



**Southwest Power Pool
MODEL IMPROVEMENT TASK FORCE
June 28, 2010
Teleconference
1:30 P.M. – 3:00 P.M.**

• A G E N D A •

- 1. Administrative Travis Hyde
 - a. Review agenda
 - b. Review previous meeting minutes

- 2. MITF Strawman/Whitepaper..... All

- 3. Other All

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



**Southwest Power Pool
MODEL IMPROVEMENT TASK FORCE**

June 28, 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 – Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OGE)
Mike Clifton – Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OGE)
Don Taylor – Westar Energy (WERE)
John Fulton – Southwestern Public Service (SPS)
Reené Miranda – Southwestern Public Service (SPS)
Dustin Betz – Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD)

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

The following guests were also in attendance:

Jim McAvoy – Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority (OMPA)

The agenda (**Attachment 1 – MITF Agenda 2010628**) stands.

Agenda Item 2 – MITF Strawman/Whitepaper:

The group continued to re-hash some of the issues that prompted conflicting comments on during preliminary discussion.

Item 4.c. of the MITF strawman document covers modeling projects in MOD before the RTO determined need date. SPP staff would like to implement a requirement such that transmission projects that have received an NTC through an SPP study process are modeled no earlier than the RTO determined need date. Previous conflicting comments included that faster study cycles or updated work schedules from TOs may dictate updated need dates or in-service date. When discussed again, a simple majority of the group had no issues with implementing SPP's suggested requirement and some agreed that this would help protect against selling transmission service on ATC that doesn't exist due to a delayed project.

Item 4.d. of the strawman addresses the modeling of new generation and transmission projects. The group had previously discussed modeling only transmission projects

which have either received an NTC or been budgeted by the transmission owner. This is currently one of the major differences between the MDWG models and the STEP base models. There was no argument that this transmission project criterion could potentially be included at the MDWG level, but the discussion quickly turned to generation. It was pointed out that the other major differences between the MDWG and STEP models are the scenarios developed for the STEP and the generation dispatch. The major issue is the requirements imposed by SPP staff to include new generation in the STEP models, especially in situations of generation deficiency. Kelsey Allen urged the group to look to the new 6-point rule set being developed by SPP staff and the TWG and consider getting involved in its development and including those requirements at the MDWG level. John Fulton stressed that not only is the rule set being developed still too restrictive when considered each LSE's resource plan but that everyone should look to the ITP to see how any rule set developed will change.

Item 1.a. of the strawman covers dispatch order coordination and expansion which would be a precursor to implementing the automated dispatch process used by SPP staff for the STEP at the MDWG level. The group previously was very hesitant to the idea of letting SPP dispatch the models but agreed that some work could be done to help develop the current process more and re-consider its implementation at the MDWG level in the future. Kelsey Allen stressed that SPP and its members need to consider that the current MDWG process will have to be changed when the day-ahead market is implemented and SPP becomes a single balancing authority, arguing that the current automated process used for the STEP would be a good first step. Don Taylor argued that dispatching as a consolidated balancing authority will be done in the operations environment but that the planning environment would not change. If a consolidated dispatch was used in the planning environment then there is no question that assumptions on market and fuel pricing would be made that may not be true in a long-term model. SPP staff disagrees that the system will not be dispatched as a single BA for planning studies when the day-ahead market is implemented and argued that this is something we all need to start considering.

Kelsey Allen asked the group for some preliminary comments on a potential solution to SPP's concern regarding the integrity of forecasted load data addressed in item 2.c. SPP has asked for a load forecasting tool which is currently included in the budget for 2011. Don Taylor commented that SPP would need more staff to take over load forecasting. He also expressed concern about SPP undertaking this process, explaining that the Westar process is blessed by Kansas state regulators and that SPP staff would have to be prepared to explain their process carefully and stand behind anything they implement. Travis Hyde reiterated Don's concerns, adding that load forecasting is very sophisticated, extensive, and detailed. John Fulton argued that this is a complete non-starter and suggested that the Bandwidth Working Group be resurrected to discuss how much of an issue SPP's concern about load forecasts really is and if it's worth the money to address. Dustin Betz shared similar concerns with the previous comments.

Item 5.b. of the strawman covers auxiliary files coordination and expansion. The group previously agreed that the contingency and other supplemental files implemented during contingency analysis should be maintained by the MDWG but there were still a few different options being considered as to the format of the contingency file. After further discussion the group agreed that the contingency file should be supplemental to the



automated single line outage function in PSS/E and should not be a seasonal file as long as a good system is developed to track contingencies that change due to topology changes throughout the planning horizon.

Agenda Item 3 – Other:

No other topics were discussed.

Agenda Item 4 - Closing Administrative Duties:

Adjourn Meeting

The MITF meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelsey Allen
MITF Secretary