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Two-Phased Approach

**Near-term Analysis**
- Analyze changes from today’s bilateral market
- Analyze the impact of depancaking the transmission charges
- Analyze the impact of going to a full Day-2 Nodal Market

**Longer-term Analysis**
- Focus on how changes in the market may affect Mountain West Group and each utility
- Analyze future scenarios for Mountain West in a market situation
### Simulation Using Production Cost Model

#### Scope of Production Cost Simulations
(without forecast errors, renewable uncertainty, real-time outages, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day-Ahead Unit Commitment</th>
<th>Day-Ahead Market Dispatch</th>
<th>Intra-Day Adjustments</th>
<th>Real-Time Market Dispatch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-pancaked transmission &amp; scheduling charges</td>
<td>De-pancaked transmission &amp; scheduling charges</td>
<td>De-pancaked transmission &amp; scheduling charges</td>
<td>De-pancaked transmission &amp; scheduling charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full grid utilization</td>
<td>Full grid utilization</td>
<td>Full grid utilization</td>
<td>Full grid utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating reserves</td>
<td>Operating reserves</td>
<td>Reduced operating reserves</td>
<td>Reduced operating reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally optimized unit commitment</td>
<td>Regionally optimized unit dispatch</td>
<td>Adjusted unit commitment and real-time bids</td>
<td>Regionally optimized unit dispatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced additional commitment hurdle</td>
<td>Avoided bilateral transaction cost</td>
<td>Avoided bilateral transaction cost</td>
<td>Avoided bilateral transaction cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced A/S needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved uncertainties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steps for Phase I (Near Term Analysis)

1. Define the Mountain West region in detail under current bilateral market
2. Simulate region with bilateral trading
3. Benchmark against prices at major and regional trading hubs
4. Measure the impact of depancaking and going to market
5. Analyze the potential benefits for each utility and Mountain West
Detailed Mountain West Representation

Created utility-level areas from the PSCO & WACM BAs:

- Created load areas by mapping load buses to utility
- Mapped generation units by ownership and contract
- Identified connections to simulate transfer capabilities across utilities within the Mountain West Group
- Built in bilateral trading capabilities between Mountain West utilities
- Assigned transmission wheeling rates based on OATTs
WECC BAs and Contract Paths / Mountain West

U.S. electricity balancing authorities in the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) electric reliability region as of June 30, 2014.
Near-Term (2016) Analysis

- **Status quo**
  - Modeled existing transmission charges within Mountain West, applied hurdle rates to simulate bilateral transactions across areas, realistic path ratings
  - Created utility-level areas and physical/contractual links to simulate the pancaked transmission charges

- **Joint Transmission Tariff**
  - No transmission charges between Mountain West utilities
  - Full “interconnectedness” within Mountain West region, increased path ratings
  - Maintain other bilateral trading hurdle rates

- **Regional market**
  - Joint unit commitment and dispatch, joint operating reserves, removes remaining bilateral hurdles within Mountain West footprint, full WECC path ratings
  - Removed must-run requirement
  - Keep the rest of WECC as it is today by maintaining transmission hurdle rates (and unit commitment and dispatch hurdle rates) between balancing areas
Experience from Other Regional Markets

- Most studies of regional market benefits show production cost savings of 2-8%
  - After-the-fact studies uniformly show higher benefits than prospective studies
    - SPP: 3.2% from full EIS; 8% from full Day-2 market
    - MISO: 1.4% from Day-1; 4% from full Day-2 market

- In addition to production cost savings, studies show regional markets also reduce investment costs, roughly doubling benefits
  - Reduced need for resource adequacy capacity
  - Improved access to lower-cost renewable resources and reduced the investment costs of meeting RPS goals
  - Reduced need for and cost of balancing resources to address variable renewable generation output
Metrics for Near-Term Analysis

Generation Dispatch and Locational Prices at Gen Buses
- Unit hourly generation, bus price, annual cost and emissions statistics

Transmission Flow and Congestion
- Bus prices at key locations and trading hubs
- Flows and congestion costs on Mountain West paths

Mountain West Regional Data
- Hourly load-weighted price for areas
- Hourly flows between other areas

Simplified Cost Impact calculation
- “Adjusted Production Costs” (APC) = variable generation costs, plus cost of net purchases (at load area price), less revenues of off-system sales (at gen-weighted price for area)
Steps for Phase II

1. Qualitatively describe future scenarios to analyze; Prioritize scenarios to analyze

2. Simulate region under “Current Trends” future under current bilateral market versus Day-2 market

3. Simulate a select few future scenarios under Day-2 market

4. Assess the impact of regional policy, resource mix and transmission changes on Mountain West

5. Analyze the potential benefits for Mountain West and each utility
Progress on Analysis

Current status

- Provided Mountain West group the regional results
- Provided individual utilities results
- Completing Phase I results reporting
- Began Phase II definition of future scenarios

Next Steps

- Defining assumptions to simulate a limited number of future scenarios (internally consistent futures, not just sensitivity analyses)
- The scenarios include:
  - Current Trends
  - Carbon Constrained Future
  - High Gas Price
  - Stress Case: High Gas, High Load, Low Hydro Future
Appendix
Limitations of Production Cost Simulations

The production cost simulations are limited in capturing some impacts of regional market operations (which yields a conservative estimate of benefits)

