



Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP

September 26, 2011

Dallas, TX

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

• SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN •

1. The ESWG directed staff to provide written justification and sample data for the 40-Year financial analysis methodology in keeping with the percentage growth approach (option 1 in meeting materials). The ESWG supported the use of depreciation applied to ATRR on a yearly basis.
2. The ESWG approved sensitivities for use on the final portfolio in the 2011 ITP10. Four sensitivities were approved that alter the natural gas price and load levels in Future 1. Two additional sensitivities varying the carbon tax value were approved for Future 2.



Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP

September 26, 2011

Dallas, TX

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

• Minutes •

(approved at 1-12-2012 ESWG meeting)

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) called the meeting of the Economic Studies Working Group (ESWG) to order at 10:00 a.m., welcomed those in attendance, and asked for introductions (Attachment – Attendance List).

Agenda Item 1a – Attendance

There were 8 in person participants and 20 teleconference participants representing 10 of 12 members. Tim Miller (SPP staff) received proxy statements (Attachment – Proxy Statements).

Agenda Item 1b – Minutes Approval

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) presented the minutes from the August 2nd meeting for review and asked for any additions or corrections (Attachment – Approved Minutes). Kip Fox recommended a change to reflect the sensitivity ranking.

A motion to approve the agenda following modification was made by Kip Fox (AEP) and seconded by David Ried (Omaha Public Power District). The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 1c – Agenda Review

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) presented the agenda for review and asked for any additions or corrections (Attachment – Agenda). The agenda was modified to include a discussion of the latest reports concerning the impact of EPA rules.

A motion to approve the agenda following modification was made by Paul Dietz (Westar) and seconded by Kurt Stradley (Lincoln Electric System). The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 2 – ITP10 40-Year Financial Analysis

Brett Hooton (SPP staff) presented three approaches to the 40-Year Financial Analysis. The group expressed support of the percentage growth method (Option 1). Additionally, the group supported the use of depreciation applied to ATRR on a yearly basis due to the fact that it closely matches the current billing structures. Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) expressed that ITC prefers levelized fixed charge over ATRR due to not having a NPCC.

The group still has questions on what years to use for the data points (e.g. if you use a year before the construction, the transmission isn't really in service yet), also what assumptions should be used for the test years (e.g. what resource plans are used). Jim Sanderson Suggested that staff write up justification for why we'd use the recommended method and show the pros/cons and provide a historical look.

The group directed staff to utilize the following wind levels in the 40-Year financial analysis for Future 1:

- Year 1: 2017 using 10 GW of wind
- Year 2: 2022 using 10 GW of wind
- Year 3: 2027 using 14 GW of wind

For Future 2 the same years should be evaluated with 14 GW of wind in each year.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to write up and present the ESWG with the justification, pros/cons, and historical background for the Forty-Year Financial Analysis using the percentage growth method (Option 1).

Agenda Item 3 – Preliminary Sensitivity Results

Tim Miller (SPP staff) provided the group with draft sensitivity calculations for the high gas sensitivity in Future 1. The group provided feedback concerning the presentation and asked that MWh as well as dollar values be provided to show the impact of the sensitivities.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to investigate the \$/MWh relation between the importing and exporting areas to ensure that the results make sense.

Agenda Item 4 – ITP10 Sensitivities

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) asked for final feedback on the sensitivities. After some discussion around gas and coal prices the group approved the sensitivities as presented.

A motion to approve the sensitivities as presented was made by Kip Fox (AEP) and seconded by Paul Dietz (Westar). The motion was approved unanimously.

Kip Fox (AEP) noted that the coal prices in the expected case are too high. Greg Sweet (Empire District) expressed that the gas prices are too high in the expected case given the current strip values.

Agenda Item 5 – Preliminary Metric Results

Tim Miller (SPP staff) provided an update on the progress in calculating the metrics. Chares Cates (SPP staff) explained that advancement and deferral analysis of the plans will occur at the end of the ITP10 and will not just address STEP reliability projects

ACTION ITEM: Staff to prepare metric information for the Markets and Operations Policy Committee (MOPC).

