasis.oati.com/woa/woa-home-show-secure-doc.wml?ProviderDocsID=450560552&Provider=PPW)

**Issue #5: Provide copy of the study that precipitated BP #68**

**Status/Answer:** **There isn’t a specific study that precipitated the BP #68. BP #68 was an effort to outline the details of the NT Allocation methodology.**

**Issue #7: Explanation of why MONA-OQUIRRH didn’t resolve the internal constraint**

**Answer: The MONA-OQUIRRH line is north of the Clover bubble and the Huntington-Sigurd constraint, so the addition of the line doesn’t help relieve the Huntington-Sigurd constraint.**

**Issue #8: Explanation of impact SIGURD-RED BUTTE #2 will have on PACE topology**

**Answer: The SIGURD-REDB #2 line is South of the Huntington-Sigurd path and doesn’t help relieve the constraint.**

**Issue #9: Explanation of where bubble UAMPS load in Sanpete County are and what will happen when PacifiCorp “switches” them to be fed from the south?**

**Answer: We will look for collaboration from all NT customers to determine the appropriate bubbles for all Loads and Resources. In this particular instance, the reservation would be PACES-Clover. While sections of the 46 kV line rebuild from Jerusalem to Gunnison are being planned, the full rebuild is long-term and beyond the 10-year planning horizon. Therefore, the load will continue to be served from the north.**

**Issue #10: Explanation of what bubble UAMPS Load/Resources in Southeast Idaho are in a different bubble from NUT.**

**Answer: We will look for collaboration from all NT customers to determine the appropriate bubbles for all Loads and Resources. UAMPS currently has 2 GSHN-PACE reservations (Gem State Hydro AREF 756310 for 22MWs and Horse Butte wind purchase AREF 793681 for 53MWs).**

**Issue #11: Explanation of how “bubbles” are determined, i.e., are there criteria for identifying the duration and severity of a constraint before a “bubble” is identified?**

**Answer: The PacifiCorp East area is a large geographic region in southeast Idaho, Utah and Wyoming. PACE is separated into “load bubbles,” which share similar geography or other unique characteristics, e.g., transmission, etc. The load bubbles are utilized to study and analyze transmission requirements as well as for operational purposes. Some load bubbles are further segmented into sub-bubbles for study purposes. For example, the Wasatch Front is comprised of five sub-bubbles: Ogden, Salt Lake Valley, Utah Valley, Tooele and Park City.**