

Southwest Power Pool
OPERATING RELIABILITY WORKING GROUP MEETING
June 18-19, 2014
OG+E Energy Technology Center – Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

• Summary of Action Items •

1. Will Tootle to send the list of all flowgates to all TOPs and the ORWG prior to July 1. (completed)
2. Develop communication improvements with TOPs for new flowgate creation outside of the annual flowgate review process.
3. Add the Flowgate ID to the CME report that is posted on OASIS. Labeled as the LLR Report.
4. Investigate requiring an Operational Study for new facilities being energized 200kV and above be completed prior to being energized.
5. Supply ORWG comments for the Capacity Margin document before the MOPC.

Southwest Power Pool
OPERATING RELIABILITY WORKING GROUP MEETING
June 18-19, 2014
OG+E Energy Technology Center – Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

• M I N U T E S •

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items

SPP Chair Jim Useldinger called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The following members were in attendance or represented by proxy:

Jason Smith, Jim Useldinger, Greg McAuley, Bryn Wilson, Abu Elteriefi, Robert Rhodes, Don Hargrove, Sing Tay, Mark Eastwood, Don Shipley, Ron Gunderson, Allen Klassen, Allan George, John Stephens, Paul Lampe, Neil Robertson, Kyle McMenamain, Bob Reynolds, Mitchell Williams, and attending by phone were David Pham, Rob Janssen, Jason (LES), Steve Gaw, Will Tootle, Dennis Sauriol, Terry Gates, David Lyle (KCPL), Scott (OPPD), Kevin Harder, Jim Utopi, Amber Metzker, Jessica Tucker, Kenny Hail, David Pham, Micha Bailey, Jared Greenwald, Lonnie Lindekugel

The following were proxies:

LES Proxy, Jason Fix for Steve Haun

Abu Elteriefi is for Darrell Yonyk

John Stephens has proxy for Mike Wech

The agenda was reviewed without changes.

Minute approvals, Feb 12, March 6, April 7, and May 8th. Allen Klassen motioned to approve all 4 sets of minutes, Ron Gunderson seconded the motion. Minutes are approved.

Agenda Item 2 – Annual Flowgate Assessment (Will Tootle)

Will Tootle discussed the flowgate information provided in the meeting material. TWG action approved to be added or not added is included in the information. Yellow indicates the ones that were not added. Effective date for new flowgates is July 1, 2014. They will be updated in the permanent flowgate list on OASIS at that time.

This is a MOD-030 requirement for an annual study related to TRM. The process identifies any new flowgates, planning models, the next 4 season evaluation, and updates implemented. Jason Smith added that as a TSP SPP uses this method to run required studies. Any congestion activity in the last 12 months for a flowgate should not be included in the list to remove.

Allen Klassen requested a full list that Will Tootle can send to the group. Ron Gunderson requested that the information go to the TOPs. Mark Eastwood asked how we determine if a flowgate has been in a CME in the last 12 months; the information should be available on the OASIS site. Jason Smith suggested submitting an RMS ticket if you need the records for a specific area.

The PSSE Bus Model number is used to determine the ownership based on the transmission operator. The flowgate list should contain ownership information. The owner is notified through the TWG. For Temporary Flowgates, the operators coordinate with the owner.

Based on monitoring of flowgates in the NERC standards, updates need to be coordinated with the flowgate owner. Jason Smith will take this back for improvement.

When the flowgates on the Proposed New Flowgates tab of the spreadsheet are built July 1, they will have a 5000 series number as a permanent flowgate number.

Jim Useldinger asked about the 2014 Results v1.2 included in the meeting material. Existing permanent flowgates and new flowgates that will become permanent with the TRM calculation. Column BB is the new 2014 TRM value. It does contain the flowgates that will be removed.

John Stephens asked about the LLR report that is posted. John would like the flowgate id included in both reports. It is needed in the CME report.

There were several specific questions related to flowgates as part of the group discussion. The study simulates a generator contingency, replacing by ramping the entire footprint to get the TDF value; multiplied by the Pmax to get the TRM value. This is done for every generator in the footprint. The Reserve Zones do not get factored into this at all. We won't sell firm service into the TRM value; it is the emergency limit less the TRM value.

Ron Gunderson moved to approve the changes indicated in the list. John Stephens seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 3 – Gas/Electric Coordination Task Force Update (Don Shipley)

Don Shipley described the involvement of the Gas Electric Coordination in our region. In the Fall of 2012, the GECTF was created. The primary focus was to respond to initiatives ITO/RSO's had filings and testimony. The group offered testimony in May and October of 2013 and held a technical conference. The SPP region took a position that we have good fuel diversity, multiple pipelines, not experiencing the same concerns as the north east. They expected the task force to sunset in 2014 which turned out to not be the case.

In March 2014 the NOPR and an Order were issued. The proposed rule is outlined in the provided document (emailed to the members late yesterday afternoon). NAESB held 4 meetings April – June to do quadrant voting. Gas and Electric quadrants followed the NAESB voting process. They were hoping to reach consensus on the FERC NOPR related to the start of the gas day and intra-day nomination cycles. There a consensus on three nomination cycles, but not on the start of the gas day; moving it from 9 am central to 4 am central. SPP and the SPP region needs to get the information in our stakeholder process so SPP can form a response based on the SPP region's response. To this point, SPP has represented the region in step with the other ISO/RTOs. A 4 am gas day allows the start before the electric peak rise. The board of directors at NAESB adopted the 3 nomination cycles that were discussed. They are being silent on the 4 am gas day. There will be a comment period starting in September that SPP and other regions can respond to. The GECTF is trying to get this information out by meeting with groups similar to today's discussion. The GECTF met with MWG and will discuss more with them. There will be additional information that needs to go to MOPC, along with the informational memorandum.