Agenda Item 6 – Coal Retirements and Impact on Future 2 for ITP10

The group discussed the relationship between the assumptions made for the second future in the ITP10 and the latest information regarding the impact of the EPA rulemaking upon SPP. Several key statements were made by the group:

1. Time to finish the study with changes to follow the latest EPA information is not sufficient.
2. Clarity is still lacking on the EPA rules and starting a restudy now would possibly be premature.
3. Make a recommendation to the SPC to change the ITP schedule and kick-in another ITP10 next year.

Kip Fox (AEP) recommended a disclaimer be placed into the ITP10 report to explain that the ITP10 Future 2 does not take into account the CSAPR. Roy Boyer (Xcel Energy) noted that the rules take effect between now and the year under study in the ITP10. In ten years the EPA rules will, presumably, have already taken effect and SPP will have built resources to respond to the needs of the system, etc. Several members noted that a big shortcoming of the ITP10 are that retirements were not enforced for all non-SPP areas. Paul Dietz (Westar) noted that everyone in the industry is petitioning a stay on the rules and asked if it is possible to have another study done. The carbon tax may coalesce ... but it is in the same direction as the forthcoming rules. Charles Cates (SPP staff) identified that as a group a “point of no return” must be documented for policy considerations in the study. There should be a time-stamped document showing this is what we knew, what we decided. Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) stated that it was not within the ESWG’s purview to change the time-frame of the ITP10 to accommodate this policy change. Paul Dietz (Westar) asked if the ESWG should bring this to SPC and see if they have a scope change for us? This discussion also needs to occur at the MOPC.

ACTION ITEM: Staff will prepare a futures presentation for the SPC that will include discussion of these rules and the impact on the ITP. It should raise the issue that we think a reliability and economic look at this would be best considered as a special study.

Agenda Item 7 – ITP10 Report

SPP staff provided an update on the ITP10 report and discussed staging of projects in the ITP10.

Agenda Item 8 – ITP10 Project Discussion

Timothy McGinnis (SPP staff) provided an update and asked for project related feedback following the transmission planning summit. He expressed staff's intention to complete Future 1 and Future 2 plans by the MOPC, integrate stakeholder feedback and then consolidate projects from each future to a recommended portfolio.

John Mayhan (Omaha Public Power District) asked and was assured that reliability analysis with the projects added will be conducted to see if new flowgates need to be added following the projects being added. He also expressed that the North to South flow in the models may be masking the line overloads around the Cass county area that OPPD expects.

ACTION ITEM: Staff will discuss OPPD's concerns about North to South flows and overloads in the Cass county area.

Agenda Item 9 – ITP20 Futures Kick-off Discussion

Josh Ross (SPP staff) updated the group concerning the a joint meeting with the Midwest ISO Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) scheduled for December 1st. Paul Dietz recommended that staff consider some software called PLEXOS for resource expansion planning in future studies.

ACTION ITEM: Staff will update ESWG following the SPC meeting regarding these futures and continue to work out the meeting with the PAC.

Agenda Item 10 – ITP10 Seams Project Integration Flow Chart

Brett Hooton (SPP staff) presented the Seams Project Integration Flow Chart for comment.

Adjournment

Chair Alan Myers adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, September 26, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Miller
Secretary



Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP
September 26, 2011
Dallas, TX
10:00 am – 4:00 pm

• ATTENDANCE LIST •

Name	System
Alan Myers	ITC Great Plains
Kip Fox	American Electric Power
Paul Hassink	American Electric Power
Roy Boyer	Xcel Energy
Charles Cates	SPP staff
Tim Miller	SPP staff
Adam McKinnie	MOPSC
Paul Dietz	Westar

Teleconference Attendees

Jim Sanderson	KCC
Kurt Stradley	Lincoln Electric System
David Ried	Omaha Public Power District
Bennie Weeks	SPS / Xcel
Bruce Walkup	AECC
Jason Shook	GDS Associates
Tim Owens	Nebraska Public Power District
Greg Sweet	Empire District
Jason McNeil	Midwest Energy
Kennie Hale	City Utilities of Springfield, MO
Dan Lenihan	Omaha Public Power District
John Mayhan	Omaha Public Power District

