

REQUESTOR NAME: **BCOAPO**
INFORMATION REQUEST ROUND NO: **1**
TO: **BRITISH COLUMBIA HYDRO & POWER
AUTHORITY**
DATE: **December 1, 2017**
PROJECT NO: **1598931**
APPLICATION NAME: **DYNAMIC SCHEDULING AMENDMENTS
APPLICATION**

1.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 1 and 5

Preamble: The Application (page 1) states: "Dynamic scheduling under Attachment Q-1 was designed in 2005 to facilitate dynamic scheduling to the California Independent System Operator (CAISO)."

- 1.1 Please outline the extent to which transmission customers of BC Hydro have made use of "dynamic scheduling" up to this point in time.
- 1.2 Have any transmission customers, other than Powerex, made use of "dynamic scheduling" to date?
- 1.3 What has been the BC Hydro's historic annual revenue under the OATT attributable to dynamic scheduling?

2.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 10

Preamble: The Application states: "To facilitate Powerex's participation in the EIM, Powerex has requested that BC Hydro evaluate the expanded use of dynamic scheduling on imports and on all transmission reservations, including Firm Service, Non-Firm Service and Network Economy Service."

- 2.1 Will Powerex's participation in EIM have any impact on Powerex's sale of power to or purchase of power from BC Hydro? If so, what is the anticipated impact, both operationally and financially, on BC Hydro?

3.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 10

Preamble: The Application states: "BC Hydro has considered Powerex's request, and concluded that there is no valid reason to restrict dynamic scheduling to exports on Firm Service."

- 3.1 What factors did BC Hydro consider in evaluating Powerex's request?
- 3.2 If there is a documentation regarding the evaluation of Powerex's request please provide.
- 3.3 What are the impacts on BC Hydro (both financial and operational) of expanding the use of dynamic scheduling?

- 3.3.1 Please comment specifically on the impacts that expanding dynamic scheduling will have on BC Hydro's revenues and costs in F2019.

4.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 21 and 23-24

Preamble: The Application states: "Network Economy Service reservations have a higher priority than Non-Firm Service reservations provided the economic test and utilization test criteria are passed."

- 4.1 Would the "economic test" now also be applicable in situations where Network Economy Service was being reserved for dynamic scheduling?
 - 4.1.1 If not, please explain why.
 - 4.1.2 If yes, please explain how the economic test would be applied and under what conditions would it be considered "satisfied".
- 4.2 Must the utilization be 100% in order for the utilization test to be satisfied?
- 4.3 With respect to Figure 5.1, would the amount paid by the transmission customer under the OATT be the same under all three examples?
 - 4.3.1 If not, why not and why is this appropriate?

5.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, pages 25-26

- 5.1 Please confirm that the \$250,000 cost referenced on page 25 is incremental to the \$300,000 noted on page 26?
- 5.2 Does the \$300,000 include the cost of the consultation process and the current proceeding? If not, what is the expected cost of these activities?
- 5.3 Will the \$300,000 in costs be eventually offset by increased incremental revenues (net of any incremental costs) to BC Hydro as a result of offering dynamic scheduling and, if so, what period of time will be required for this to occur?

6.0 Reference: Exhibit B-1, page 26

Preamble: The Application states: "Due to the expedited timeline required to implement dynamic scheduling to facilitate Powerex's participation in the EIM, the implementation costs will be recovered from Powerex".

- 6.1 Please confirm that Powerex's net income will be impacted as a result of it paying the implementation costs.
- 6.2 If confirmed, will this have an impact on the Powerex net income attributable to BC Hydro and, subsequently, BC Hydro's future revenue requirements?
 - 6.2.1 If yes, what is the anticipated impact?