



**Southwest Power Pool  
OPERATING RELIABILITY WORKING GROUP MEETING  
TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP MEETING  
May 13, 2010  
Amarillo, TX**

**• M I N U T E S •**

The meeting between ORWG and TWG was called to order at 8 a.m. on May 13, 2010.

**Agenda Item 11 – Developing new Standards (Greg Sorenson)**

Greg reviewed his PowerPoint presentation. The concept of unofficial comment period was unfamiliar; Greg responded that during this time, the comments do not become part of the record.

**Agenda Item 12 - Flowgate/TRM Reviews 2010 (Market Sensitive Information)(Bob Lux)**

Market participants left the room and the phone for this discussion.

Bob Lux described the annual flowgate process. Once Bob determined flowgate candidates and removals through the process, SPP Operations provided comments on all candidates and showed the TLR records over the last 3 years for removal candidates. The list was sent to the TWG for review.

**New Flowgate Candidate**

The TWG and ORWG discussed the candidates for addition to the permanent flowgate list. After making a few changes and verifying several comments, the TWG was ready to approve the flowgate additions. Motion to approve addition of elements made by Harold Wyble and seconded by Don Taylor. The motion passed unanimously by TWG. ORWG does not normally approve the flowgates, as review is sufficient. Jim U. stated no more comments offered by the ORWG for additions.

**Removal Candidate**

The TWG and ORWG discussed the candidates for removal from the permanent flowgate list. After discussing the candidates and making several recommendations, the TWG voted on the removal flowgate candidates. Motion to approve removal of elements made by Don Taylor and seconded by Harold Wyble. The motion passed unanimously by TWG.

Jason Smith's team calculates the TRM values, please let him know if there are errors in the 2010 TRM calculations.

**Agenda Item 13 - PRC-023-1 Definition of critical facilities by the Planning Coordinator**

A comment from the ORWG meeting, PRC-023 has been approved, the standard contains a reference to the Planning Coordinator having a defined list of 100 – 200 kV critical facilities. FAC-003 introduced a similar problem last year with vegetation management. "Critical Facilities" were referenced in the SPP Criteria but were not the same as would be needed for FAC-003. This led to ORWG discussion with the RE, and ORWG defining the critical facilities between 100 – 200 kV for FAC-003 as only those that are part of an IROL flowgate. The ORWG recommends the Planning Coordinator use the same list for the PRC-023 standard. The definition of "critical facilities" for FAC-003 is in Criteria 5 currently, 5.2.1.2. OPS1 contains the list of FAC-003 defined critical facilities.

Jason Smith recommends adding a similar definition to the Criteria for PRC-023. Noman Williams asked if the ORWG was recommending this same ORWG definition as the definition for PRC-023; Jason responded that since this is for the Planning Coordinator, the TWG should probably address this. Allen Klassen added that the definition could also state that there are no 100-200 kV critical facilities; however, the definition needs to be captured.

Staff (Jason S. and Rachel) will work to draft language for proposal of inclusion of PRC-023 in the Criteria. Based on general discussion, the groups are looking for consistency in the language between ORWG's definition and TWG's definition.

**Agenda Item 14 - Criteria 12 – Appendix A/6 reference (Jason Smith)**

SPP Criteria references an Appendix A, which is part of Appendix 6. Don Taylor stated that the appendices are listed as A – x within Appendix 6. The recommendation is to clean up the Appendix 6 references in Criteria and Appendix 6 titles (e.g., Appendix 6.A, 6.B, etc.).

**Agenda Item 15 - Criteria 12 – Facility Rating Methodology (Jason Smith)**

FAC-008 standard was displayed on screen. SPP Criteria 12 is referenced as the document for facility rating methodology. Jason Smith is concerned that these two documents have not been reviewed for consistency. Don Taylor pointed out that Criteria 12 pre-dates the standards.

Operationally, SPP has a dynamic short term rating on the facility; others provide the same rating for short-term, long-term and emergency. The ORWG would like to request a review of Criteria 12 by the TWG.