Al Tamimi	Sunflower Electric Cooperative
Jim Okenfuss	KCPL
Mitch Williams	WFEC
Tony Gott	AECI
Mike Collins	OGE
Brett Hooton	SPP staff
Tim McGinnis	SPP staff
Joshua Ross	SPP staff



ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP

September 26, 2011
AEP Offices | 8th floor
1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 72501

• P R O X Y S T A T E M E N T S •

Tim Miller

From: Myers, Alan K. [amyers@ltctransco.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 11:33 AM
To: Charles Cates; Tim Miller
Subject: FW: ESWG meeting

FYI

Thanks,
Alan

From: Boyer, Roy D [<mailto:Roy.D.Boyer@xcelenergy.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 11:31 AM
To: Myers, Alan K.
Cc: Weeks, Bennie F
Subject: FW: ESWG meeting

From: Weeks, Bennie F
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 11:12 AM
To: Boyer, Roy D
Subject: RE: ESWG meeting

I need to get off to go to my next meeting. I don't have Alan Myers' email. Can you forward this email with this statement to him? I, Bennie Weeks, am making Roy Boyer my proxy vote for the remainder of this meeting on 9/26/11. I may be back on around 2:00 today.

Thanks!

From: Boyer, Roy D
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2011 10:09 AM
To: Weeks, Bennie F
Subject: ESWG meeting

Are you listening or attending today? I am at the meeting.

Please consider the planet before you print.



**Southwest Power Pool
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP**

August 2, 2011

Dallas, TX

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

• SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN •

3. The ESWG approved the list of metrics that will be evaluated in the 2011 ITP10
4. The ESWG selected, pending formal approval, four sensitivities for use with the Business as Usual future and six sensitivities for use with the EPA Rules with Additional Wind future in the 2011 ITP10.



**Southwest Power Pool
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP**

August 2, 2011

Dallas, TX

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

• Minutes •

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) called the meeting of the Economic Studies Working Group (ESWG) to order at 10:00 a.m., welcomed those in attendance, and asked for introductions (Attachment – Attendance List).

Agenda Item 1a – Attendance & New Member

There were 15 in person participants and 17 teleconference participants representing 11 of 12 members. Tim Miller (SPP staff) received proxy statements (Attachment – Proxy Statements). Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) welcomed the newest member of the ESWG, Kurt Stradely.

Agenda Item 1b – Agenda Review

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) presented the agenda for review and asked for any additions or corrections (Attachment – Agenda). No modifications were made to the agenda.

A motion to approve the agenda as provided was made by Kip Fox (AEP) and seconded by Leon Howell (Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co.). The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 1c – Meeting Schedule

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) led a discussion of upcoming meetings. Tim Miller (SPP staff) floated the idea of changing the September 26 meeting to a teleconference to improve travel arrangements in light of the transmission summit planned for September 22. No action was taken at this time.

Agenda Item 2 – ITP10 Update & Next Steps

Agenda Item 2a – July MOPC & Summit Recap

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) recapped the July Markets & Operations Policy Committee meeting and the July 21 transmission planning summit. Alan noted that the summit was heavier on the 2011 ITP Near Term results and that the preliminary 2011 ITP10 results did dovetail with the 2010 ITP20 plan.

Agenda Item 2b – Current Activities

Tim Miller (SPP staff) provided an update to the group concerning current activities. SPP staff continues to investigate flowgate loadings, AC and DC overloads, feedback provided by stakeholders, initial work on the metric calculations, and prepare for financial calculations.

Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) asked if the flowgates are being evaluated for 10 years out and if the resource plan is contained in the models being used. Tim Miller replied in the affirmative and supplied that the flowgate loadings are being investigated in both ITP10 futures – which include the key drivers such as the resource plan.

Mike Proctor asked if anything had come of Mike Wise's (Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc.) comment at the July 21 summit in reference to units in the resource plan. Bennie Weeks (SPS/Xcel Energy) responded that her frequent talks with him have not indicated a need for a change to the models.

David Ried (Omaha Public Power District) asked that the treatment of wind curtailment in the ITP be discussed. Tim Miller answered with the methodology utilized in the ITP20 and indicated that the method to be used in the ITP10 is currently being worked out. In the ITP20 study process, SPP staff was not comfortable with the curtailment of wind in the PROMOD IV software. An additional analysis was performed to evaluate wind transfers from the proposed wind sites to generation resources in the footprint. This analysis determined the amount of wind modeled in the base case for use in the APC based B/C calculations presented in the ITP20 report.

