

**Southwest Power Pool**  
**TRANSMISSION WORKING GROUP MEETING**

**November 30, 2010**

**Net conference**

**• M I N U T E S •**

**Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items**

TWG Chair Noman Williams called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The following people were in attendance: (Attachment 1 – Proxies)

**TWG Members**

Noman Williams, Sunflower Electric Power Corp  
John Chamberlin, City Utilities of Springfield  
Ronnie Frizzell, Arkansas Electric Cooperative  
John Fulton, Southwestern Public Service Company  
Deepthi Kasinadhuni for Joe Fultz, Grand River Dam Authority  
Travis Hyde, Oklahoma Gas and Electric  
Dan Lenihan, Omaha Public Power District  
Randy Lindstrom, Nebraska Public Power District  
Jim McAvoy, Oklahoma Municipal Public Authority  
Sam McGarrah, Empire District Electric  
Nathan McNeil, Midwest Energy  
Matt McGee, American Electric Power  
Jason Shook, GDS Associates for ETEC  
Don Taylor, Westar Energy  
Harold Wyble, Kansas City Power & Light

**Other Stakeholders and Staff**

Mo Awad, Westar Energy  
Kevin Bates, SPP Staff  
Alan Burbach, Lincoln Electric System  
Roy Boyer, Southwestern Public Service Company  
Charles Hendrix, SPP Staff  
Leon Howell, Oklahoma Gas and Electric  
Rachel Hulett, SPP Staff  
Michael Hutson, RES Americas  
Shawn Jacobs, Oklahoma Gas and Electric  
Lloyd Kolb, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative  
Bob Lux, SPP Staff  
Alan Myers, ITC Great Plains  
Paul Simoneaux, Entergy  
Greg Sorenson, SPP RE  
Zach Stica, Associated Electric Cooperative  
Thomas Teafatiller, SPP RE  
Chris Underwood, Burns and McDonnell

## **Agenda Item 2 – Attachment C Revisions**

Kevin Bates, SPP Staff, shared that staff has proposed revisions to Tariff Attachment C so Tariff is in sync with SPP processes. He further explained RTWG solicited TWG feedback on the Attachment C revisions. Kevin went through the Tariff revisions asking for comments. John Fulton noted a mismatch defining the use of CBM in Attachment C, Section 6 versus SPP Criteria. John thought the Tariff should be revised to reflect the use of CBM at this time. However, Kevin asked that this concern be tabled for future revisions. The group discussed this concern and noted that if CBM is used by the SPP, the MOD-004 Standard would require an implementation document to be in place prior to April 2011.

**Action Item: Staff to work with SPP Compliance to determine if a CBM Implementation Document needs to be created based on existing Criteria and Tariff language per MOD Standard 004.**

**Jim McAvoy motioned “for TWG to endorse Attachment C changes, recognizing a conflict between the Tariff and Criteria on the use of CBM. This conflict needs to be resolved. TWG asks RTWG to determine if it needs resolution before this filing.” The motion was seconded by Jason Shook and passed unopposed.**

## **Agenda Item 3 – SPS**

### SPS Policy

Charles Hendrix, SPP Staff, shared staff’s comments to member concerns and reviewed the policy with the group (Attachment 2 – Draft SPS policy). Greg Sorenson, SPP RE, offered an opinion on if the policy met TPL requirements. SPS will be reviewed during audits and other compliance activities on a case-by-case basis and that the use of SPS should be based on sound engineering judgment and supported by a study or other analysis. Greg stated that the removal of a generator near the fault was acceptable under N-1 conditions but stated that taking another element out of service under the same conditions was generally not acceptable unless needed to clear the fault. He agreed with the ORWG in striking section 3.2. The group further discussed if the policy met TPL Standards. Most agreed the TPL Standards were met in the policy as there would be no “curtailed firm transfers<sup>1</sup>” because service would not be sold on SPSs. NPPD disagreed the policy met the TPL Standards. The Chairman was mainly concerned about control performance violations occurring because of the policy as there may be operational issues in a smaller BA.

The group discussed where the policy should be put in SPP’s governing documents: the Tariff, Criteria, or business practices. Several members thought the policy should be placed in SPP Criteria; however, a few disagreed with putting the policy into Criteria immediately as it may need future refinement once implemented. The group agreed that this should not be considered a policy, but rather “guidelines” that would eventually be integrated into Criteria. TWG also noted that the guidelines should meet SPP Criteria requirements.

**John Fulton motioned to request the SPCWG to revise the “guidelines” to include additional technical details and then bring back to ORWG/TWG and finally MOPC for approval. Don Taylor seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.**

### Crossroads SPS

The discussion moved to the Crossroads SPS. The group mainly supported the SPS, with a few voicing concern over approving this before having a policy.

**Jim McAvoy motioned, which was seconded by Don Taylor, “for TWG to approve the Crossroads temporary SPS, subject to restrictions of the Tariff. By approving the SPS,**

<sup>1</sup> TPL Standards, Table I. Transmission System Standards — Normal and Emergency Conditions

**TWG does not approve any potential SPS policy. This is a one-time approval that will not set precedence for future SPSs.”** During discussion of the motion John Fulton asked SPP Staff to provide the SPS studies, which are required for review per the Criteria. Based on the necessary review of studies, TWG agreed to table the motion on the Crossroads SPS to an email vote taken Friday, December 3. SPP Staff will provide the TWG the studies immediately.