The SPP RC will turn a facility into a flowgate and an SOL on an as needed basis. It is a hindrance for the RC to coordinate with the SPP planning models long-term emergency rating, Rate B, and the member to determine the acceptable 30 minute rating. Since normal and emergency ratings are not defined on the same basis for all entities, Jason is concerned about the inconsistency between entities' facility rating methodology, proposing to move toward standardization of the rating methodology across the footprint. Currently the SPP planning models contain a normal rating, Rate A, and an emergency rating, Rate B, which the TWG described as a long term emergency rating, not a 30 minute rating. The main concern with the current rating systems is that the 30 minute rating could be more stringent than the long term emergency rating, Rate B; this problem needs to be resolved in the planning models. The TWG and ORWG discussed the benefits of adding a potential Rate C, 30 minute rating, to the planning models. However, the groups agreed that dynamic ratings play a large role in the determination of the 30 minute ratings, as compared to the planning models proposed Rate C.

Adding a requirement to have Rate C in planning models either in SPP Criteria or the Model Development Manuals would be sufficient to aid the RC in real time issues. [Staff \(Jason\) to write up a request for rating information/proposal to be reviewed and updated by TWG.](#)

**Agenda Item 16 - Criteria 6 vs. Criteria 4 (BA's transferring reserve obligations – impact to TRM) (Jason Smith)**

Currently SPP Criteria 6 (Operating Reserve) and Criteria 4.3 conflict on when to calculate TRM on flowgate. Criteria 4.3 assumes every entity is carrying their own reserve obligation and so therefore TRM is calculated annually for seasonal planning. However, Criteria 6 allows the operating reserve to be carried by another entity, invalidating the annual calculated TRMs and making the reserves undeliverable. Staff has not practiced this Criteria 6 option due to the conflicting language.

Jason Smith said this will be revisited with the Future Market – what does this do with the TRM calculation?

Jason explained the purpose of TRM and its application in Criteria 6. In the event that one entity gives their reserve sharing obligation to another entity and if reserves are called for during that time, the flows in real time to replace the energy will be different than was calculated, invalidating the TRMs and causing other problems. The TRM is based on the reserves from the individual BA.

The group discussed how the firm transmission service is accounted for in this instance. Ron Gunderson suggested that a firm transmission reservation should be sufficient. By having firm appropriate transmission reservations with the entity that you are giving your reserve sharing obligations to, then the

original entity should be able to schedule the transmission reservations to come to them from the designated entity and then to additionally schedule reservations to the area needing reserve shares. However, Jason Smith noted the schedules and flows are not set to make this work in real time. Jason asked the ORWG if "F" is done, then the RC needs to be notified, to zero out the reserves for that entity and apply them appropriately. The groups agreed that SPP needed to change the RSS scheduling calculations to account for the scheduling differences in this scenario. The schedule would be automatically generated by RSS.

[Staff \(Jason\) will determine additional language for Criteria 4.3.1 for the TRM calculation and Reserve.](#)

#### **Agenda Item 17 - Appendix 1 – Replaced by NERC TPL-001-0.1 Table 1**

Staff pointed out that Appendix 1 seems to be an old procedure manual or TPL table reference. Since the TPL Standards contain a similar but updated table, perhaps this should be removed from SPP Criteria. [Staff \(Rachel\) could blank this out without MOPC approval.](#)

#### **Agenda Item 18 - Criteria 2.4.c – Planning Requirement to have a Blackstart unit in each “major load area”**

SPP Criteria 2.4c contains a specification that every major load area is required to have a blackstart unit. Staff asked who and what defines a major load area. Ron Gunderson suggested that the Black Start unit is needed to get the other generation in the area started and restore power. Jason Smith said there is no other requirement for Blackstart units like this in Criteria, but that it is very restrictive. Jason asked if the Board would be required to issue an NTC for a blackstart unit per this Criteria. The TWG disagreed with issuing an NTC for these purposes. TWG stated that Criteria 2 belongs to the Generation Working Group. Jason said that if TWG does not want to claim ownership of this, staff will approach GWG to help define a major load area.

Who is required to have Blackstart units? No one is since it is not required for each BA. John Fulton indicated that this may need to be passed to MOPC instead due to the vast dollars associated with it. [Jason agreed to take the blackstart unit in each major load area discussion to GWG.](#)

#### **Agenda Item 19 - Criteria 3.5 – Interconnection Review Process**

ORWG would like to be included as a reviewer in the SPP Criteria 3.5 Interconnection process. Don Taylor suggested this is part of the coordination among the Working Groups.