Kip Fox (AEP) asked for the details of the announcement that the generator outages supplied at the transmission summit were erroneous. Tim Miller supplied the reason of an incorrectly set pmax for a unit in the models that caused an incorrect re-dispatch, following unit contingencies, in the ACCC runs performed by staff. The overload caused by a generator outages in the AC results for both futures should be ignored until the error is corrected. Updated results should be available by the September summit.

David Ried asked when the final PROMOD base case would be available for review. Tim Miller replied that it should be finalized following stakeholder feedback by August 3, but updates following that day will delay its completion. The wind curtailment issue is outstanding, Tim requested that it be reviewed by the ESWG prior to the September summit.

Mike Proctor commented that unit commitment decisions during high wind hours when conventional units are already online are not captured well in the PROMOD simulations due to the nature of the algorithm. Bennie Weeks did not agree, at least regarding the decisions the commitment algorithm makes to place units online. Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) asked if the wind modeling utilized in previous studies had treated the wind as a dispatchable resource rather than a transaction. Tim Miller replied that previous studies had treated the wind as a transaction. David Ried supplied that this allows for the use of hourly wind output profiles.

Dan Lenihan (Omaha Public Power District) noted that coal plant retirements for the ITP10 Future 2 are shown online and generating in the posted AC models. Tim Miller remarked that a final QC check was completed on the models after the AC modeling process was initiated. The two or three week time frame required to make the conversion precipitated this error. It will be corrected in the next pass.

Agenda Item 2c – Sensitivity Determination

Tim Miller (SPP staff) opened a discussion of the values to be used for the economic sensitivities in the 2011 ITP10. He requested that the ESWG discuss what combinations of natural gas price, coal price, and demand values be utilized. Kip Fox (AEP) noted that the late posting of ESWG materials prevents much valuable discussion and that he will need to return to his company to get consideration from others. Tim apologized for the late notice.

Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) noted the small variation in coal pricing. Kip Fox noted that the majority of fluctuations in the price will be a result of the transportation cost, rather than the commodity price. He asked if SPP staff had information regarding the fuel contracts the TOs have. Tim Miller replied that staff only has generic information provided by Ventyx[®]. David Ried (Omaha Public Power District) noted that calculations have been done for the coal transportation costs using the GPS mileage from each mine to each plant.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to write up and present the ESWG with the assumptions used for the coal and natural gas transportation costs in the ITP10 process.

David Ried recommended that individual variables be altered in separate sensitivities. Discussion of this idea continued and a blend of individual variable and correlated variables were selected in order to achieve a range of possible outcomes that should provide the group with the widest possible spreads in benefit.

Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) asked when the sensitivities need to be finalized. Tim Miller recommended that they be ready for presentation at the October MOPC meeting. Given the need for a day to run each simulation, the group decided to prioritize the sensitivities.

David Ried asked if the losses were being double-counted in the load and energy values. Dan Lenihan (Omaha Public Power District) commented that his discussions with Tim McGinnis (SPP staff) lead him to believe that the process is correctly accounting for losses.

Leon Howell (Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co.) asked how the sensitivities would be calculated. Tim Miller replied that the sensitivities will be calculated on the draft plan for the MOPC. Kip Fox (AEP) asked if the sensitivities will determine the final plans or grade the final plan. The group discussed running the sensitivities only upon the final plan.

Steve Gaw (The Wind Coalition) asked if any thoughts had been given to different scenarios based upon the EPA regulation variations. Mike Proctor provided that a changing resource plan would be required to keep pace with the regulation changes. Kip Fox expressed that in his estimation the future being studied provides a robust look if the regulations come to pass.

Alan Myers recommended that a base of six sensitivities be developed in order to focus efforts and give staff time to calculate the results.

Kip Fox asked why the individual municipalities are being reported in the results. David Ried pointed them out as individual municipalities within the OPPD control area. OPPD desires to see the company benefit numbers instead of the control area benefits. Kip asked if more of the group would like to see similar detail. Greg Sweet (Empire District Electric Co.) responded that opportunity had been given a few meetings back when OPPD requested the change for their area.