#### **Agenda Item 4 – Adjournment**

Staff will send out the 2010 STEP report and updated ITP10 scope shortly. These both need endorsements before the end of the year. TWG agreed that they would provide comments on the items by Friday, December 10. An email vote may possibly be done for the STEP report depending on the comments. The TWG scheduled the next conference call for December 14, 9-11 a.m.

With no further business, Travis Hyde adjourned the meeting at 11:22 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rachel Hulett  
TWG Secretary

#### **Post Meeting Activities**

On Friday, December 3, the TWG took an email vote on the following motion: “Motion for TWG to approve the Crossroads temporary SPS, subject to restrictions of the Tariff. By approving the SPS, TWG does not approve any potential SPS policy. This is a one-time approval that will not set precedence for future SPSs.” The motion was approved with 14 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention. It was noted that Empire abstained from the motion. NPPD opposed the motion for the following reasons: NPPD thinks that the SPS study work is not an all inclusive analysis; it does not show acceptable performance of the TPL requirements for Category B or C events, it does not address all of the critical stability issues in the study area, and it does not address all of the requirements of SPP Criteria 7.4.

## GRDA, Deepthi Kasinadhuni for Joe Fultz

---

**From:** Fultz, Joe [mailto:jfultz@grda.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2010 9:04 AM  
**To:** Rachel Hulett; Kasinadhuni, Deepthi  
**Subject:** Proxy for Joe Fultz TWG

Deepthi Kasinadhuni will be my proxy for the meeting today.

Thanks.

*Joe Fultz*  
GRDA  
918 824-7884

**Generation Interconnection Special Protection Scheme Guidelines**

1. Any **new** Special Protection Scheme (SPS) that affords the in-service date of a Generating Facility that is the subject of a Generation Interconnection Agreement (GIA) or an Interim Generation Interconnection Agreement (IGIA) to be accelerated ahead of the in service date of its required network upgrades shall be offered on a non-discriminatory basis to any Interconnection Customer under the SPP OATT who meets the following criteria -

1.1. Interconnection Customers who(se)

- 1.1.1. Have requested a Limited Operation Study under GIA 5.9 and have found that Limited Operation is not available until the required network upgrades in the GIA are placed in service; or have requested an IGIA under the OATT and have found that Interim Interconnection Service cannot be granted until the Impact Study required network upgrades are in service; and
- 1.1.2. Have had a study completed by Transmission Provider that shows the SPS will be able to facilitate the interconnection of the Generating Facility.

2. SPS will be a temporary measure, not to exceed three years, until such time that the Interconnection Customer's required network upgrades under their GIA can be completed.

**2.1. Customer may resubmit the SPS for review at after three years if network upgrades have been delayed.**

3. SPS configurations that will be considered for evaluation will be limited to the items following

- 3.1. Removal of Customer's generation from the Transmission System following a disturbance that causes the outage of a transmission line or transformer that terminates at the point of interconnection substation facility (or within a reasonable physical distance from that facility – less than 0.25 mile).

4. SPS operation shall not cause the removal of other generation from the Transmission System unless agreed to by the affected generator owners; subject to queue priority listed in Item 10.

5. Operation of an SPS cannot cause the disruption of service to Native Load Customers.

6. Installation of an SPS cannot inhibit the use of the Transmission System for future use (i.e. prevent the addition of points of delivery for Native Load Customers).

- 6.1. SPS can be re-evaluated at later time to ensure adherence to this criteria.

Comment [S1]: SPCWG addition

Comment [S2]: ORWG – is this Criteria or business practice

Comment [rah3]: TWG: suggests making this a Guidelines document

Deleted: Policy

Comment [S4]: SPCWG addition

Comment [S5]: SPCWG suggestion

Comment [S6]: ORWG – concern that SPS may become permanent

Comment [S7]: ORWG – suggest removal of 3.2 as doesn't apply to Crossroads

Comment [rah8]: SPP RE suggests removing 3.2 for compliance purposes

Deleted: <#>Tripping and removal from the Transmission System of a transformer or transmission line that terminates at the point of interconnection substation facility.

Deleted: <#>

7. SPS will not be considered after the execution (or unexecuted filing) of a GIA unless Transmission Provider has determined that the in service date of the required Network Upgrades under the GIA will be delayed.

8. SPS does not relieve Customer from obtaining applicable transmission service or from curtailment under applicable SPP processes.

**Comment [S9]:** (CH) – generator would be curtailed same as any other generator with comparable transmission service.

9. SPS will not be considered in the processing of short term or long term transmission service requests.

**Comment [S10]:** (CH) – TPL-001 and TPL-002 refer to firm service. This section excludes firm service being sold.

10. SPS does not relieve Customer from queue risk associated with Interim Interconnection Service under the IGIA or Limited Operation under the GIA (i.e. subject to future studies that may require a reduction or pre-emption of service when higher or equally queued customer come on-line)

**Comment [S11]:** (CH) - Generator's queue position will be honored

10.1. A Customer with higher or equal queue priority proposed SPS and Generating Facility may be accommodated by the removal of a lower queued Customer's SPS and Generating Facility or the pro-rated reduction in service of a Customer with equal queue priority.

11. SPS must be approved by the System Protection and Controls Working Group (SPCWG), Transmission Working Group (TWG), Operations and Reliability Working Group (ORWG), and the Market and Operations Policy Committee (MOPC)

12. SPS must conform to SPP Criteria 7.4 requirements.

**Comment [rah12]:** TWG addition