An interconnection could be extremely large, becoming the single largest contingency, changing the way the ORWG approaches the reserves. Jason Smith commented that there are suggestions in several locations, but an actual study is not performed currently. Jason requested formal notification of new transmission interconnection request to the ORWG. The TWG does not approve the transmission interconnections, only that all affected parties have been notified and had an opportunity to participate. Noman said they could share the information with the ORWG. The ORWG would like the notification at the point when the studies are complete and they are asking for review by the TWG.

[Rachel will add the notification to ORWG secretary to the SPP Criteria Appendix 11.](#)

#### **Agenda Item 20 - Criteria 4 Revisions – CBM implications from MOD standards (Jason Smith)**

Reviewing the MOD standards, SPP Staff has determined that we need to have a methodology for the calculation of CBM. Two options were suggested, one where we do not maintain CBM and one that provides the appropriate statements to meet the requirements in this standard. Staff provided proposed Criteria for these two options. Don Taylor specified that the current Criteria states CBM is defaulted to zero, if needs to be something needs to be included, it should be brought to SPP. Absent any other request, it remains zero. Jason suggested that if they can request a different value, we need to document the process.

The TWG discussed if SPP as a Transmission Planner would calculate the CBM or if individual entities TPs would calculate CBM. The individual entities wanted to calculate the CBM. The TWG asked for

more time to review the two options provided. Don proposed this be an August agenda item for TWG. Jason Smith said this methodology could be a separately referenced document that could be kept up to date as needed, instead of included in the Criteria 4. And John Fulton suggested it be included as an Appendix in the SPP Criteria.

The ORWG would want to be notified how the CBM would be honored, including when there is not enough capacity available. Jim Useldinger agreed that the ORWG would be involved, taking the output from the TWG August discussion.

#### **Agenda Item 21 - LOLE (Loss of Load Expectation) Studies (Rachel Hulett)**

Without a Resource Planner at SPP, this is being suggested to fall to the ORWG. If ORWG does not want this, MOPC could be requested to assign this to a group.

SPP is running the study for 2010, but need it will need to be reviewed. In the past this responsibility was given to TWG, but they do not think it is theirs to bear. TWG also proposed taking this to the GWG, but GWG seems to be uncomfortable with this study as well. ORWG is not geared up to assess the situation 10 years as is indicated for SPP Operations.

Ben Roubique said the study will be complete in the next 2 months. The results of the study will be used to determine if any capacity deficiency in the system exists. This study should validate the planning reserve requirement since the SPP Region does not currently carry 12% reserves for Operating Reserves. Ben considers this a Reliability Assessment. Near term would be too short of time frame to be helpful, not allowing time to make needed changes. It was suggested that the results go to MOPC. [Noman suggested TWG should take it back to MOPC, and will take care of this.](#)

MRO is implementing a regional standard requiring an LOLE, according to Jason Fortik. This may fulfill the requirement and not force them to pay for one on their own.

#### **Agenda Item 22 - WITF Action Items (Reactive Planning) (Jason Smith)**

In the last ORWG meeting, OWRG reviewed the Wind Integration Task Force Action Items as assigned. One of ORWG's action items was in the realm of reactive planning. Operations staff asked what kind of reactive planning is SPP doing that would require the ORWG to address the question. Don Taylor said there are two paths for reactive planning—the generation interconnection reactive requirements and transmission planning reactive requirements. Staff is currently performing the generation interconnection reactive studies but not transmission planning reactive studies.

Operations Staff asked if SPP does a comprehensive analysis of large EHV projects to make sure that reactive requirements were identified. TWG answered no, although there was cursory for the Priority Projects. Jason Smith suggests modifying the study requirements to include consideration of SVC's, cap banks, reactor banks, etc.

SPP Staff may need to be approached and given guidelines if they are asked to perform these studies. There is a division of responsibility mismatch which Noman Williams would like to have addressed. Although everyone agrees the studies need to be done, there is not agreement on who is responsible for the study, SPP or the Member. Currently the responsibility falls to the transmission owning entity. The members feel that SPP should be conducting these studies.

[Rachel to add to the agenda for additional studies and expected outcome, TWG future meeting.](#)

#### **Adjourn**

Noman suggested an annual joint meeting between OWRG and TWG, more frequently if necessary. Noman and Jim will align the meetings and approach this with the groups.



Meeting adjourned at 11:59 AM on May 13, 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Jones  
ORWG Co-Secretary

Rachel Hulett  
TWG Secretary

Attachments:

1. Attendee List