The group specified that the load & demand sensitivity values should be evaluated in order to identify the outcomes in the case of extreme weather patterns in one year that deviate from the normal load patterns that would be forecasted for the time period.

David Ried requested a sensitivity for just Future 2, varying the carbon tax values.

The group discussed the pros and cons of evaluating 1.96 standard deviation values or 1 standard deviation values for the gas price and load sensitivities. The group landed on a 1.96 standard deviation value for the natural gas price and a 1 standard deviation value for the demand & energy.

Greg Sweet noted that the current NYMEX strip indicates monthly gas prices for 2022 that are \$1 lower than what was pulled in April.

ESWG members will review the sensitivities proposed with their companies before a formal vote at the August 30 ESGW meeting. Natural gas will utilize the 1.96 standard deviations, demand & energy will use 1 standard deviation from the mean (Attachment – Sensitivity Values). The sensitivities proposed are:

1. Four sensitivities upon both Future 1 and Future 2
 - High natural gas & demand forecasts²
 - High natural gas³
 - Low natural gas⁴
 - Low natural gas & demand forecasts¹
2. Two additional sensitivities for only Future 2
 - High carbon tax of \$54 per ton
 - Low carbon tax \$14 per ton

Note: The sensitivities were prioritized by the group and are listed by importance (1 is highest importance – 4 is lowest).

ACTION ITEM: ESGW members will review the sensitivities proposed with their companies before a formal vote at the August 30 ESGW meeting.

Agenda Item 2d – Metric Selection

Tim Miller (SPP staff) led a discussion of the metrics that the ESWG identified as probable for inclusion in the ITP10. Following discussion of each metric the group decided that priority should be given to a “less is more” approach that would focus the attention of the Board of Directors upon the results, rather than providing them a slew of numbers that are hard to interpret..

Kip Fox (AEP) recommended that staff report on the metrics for the upcoming analysis and if needed the ESWG can whittle the list down before the final decisions that will be made in January.

David Ried (Omaha Public Power District) recommended that if a metric is monetized it should be added to the APC savings, so that a single dollar benefit is represented. This would create less confusion.

Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) updated the group with some research being conducted by the Brattle Group. The research may yield a method for monetizing metrics 1.1.2 and 6.

The group gained consensus on a handful of metrics – maybe six separate metrics. Mike Proctor summarized the discussion where five monetized measures of benefit plus three robustness metric groupings (Metrics 1.1.2, 6, and 14 together as ATC metrics. Metrics 2 and 3 together as affect on competition). (Attachment – Metrics for the 2011 ITP10).

A motion to approve the selected metrics and grouping was made by David Ried (Omaha Public Power District) and seconded by Kip Fox (AEP). The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 2e – Forty-Year financial analysis

Brett Hooton (SPP staff) provided a high-level overview of the forty-year financial analysis that staff will conduct in the coming months. The topic will be further discussed at the next ESWG meeting.

Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) encouraged staff to utilize nominal dollars in the analysis.

Agenda Item 2f – Future Work Items

Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) commented on his desire to bring ESWG charter related work items to the group in order to create some standard work items. He and Tim Miller (SPP staff) took an action item to outline these for the group to discuss in the future.

ACTION ITEM: Alan Myers to coordinate with staff and outline work items for the group and discuss ESWG responsibilities per the group’s charter

Agenda Item 3 – ITP20 Strategic Thoughts

Agenda Item 3a – Future(s) with the SPC & Midwest ISO’s PAC

Tim Miller (SPP staff) explained an opportunity to coordinate futures with the Midwest ISO for the upcoming ITP and MTEP processes. Adam McKinnie (Missouri PSC) and Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) provided some of their perspectives on the approach used by Midwest ISO’s Planning and Advisory Committee (PAC). Tentatively, a meeting in November is being discussed by staff at SPP and Midwest ISO.

ACTION ITEM: Staff to coordinate meetings with Midwest ISO.

