

Task Force Member Attendance:

Organization	Name
APS	<b>Brandon Holmes</b> Xinyue Fan Narup Akhil Mandadi <b>Tatum Bingham</b>
IPC	<b>Nicole Blackwell</b> Andres Valdepena Delgado Ben Brandt
NVE	<b>Lindsey Schlekeway</b> Rodger Mazano
BPA	<b>Anthony Lusardi</b> Steve Belcoff
Powerex	<b>Michael Goodenough</b> Glen Tang Ryan Holyk
Tacoma	<b>Leah Marquez Glynn</b> Thad LeVar Carly Page Connor Lennon
TEA	<b>Ed Mount</b>
PSE	<b>Sachi Begur</b> Phil Haines <b>Tricia Fischer</b>
PGE	<b>Stefan Cristea</b> Devin Mounts Teyent Gossa

Meeting Agenda

1. Restudy Discussion
  - a. See page 2 for notes
2. Transition Timing
  - a. See page 3 for notes

**WPP forums will not foster or allow communications or practices that violate antitrust laws. Please avoid discussion of topics that would result in anti-competitive behavior, including but not limited to: availability of or terms of services and sales, design of products, price setting, or any other activity that might unreasonably restrain competition.**

### Restudy Options for Discussion

#### 1. Option 1: No restudy

- Binding FSPRM set at 5 years
- Remove idea of restudy – delete new section 4.1 from BPM 101 redlines

#### Key Discussion Points:

- Strong support for long-term certainty and planning stability.
- Avoids confusion created by having advisory metrics alongside binding metrics.
- Reduces operational and governance complexity.
- Participants could still pursue informal/off-process analyses if desired.

#### 2. Option 2: Advisory Restudy (existing proposal language)

- Binding FSPRM set at 5 years
- Restudy metrics calculated only after a Participant exits and threshold of 10% change is met (but takes into account net load changes)
- Restudy metrics are advisory only

#### Key Discussion Points:

- Some value seen in maintaining advisory metrics for risk awareness.
- Concerns raised about awkward situations where advisory PRMs differ from binding PRMs, particularly if advisory PRMs are lower.
- Viewed by several participants as acceptable but not preferred.

#### 3. Option 3: Restudy for joining and exiting, Advisory + encouragement

- Binding FSPRM set at 5 years
- Restudy metrics calculated any time a change in participation meets the threshold of 10% change (Participants exit *or enter*)
- Restudy metrics are advisory only, but included added language (or similar) to BPM 101 redlines:
  - "In the event that the Restudy FSPRM are higher than the binding FSPRM previously approved by the Board of Directors, Participants are strongly encouraged to make all efforts necessary to meet the Restudy FSPRM"

#### Key Discussion Points

- Questions around what "best efforts" or "strongly encouraged" would mean in practice.
- Limited support: concern that added language blurs the line between advisory and binding.

#### 4. Option 4: APS proposal (or variation)

- Binding FSPRM set at 5 years
- Provided in more detail directly from APS
- Restudy metrics calculated any time a change in participation meets the threshold of 10% change (Participants exit *or enter*)

- Restudy metrics are 'binding' but without charges assessed on the higher PRM
  - Additional discussion regarding Ops program implications, etc.
  - Determination of whether participant is still 'in good standing'

Key Discussion Points

- APS emphasized maintaining LOLE integrity and WRAP value.
- Significant concerns raised by others regarding:
  - Operations Program implications (access to pooled capacity without charges).
  - Inconsistency with the goal of long-term certainty.
  - Complexity and lack of tariff framework for this construct.
- Broad concern that this option undermines the task force's original objective.

**5. Task Force Vote**

- Members voted on all four options (yes/no for each).
- Option 1 received the strongest support (8 of 9 entities).
- Option 2 received second strongest support; Options 3 and 4 did not achieve majority support.

Entity	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
APS	No	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
IPC	<b>Yes</b>	No	No	No
NVE	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
BPA	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
Powerex	<b>Yes</b>	No	No	No
Tacoma	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Yes ( <i>not preferred</i> )	No
TEA	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No
PSE	<b>Yes</b>	No	No	No
PGE	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
<b>Total Yes</b>	<b>8</b>	5	2	1

Outcome

- Task Force agreed to proceed with Option 1 (No Restudy).
- WPP to remove all restudy-related language and tables from:
  - Proposal
  - BPM 101 redlines

## 6. Transition Timing

### Proposed Change

- Delay transition to the 5-year-ahead PRM timeline until after full governance approval (PRC, RAPC, Board, and FERC as applicable).
- Begin transition with modeling conducted next year, rather than starting in March 2026.

### Rationale

- Avoids beginning modeling changes before formal approval.
- Prevents the need to redo modeling if the proposal changes during approval.
- Allows incorporation of expected new participants joining in late 2026–2027 into metrics we will use for 2-3 years.
- Provides flexibility to align with outcomes from the Day-Ahead Markets Task Force.

Task Force support for this proposal.

## 7. Next Steps

- WPP to update proposal to reflect removal of restudy provisions (Option 1) and revised transition timing
- Circulating clean version, Redline showing changes from this meeting
- Schedule follow-up Task Force meeting: January 20 (10:00–11:00 AM PT)

## 8. Next Meeting Objectives

- Review final redlines
- Vote to approve Task Force proposal
- Recommend public comment duration to PRC (likely 4–5 weeks, pending schedule alignment)

# Western Resource Adequacy Program

## PRC Task Force - PRM Meeting

December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025; 10am-12pm PPT

Binding Season	Data Collection	FSPRMs Approved	Proxy Used (if applicable)	Notes
<b>Summer 2027</b>	March 1 2025	January 31 2026		Modeling complete
<b>Winter 2027-2028</b>		June 30 2026		Modeling underway using previous methodology
<b>Summer 2028</b>	March 1 2026	January 31 2027		Use previous methodology
<b>Winter 2028-2029</b>		June 30 2027		Use previous methodology
<b>Summer 2029</b>	March 1 2027		Summer 2031	
<b>Winter 2029-2030</b>			Winter 2030-2031	
<b>Summer 2030</b>	March 1 2027		Summer 2031	
<b>Winter 2030-2031</b>		January 31 2028		Use proposed methodology
<b>Summer 2031</b>		June 30 2028		Use proposed methodology
<b>Winter 2031-2032</b>	March 1 2028		Winter 2032-2033	
<b>Summer 2032</b>			Summer 2033	
<b>Winter 2032-2033</b>	March 1 2028	April 19 2029		Use proposed methodology
<b>Summer 2033</b>		October 31 2029		Use proposed methodology
<b>Winter 2033-2034</b>	March 1 2029		Winter 2034-2035	
<b>Summer 2034</b>			Summer 2035	
<b>Winter 2034-2035</b>	March 1 2029	April 19 2030		Use proposed methodology
<b>Summer 2035</b>		October 31 2030		Use proposed methodology
<b>Winter 2035-2036</b>	March 1 2030		Winter 2036-2037	
<b>Summer 2036</b>			Summer 2037	
<b>Winter 2036-2037</b>	March 1 2030	April 19 2031		Use proposed methodology
<b>Summer 2037</b>		October 31 2031		Use proposed methodology
<b>Winter 2037-2038</b>	March 1 2031	April 19 2032		Use proposed methodology
<b>Summer 2038</b>		October 31 2032		Use proposed methodology