1. Simulated only “normal” weather, hydro, and loads for entire WECC
2. No transmission outages or operational de-rates; no extended generation outages
3. No unusual/challenging market conditions
4. No improved regional optimization of hydro resources (almost identical hydro dispatch in all cases)
5. Assumed perfectly competitive bidding behavior (does not capture competitive benefits)
6. Did not simulate benefit of regional market operations in addressing uncertainties in real-time load and renewable generation
7. Many contracts (such as coal and intertie contracts) are not explicitly modeled
8. Used only “generic” TEPPC and plant and fuel cost assumptions for rest of WECC, which understate the true variance in plant efficiencies and fuel costs
9. Assumed all BAs in WECC already utilize an ISO-like optimized security-constrained economic unit commitment and dispatch even today
10. Derated transmission paths in rest of WECC (by 10%), but did not simulate scheduling constraints that limit transmission availability below actual physical constraints
11. Other than for hurdle rates and reduced path ratings, simulations do not capture inefficiency of bilateral trading blocks (25 MW 6x16 HLH vs. LLH), contract path scheduling, and unscheduled flows
# Transmission Costs and Interties Between Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Wheeling Rate</th>
<th>Combined Administrative, Trading, and Commitment Hurdle</th>
<th>Area Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status Quo</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source Outside Mountain West</strong>: Off-peak export hurdle rate. <strong>Source Inside Mountain West</strong>: Average of on- and off-peak export hurdle rates</td>
<td><strong>Source Outside Mountain West</strong>: <strong>Source Inside Mountain West</strong>: $6/MWh commitment adder, $2/MWh dispatch adder</td>
<td>Base case assumptions provided by Mountain West constituent areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Joint Tariff**| **Source Outside Mountain West**: Same as Status Quo **Export From Mountain West**: Average of each area’s on- and off-peak export hurdle rates, weighted by the area’s ATRR **Intra-Mountain West Connections**: No hurdle | **Source Outside Mountain West**: Same as Status Quo **Export From Mountain West**: $8/MWh commitment adder, $4/MWh dispatch adder **Intra-Mountain West Connections**: $7/MWh commitment adder, $3/MWh dispatch adder | • Unlimited connections added between all areas within Mountain West  
• Any external area which connected to at least one area in Status Quo now connects to all constituent areas  
• All de-hurdled external connections maintained |
| **Regional Market** | Same as Joint Tariff | **Source Outside Mountain West**: Same as Status Quo **Export From Mountain West**: Same as Joint Tariff **Intra-Mountain West Connections**: No adders | Same as Joint Tariff |
Existing Transmission Contracts

Existing transmission contracts modeled as wheeling-free trading connections

- Mountain West Group provided information on long-term transmission contracts
- Certain trading relationships defined in the model based on this information
  - These relationships have no wheeling fees
- Conversations with each entity to confirmed these arrangements

To simulate depancaked transmission, intra-Mountain West trading is simulated without transmission wheeling charges

The contract path “layer” is separate from the physical capability of system:

- Independently of transmission contracts and bilateral schedules, the model monitors actual physical power resulting from generation dispatch and enforces physical transmission limits (path ratings)
## Review of Assumptions for Each Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Transmission Fees</th>
<th>Wheeling Rates</th>
<th>Path Limits</th>
<th>Must Run</th>
<th>Reserves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status Quo</strong></td>
<td>Trading margin, administrative fee, commitment and dispatch adders</td>
<td>Individual areas assess individual rates</td>
<td>Path limits restricted based on conversation with the group.</td>
<td>Several large units set as Must Run to mimic reported operation levels</td>
<td>Individual requirements assessed on individual areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Tariff</strong></td>
<td>Remove $1/MWh administrative fee within Mountain West</td>
<td>No wheeling rates within Mountain West, individual rates averaged by ATRR for external hurdle</td>
<td>Path limits increased, but below WECC limits</td>
<td>Must Run status maintained to replicate existing bilateral market</td>
<td>Same as Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Market</strong></td>
<td>No fees within Mountain West</td>
<td>Same as Joint Tariff</td>
<td>Path limits increased to WECC limits</td>
<td>No must run units in the Mountain West</td>
<td>Reserves are pooled across Mountain West and provided by the most economic units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Benefits Estimated in Other Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Benefit</th>
<th>Estimated Savings as % of Total Production Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings Captured by Real-Time Energy Imbalance Markets (similar to EIM)</td>
<td>0.1% – 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Production Cost Savings Estimated by Prospective Studies</td>
<td>0.9% – 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Production Cost Savings Estimated by Prospective Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>1% – 3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Efficiency and Availability Improvement</td>
<td>2% – 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Real-Time Savings (Considering Daily Uncertainties)</td>
<td>1% – 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Operational Savings with High Renewables (experience to date)</td>
<td>0.1% – 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Production Cost Savings Estimated by Some Studies</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1% – 6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Diversity Benefits (Generation Investment Cost Savings)</td>
<td>1% – 1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Capacity Cost Savings (experience to date)</td>
<td>1% – 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investment Cost Savings</strong></td>
<td><strong>2% – 5.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expressed as Equivalent to % of Production Costs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings as Share of Total Production Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>6% – 13%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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About The Brattle Group

The Brattle Group provides consulting and expert testimony in economics, finance, and regulation to corporations, law firms, and governmental agencies worldwide.

We combine in-depth industry experience and rigorous analyses to help clients answer complex economic and financial questions in litigation and regulation, develop strategies for changing markets, and make critical business decisions.

Our services to the electric power industry include:

- Climate Change Policy and Planning
- Cost of Capital
- Demand Forecasting Methodology
- Demand Response and Energy Efficiency
- Electricity Market Modeling
- Energy Asset Valuation
- Energy Contract Litigation
- Environmental Compliance
- Fuel and Power Procurement
- Incentive Regulation
- Rate Design and Cost Allocation
- Regulatory Strategy and Litigation Support
- Renewables
- Resource Planning
- Retail Access and Restructuring
- Risk Management
- Market-Based Rates
- Market Design and Competitive Analysis
- Mergers and Acquisitions
- Transmission