



**Southwest Power Pool
MODEL IMPROVEMENT TASK FORCE**

April 5, 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)
Reené Miranda – Southwestern Public Service (SPS)
Dustin Betz – Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD)
Don Taylor – Westar Energy (WERE)

SPP Staff in attendance included Kelsey Allen (Secretary).

The following guests were also in attendance:

Ahmad Sayed – Office of Electric Reliability (OER, FERC)
Mitch Williams – Western Farmers Electric Cooperative (WFEC)

The agenda (**Attachment 1 – MITF Agenda 20100405**) and minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and no changes were made.

Agenda Item 2 – SPP EIS Market Generation:

John Fulton requested at the March 22 meeting that SPP EIS Market Generation be added as a topic of discussion for the MITF. He explained that this relates to the different types of generation with respect to wind and a lack of good identification of these types. Most other generation is assumed to be firm. When we start getting into wind and you have different flavors. Some is long-term firm, some is EIS market (Non-firm), some is QF wind (that the host TO has to take). He said that SPP and its members are doing a good job of planning firm transmission, but we're mixing in non-firm generation, especially with respect to wind in economic studies, which has no right to be dispatched. We need to add better rules for identifying the different wind buckets in order for both staff performing economic studies and the TOs to know what generation is dispatchable.

Kelsey Allen suggested trying to include some sort of modeling ID, as the MDWG has done with load, in order to make these distinctions. Don Taylor quickly questioned this idea, as this is not as simple as load identification. Generators can be a combination of the types described by John.

This topic is mainly an issue of categorization which needs to be added to the strawman. The general question is how should we as planners model or treat the different generation types. Customer owned, behind the meter, generation needs to be added as a bucket to the above discussion.

Agenda Item 3 – MITF Strawman:

Delivery Point Changes and Load Owner Reports

The task force began discussion on item 2.b. of the strawman document. This item is related to the difficulty staff has identifying load on an owner/LSE basis when preparing study models, especially for new transmission service requests to a load owner. Staff has to correct intra-area transfers between host TOs and other LSEs each year and the lack of documentation on delivery point additions, modifications, and abandonment make this task difficult.

Don Taylor noted that Westar Energy has led the charge in insisting that LSE's submit their own data to SPP, acknowledging staff's concern.

This issue is closely related to item 2.a. of the strawman, uniform load modeling. This topic was briefly discussed. Don Taylor advocated that with the "Tie lines and loads" PSS/E solution parameter that was never available in the past, modelers should be able to model load on another modeling area bus without showing a transaction back to the host modeling area, utilizing the load area data type of any specific load. There is disagreement with this method, noted by staff, in that if there is an OASIS representation for any power transfer, there should be a transaction modeled. Staff was tasked with querying all modeling contacts to find out how load is modeled from each modeler across the SPP footprint. The MITF will revisit this topic after this information is received.

Discussion continued on delivery point changes. The overarching question raised by John Fulton is when do you allow new load to go into models? Loads should not be modeled based on speculation. Attachment AQ to the SPP Tariff which will go into affect shortly will address the issue of adding load and identify upgrades associated with new delivery points. John Fulton stated in a discussion with Ed Horgan and Keith Tynes regarding this attachment that the question of when to add new load in the base model set is still not addressed.

New network load is supposed to be listed in Network Integration Transmission Service applications and staff would like to see modeling data (bus numbers and load id's) referenced in that document for verification purposes. Don Taylor said that new load is added to the application without modeling information because at that time the exact bus the load will be served from is still unclear.

Integrity of Forecasted Load Data

Discussion continued with item 2.c. of the strawman. This item is related to discrepancies that exist between load forecasts as they appear in the MDWG load flow models and the data submitted through the EIA-411 process. Don Taylor explained that Westar Energy as one load forecasting department. This group does not have to separate the load from the losses as done in the modeling process. Westar planning staff has to scale load numbers so that load + losses = load as reported.

John Fulton explained that SPS has multiple forecasts per year which creates a timing problem for load submission into the different processes. EIA-411 also doesn't have the granularity it should (by LSE), being built more like an EMS system than planning. He

said that the EIA-411 is a data vehicle and should not be used for verification of the models.

MDWG Transaction Improvement

Discussion continued with item 3.a. of the strawman. This item is related to the lack of connectivity between the MDWG transaction schedules and SPP OASIS transaction reservations. Staff explained the amount of work required to verify the MDWG projected schedules and the corrections needed to build a base model for STEP reliability, transmission service, and generation interconnection studies. Non-firm and exploratory and proposed transactions above reserved amounts are adjusted or removed in developing the STEP models. The practice of netting transactions with the same source and sink make it difficult for staff to verify against OASIS reservation amounts. Staff was tasked with querying all modeling contacts to find out their own use of OASIS data in developing MDWG transactions and the work involved with helping staff correlate the data sources.

John Fulton stated that the MDWG allows fictitious transfers for shortfall. Staff removes these transactions in to start, along with other corrections, and shortfall transactions may be added back to the models following a uniform process for the SPP footprint as a whole. Don Taylor expressed concern with the transfers in the models, suggesting adding fictitious generation, not fictitious transfers.

Agenda Item 4 – Other:

No other topics were discussed.

Agenda Item 5 - Closing Administrative Duties:

Adjourn Meeting

The MITF meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelsey Allen
MITF Secretary