



Minutes for Generating Resources Advisory Committee May 7, 2026

Annika Roberts, NWPPCC, began the meeting at 9:00am. Chad Madron, NWPPCC, explained how to best interact with the Zoom Webinar platform. Joe Walderman, NWPPCC, took roll call.

Ninth Plan Capital Expansion Modeling Results: Supply-Side Resources

Aliza Seelig, PNUCC, asked where the model is building stand-alone batteries [Slide 18]. Jennifer Light, NWPPCC, answered that the first tranche of stand-alone batteries are the planned batteries and show up in a few zones. She offered to follow up on builds that happen later.

Seelig asked if hybrid batteries are not allowed to charge from market and can only use the renewable source. Roberts thought so. Seelig said she is trying to understand the difference between the technologies and if that is how utilities think about them too, confirming that the model does not have to choose them even if the resources are planned. Roberts answered yes. Light added that this happens with other planned resources as well, even though in most cases most are selected.

Jim Lazar, independent, asked if the model has visibility into batteries being built for distribution support and transmission avoidance. He pointed to three sites proposed in his community for this use. Roberts said the resources must be larger than one MW and in the existing system to be included. Light said the batteries get a T&D deferral credit.

Lazar noted that the model only has a small amount of traditional geothermal available to it before pointing to Fervo and enhanced geothermal [Slide 24]. He asked if there is any sensitivity that captures this resource. Roberts said enhanced geothermal sits in emerging tech and is characterized as a clean baseload proxy.

Lazar confirmed that there is no wind-plus-storage resource [Slide 27]. Roberts confirmed.

Seelig asked why there are so many emerging tech builds [Slide 28]. Roberts said they are the greatest number of renewable builds. Seelig confirmed that they are available but at a high cost. Light added that this sensitivity stays at the 3000MW level of gas because it is trying to meet clean policies.

Carla Essenberg, BPA, questioned seeing the same amount of wind built in every zone, wondering if it is a modeling artifact [Slide 31]. Roberts confirmed that is a modeling artifact.

Seelig wondered about this as related to the transmission cost assumption, saying it's not that high. Roberts said the interconnection-type transmission costs are the same across all resources.

Seelig confirmed that wind is built for energy and not resource adequacy. Roberts said yes. Seelig asked if this competes with conservation. Roberts said yes, renewables often do as their costs come down.

Seelig asked if the wind builds are pushing out conservation, and what happens if the region can't build all this wind at this cost. Light said there are a lot of options and costs of conservation but buying up the stack is more expensive, at a levelized cost, than buying renewables. Light said they both provide energy, while conservation lowers the load and helps with the resource adequacy.

Seelig said Essenberg's comment made her think all the zones need energy. Light said conservation meets load in a specific area while wind and other resources can move to other places. Roberts added that wind is not available in every zone while conservation is.

Lazar called these numbers small compared to the 100,000MW of wind in the interconnection queue. He asked why the model is buying so little. Roberts said lots of resources in the queue do not get built, especially renewables.

Lazar confirmed the model is buying this out of a much larger available pool. Roberts said wind's availability is set by a zone's transmission availability.

Seelig wrote in the question pane; I'm noticing in the wind slide (31) that the regions where wind is built is not the same in each sensitivity.

Lazar said there are Utah data centers that will be built with reciprocating gas and not turbines [Slide 36]. He asked if reciprocating units are available to the model but is it choosing simple-cycle turbines on economics. Roberts said reciprocating units are available adding that they are more efficient, more flexible, and more expensive.

Seelig referenced clean baseload coming in when plants are retired [Slide 43] asking if staff retired I-5 corridor gas plants in 2046. Light answered that only Centralia 2 has been announced. Seelig confirmed that existing Washington plants will not be removed unless specifically announced. Roberts answered yes.

Seelig said she would not use the Needed Future Resources compared to the Plan builds slide, suggesting only using committed resources as these are not real [Slide 49]. Roberts called that a good caveat assuring her that this is meant only for comparison.

Seelig asked if this is the most recent NFR. Roberts answered yes. Seelig urged staff not to use this chart outside of this committee. Roberts said this is only for the GRAC.

Seelig hoped the utilities would speak up more [Slide 47]. She reported that adding resources to the winter need is challenging. Seelig also reported that while firm capacity has been reduced and has been hard to replace in the NW Regional Forecast. She said while there are prospective announced resources there is still a large gap to fill. Seelig cautioned that the practical reality of what utilities can acquire is different than the strategy and the low hanging fruit is getting harder to get considering transmission constraints.

Ian McGetrick, Idaho Power, approved of showing an unrealistic build because everyone is seeing this. He thought this was good reinforcement to help regulators and policy makers see the need is real. McGetrick said his utility has an RFP out for 2031/32 resources in an attempt to get ahead of the issue.

Lazar predicted that the Fervo Energy could be ten times the geographic area shown in this work. He noted that transmission reconductoring could significantly change availability, acknowledging that it is an expensive strategy.

Lazar thought adding wind plus storage may prove attractive to manage limited transmission excess in the short run.

Lazar asked for a study of local storage that provides energy arbitrage opportunities and transmission/distribution avoidance. He said these four things are not reflected in this build, but they could change quickly in the context of a 20-year Plan. Roberts said these suggestions are all on staff's radar for recommendations.

Seelig asked if there will be more meetings with Council after next week's meeting [Slide 54]. Roberts answered yes, this is a start of the discussion. Light added that there are dates in late May while June should transition into putting this down in chapters. Light said this means staff are about 90% into locking numbers in for the July Draft Plan. Seelig called this helpful.

Roberts ended the meeting at 10:30.

Craig Patterson, independent, posed many questions in the Q&A pane:

- Do you have any idea what wholesale KWH will cost then? Light answered: This analysis has focused on the buildout and cost of buildout, but not on the retail costs at this time.
- And how will that affect consumption?
- How do you factor historical experience (WPPSS) into your modeling efforts? Light answered: The Council developed a wide range forecast of load to account for uncertainty around future load growth. The Council will be working to develop a strategy that ensures adequacy, while avoiding potential overbuilding.
- What accounts for the radical differences projecting forward?

Attendees via Zoom Webinar

Annika Roberts	NWPCC	Joe Walderman	NWPCC
Kevin Smit	NWPCC	Kaitryn Olson	Puget Sound Energy
Jennifer Light	NWPCC	Esther Neuls	BPA

Ian McGetrick	Idaho Power
Robert Hughes	Avista Corp
Quinn Weber	WA UTC
Andrea Talty	Puget Sound Energy
Alexandra Carpoff	Puget Sound Energy
Jim Lazar	independent
John Purvis	Clallam PUD
Carla Essenberg	BPA
John Lyons	Avista Corp
Trais Nelson	WPUDA
Steven Simmons	NWPCC
Elizabeth Osborne	NWPCC
Lisa Stites	Grant County PUD
Aliza Seelig	PNUCC
Shannon Souza	Sol Coast Consulting
Eric Graessley	BPA
Joni Sliger	ODOE
Ryan Bottem	Pub Gen Pool
Michael Deen	N. Wasco County PUD
Jared Hansen	Idaho Power
Nora Hawkins	WA Dept of Com
Brian Dekiep	NWPCC
Craig Patterson	independent