Agenda Item 3b – Metrics to Pursue

Tim Miller (SPP staff) encouraged attendants to discuss other metrics that are not currently being used in the ITP10 with their staff in order to identify priorities for metrics that should be pursued in the future.

Mike Proctor (Consultant to SPP RSC) mentioned a few vendors that may be able to assist with spreadsheet models or other software: Northbridge Group and Math Works.

Adjournment

Roy Boyer (Xcel Energy) asked that the group consider a change to the 2011 ITP10 resource plan in light of developments of a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity (CCN) for a new combustion turbine at the Jones station. He requested that the Chaves Co. combustion turbine identified in the resource plan for



Future 1 be moved to Jones and be called Jones 4. Chair Alan Myers (ITC Great Plains, LLC) noted that the quorum for the meeting was being lost. Tim Miller (SPP staff) recommended that the item be discussed at the Transmission Working Group if it was already on their plate. Kip Fox (AEP) noted that the change would affect the stability and reliability study results more than the economic. Roy and Tim agreed with this assessment.

Chair Alan Myers adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m. on Tuesday, August 2, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim Miller
Secretary



ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP

**September 26, 2011
AEP Offices | 8th floor
1201 Elm Street, Dallas, TX 72501**

• A G E N D A •

10:00 am – 4:00 pm

1. Administrative Items Alan Myers
 - a. Attendance
 - b. Minutes Approval
 - c. Agenda Review
2. ITP10 40-Year Financial Analysis Brett Hooton, SPP staff
3. Preliminary Sensitivity Results Tim Miller
4. ITP10 Sensitivities Alan Myers
5. Preliminary Metric Results Tim Miller
6. Coal Retirements and Impact on Future 2 for ITP10 Open Discussion
7. ITP10 Report Tim Miller
8. ITP10 Project Discussion Tim McGinnis
9. ITP20 Futures Kick-off Discussion Josh Ross
 - a. Future(s) with the SPC & Midwest ISO's PAC
10. ITP10 Seams Project Integration Flow Chart Brett Hooton, SPP staff
 - a. Approaching seams projects in the ITP10



Southwest Power Pool
ECONOMIC STUDIES WORKING GROUP
Pending Action Items Status Report

September 26, 2011

ID	Action Item	Date Originated	Status	Comments
001	ESWG directs SPP staff to write up and present the ESWG with the assumptions used for the coal and natural gas transportation costs in the ITP10 process.	Aug 2, 2011 ESWG	Complete	In ITP10 draft report
002	For discussion at the next meeting Alan Myers and staff will outline work items for the group and discuss ESWG responsibilities per the group's charter.	Aug 2, 2011 ESWG	In Progress ESWG & Staff	
003	ESWG members will review the sensitivities proposed with their companies before a formal vote at the August 30 ESWG meeting.	Aug 2, 2011 ESWG	Complete	ESWG voted and approved sensitivities on 9-26-11
004	Coordinate a meeting to discuss possible join future(s) with the Midwest ISO Planning Advisory Committee	Aug 2, 2011 ESWG	In Progress Staff	
005	Staff to write up and present the ESWG with the justification, pros/cons, and historical background for the Forty-Year Financial Analysis using the percentage growth method (Option 1).	Sep 26, 2011 ESWG	In Progress Staff	
006	Staff to prepare metric information for the Markets and Operations Policy Committee (MOPC).	Sep 26, 2011 ESWG	Complete	Provided to Oct 11-12 MOPC meeting
007	Staff will prepare a futures presentation for the SPC that will include discussion of these rules and the impact on the ITP. It should raise the issue that we think a reliability and economic look at this would be best considered as a special study.	Sep 26, 2011 ESWG	In Progress Staff	
008	Staff will discuss OPPD's concerns about North to South flows and overloads in the Cass county area.	Sep 26, 2011 ESWG	Complete	Staff held discussions with John Mayhan (OPPD) and collected thoughts for improving ITP

				moving forward.
009	Staff will update ESG following the SPC meeting regarding these futures and continue to work out the meeting with the PAC.	Sep 26, 2011 ESG	In Progress Staff	
010	Staff to investigate the \$/MWh relation between the importing and exporting areas to ensure that the results make sense.	Sep 26, 2011 ESG	In Progress Staff	