



**Southwest Power Pool
MODEL IMPROVEMENT TASK FORCE
March 22, 2010
Teleconference
1:30 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.**

• A G E N D A •

- 1. Administrative Travis Hyde
 - a. Call to order
 - b. Approve agenda
 - c. Approve previous meeting minutes

- 2. MITF Strawman All

- 3. Other All

- 4. Closing Administrative Duties..... Travis Hyde
 - a. Adjourn meeting



**Southwest Power Pool
MODEL IMPROVEMENT TASK FORCE**

March 22, 2010

1:30 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.

Teleconference

• M I N U T E S •

Agenda Item 1 - Administrative Items

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. The following Model Improvement Task Force (MITF) members were in attendance:

Travis Hyde, Chair – Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OGE)
John Fulton – Southwestern Public Service (SPS)
Mike Clifton – Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OGE)
Reen  Miranda – Southwestern Public Service (SPS)
Dustin Betz – Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD)

SPP Staff in attendance included Kelsey Allen (Secretary), Chris Jamieson, and Bob Lux.

The following guests were also in attendance:

Mitch Williams – Western Farmers Electric Cooperative (WFEC)

The agenda (**Attachment 1 – MITF Agenda 20100322**) and minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and no changes were made.

Agenda Item 2 – MITF Strawman:

LSE's That Cannot Meet Their Load

The task force began discussion on item 1.b. of the strawman document and quickly widened it to the process of modeling new generation and transmission projects. Reen  Miranda expressed that the MDWG should only include transmission projects in the models which the transmission owner has a firm commitment to build. Staff agreed with this philosophy and has done its best in the past to enforce this when developing the STEP reliability base models. This concept includes projects that have been issued an NTC by SPP or have been budgeted by the transmission owner. The MDWG approved MOD (Model On Demand) Type/Status matrix allows for identification of projects that are planned, proposed, and exploratory in a manner aligned with SPP Tariff processes.

John Fulton stated there should be a planned, proposed, and exploratory concept for generation. Staff is concerned about adding any generation to the base models that does not have an IA (interconnection agreement) or transmission service and the current practice of including only generators that meet these criteria is a way to hedge the risk of generation projects falling through. John Fulton stated that the fictitious transfers modeled to meet demand when an LSE is short of generation is just as bad as including proposed or exploratory generation.

Discussion continued on developing rules for when it is appropriate to model future generation. The current process dictates that new generation will not be modeled unless it has an IA and won't be dispatched unless it has transmission service. Exceptions are made for generation with a Transmission Service Request currently in study. John Fulton suggested allowing generation with a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) to be dispatched, as a PPA may exist before an IA. The question was raised about also including generation with an Interim IA. John Fulton argued that this requirement should be based on a financial milestone, as a GI customer can put a project on suspension even a year after an IA is signed. He said that these concepts need to be applied at the MDWG level and carried forward, adding that SPP needs to be able to adjust in order to respond well to the needs of different members.

Coordination Between G.I. & Model Building

Discussion continued with item 1.c. of the strawman. This item is related to the lack of a defined process for staff to utilize all of the information available from the Generation Interconnection group in the MDWG model development process. A bigger issue is the lack of data, especially related to dynamics, that even GI staff struggles to obtain. Reené Miranda stated that SPP needs to collect dynamics data for all generation and needs to receive equivalence modeling data from GI customers. John Fulton stated the major hurdle is that many of the GI customers are not SPP members and thus the only requirement currently in place, as a part of the IA, is for the generation owner to provide actual data within 6 months of the units being built. Kelsey Allen said that he is currently working with Juliano Freitas of the GI staff and Scott Jordan, who is heading up dynamics studies, to try and identify the deficiencies in these data and brainstorm on ways to fill in the gaps.

Uniform Generation Modeling

Discussion continued with item 1.d. of the strawman. This item is related to the discrepancies in data from the various sources (EIA-411, Network Integration Transmission Service Applications, and modeling data provided by the MDWG modeling contacts) available to staff and the need to cross reference and ultimately reconcile the differences, as well as certain practices that differ between members. This topic is closely related to the dispatch order coordination topic (specifically the request being developed by staff) request previously discussed by the task force and may be addressed through staff's work to compile the different data into a central location.

Joint-Owned Unit Coordination and Reports

Discussion continued with item 1.e. of the strawman. Chris Jamieson explained that the information staff receives for joint-owned units is simply a generation output value and that it is hard to tell who is using the power. Staff needs to be able to see both inter-area and intra-area transactions that represent the modeling of that dispatched power. This is closely related to other topics and the broader issue of data being imbedded in the load flow models without supplemental reports to help decipher it.

Uniform Load Modeling

Discussion continued with item 2.a. of the strawman. This item is related to the varying practices of load modeling and the need for a process that is consistent across the SPP footprint. One of the major concerns is the practice of pseudo-tie load modeling. Load owned by LSE's that have load in other modeling areas is currently being modeled three different ways: creating a fictitious bus assigned to the host modeling area with zero impedance line tied to the actual load bus, modeling load at the actual load bus and assigning the load area to the host modeling area in order for the host generation to



serve the load, and modeling load at the actual bus with only ownership assigned to an LSE with a transaction modeled from the host modeling area serving the load. Staff believes that modeling load needs to follow the last method, similar to the Remote Generation Modeling Procedure of the MDWG manual.

John Fulton asked the meeting participants if there is a NERC Tag for all load modeled in other areas and stated that the planning models need to reflect the operating world with respect to load modeling. John also raised the question of how new Delivery Point Requests are handled with respect to the models and when and how the get put in, adding to this the differences when related to non-SPP Tariff members.

Agenda Item 3 – Other:

John Fulton requested that SPP EIS Market Generation be added as a topic to be discussed.

Agenda Item 4 - Closing Administrative Duties:

Adjourn Meeting

The MITF meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelsey Allen
MITF Secretary