The March 20, second step was an order to the ISO/RTO's that once this becomes an official order and in effect (around November 2014), the ISO/RTO's will have 90 days to make a filing to explain how/why our practices are fair and just and how they will get to meet the new order. Or explain why we can't do it. Currently our cycles are outside of these changes. If SPP doesn't make any changes, we are not providing what is needed until after 4pm – we cannot represent that our market is fair under the scheduling practices. There are caveats to the response we can provide, such as that we are a new market and have not been through the seasons at this time. This group will need to be engaged to represent the reliability components based on the market and fuel management issues that may not be addressed fully from the economic perspective.

The goal is the alignment of the two industries for the scheduling of gas and electric harmonization. There are some other coordination issues. This is a fuel management issue: coal, wind, gas, etc... all

are included in this. There is an increase in the pressure for gas based on EPA restrictions on coal, regulation for wind using quick starts, etc.... many are backfilled with gas.

The changes may include software changes and costs associated with the changes. We anticipate some type of market timeline change. Phase 2 Combined Cycle, Full Operating Season, Changing Market engine; several items are impacted based on current projects and timelines.

Don Shipley is the point person for this effort, there are many other areas including Market Design, and others within SPP that are working on the project.

Ron Gunderson commented that getting the market to solve prior to the gas nomination time will be important. The availability of the gas and the pipeline may be impacted. The timeframe may need to shrink which will be a program/software change; even so, moving the timeline would move the start of the market and will impact the people who submit the offers and bids accordingly.

Kyle McMenemy reiterated that the pipelines will be impacted. Don Shipley said there are 8 pipelines within our region with 3 of are main pipelines. The pressure increases as cold weather issues force people to move more into gas than other fuels.

In discussions with the pipeline during an event, they were trying to supply 5 units with gas and the pressure was being impacted and was about to cause pipeline issues. SPP is meeting with Enable Midstream and has already met with Southern Star, etc...to discuss potential issues and account for them appropriately within our market protocols.

John Stephens commented that the pipeline capacity isn't where it needs to be. Don Shipley added that the pipeline doesn't add capacity in the same manner that the transmission side will add it. We have Intra-State pipes that are not FERC jurisdiction. This adds another layer to manage.

Ron Gunderson said just because you have firm gas on a pipe, if you don't have the nomination in, you won't get it.

Don Shipley said that a limitation we have encountered is that a pipeline can't talk to SPP without the Generator owner in the discussion.

MPRR 189 – Ensuring Reliable Operations

These are short term management type actions that may help get prepared for these changes.

Rob Janssen commented that this was discussed at the end of the day in the MWG meeting yesterday. There were no votes or approvals. This won't be able to go to the MOPC until October. Don Shipley would like to include the ORWG comments. Ron Gunderson asked to review the MWG comments. Jason Smith said this could be included with the MPRR discussion tomorrow during the meeting. With the delay to MOPC, any filings won't have time to be submitted for this winter.

Rob Janssen added that in the current form Tariff changes may not be needed. Some comments included cost recovery, which would require Tariff changes.

Kyle McMenemy commented that in the EEA section, if the information is only posted to OASIS, the Sat phone should be used to notify the entities. Jason commented that the last sentence in the section covers the additional notifications needed. Several expressed the concern that OASIS appears to be the primary means of communications.

Rob Janssen added a request for emergency assistance across the DC Ties to be included in the MPRR. Don Shipley said we have other documents that are used for those situations.

Greg McAuley commented that he is providing this information to the generation side of OGE. When he saw the GECTF activities increasing, he thought the load shed plans didn't have the compressor stations, etc... included. Don Shipley confirmed Greg's expectation that this is not part of the GECTF's radar now. Ron Gunderson added Black Start type issues, that unless they are nominated for the gas, the fuel may not be available when needed, especially in a Black Start type situation.

Based on the way the pipelines use the pressure to move the gas, they have to plan and implement changes based on weather patterns. The SPP BA is growing the coordination/communication with the GOPs as a means to get to the point SPP is with the transmission side. Ron Gunderson added that the generation piece is market sensitive and may require more one-on-one discussions.

Kyle McMenamin asked about a code of conduct for the pipelines. Don Shipley said they have a very strict code of conduct. They don't talk about any contract, only what is publically posted on their websites. They do post a lot of information, the struggle is figuring out what the posted information does mean. They will only discuss contractual information with the parties included in the contract, which is why SPP needs the Gen Owner to be involved in the discussion.

Greg McAuley said there should be a fuel supply field included in the offers. John Stephens commented that many GOPs may provide the information if we asked them to, even if it's not required by standards. Rob Janssen said there is some pipeline type information available. There is an issue that needs to be addressed with the gas generators having an electric start.

Lunch break from 12:16 to 1:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 4 – OGE Centennial SPS Event

OGE is looking for feedback on the event... did OGE, SPP, Market Engine, miss something? Their impression is that the Reserve Zones should have prevented the situation.

Jason Smith said that Reserves are put where they get put until they are called. When needed it is a prorated amount put out to the units to supply it.

Greg McAuley said the SPS is set to operate at the thermal limit. If deploying reserves, shouldn't there be a study to see if the reserves can flow without overloading the transmission line. Jason Smith explained that there is a flowgate in place now, since the event. The RZ calculator is only looking at a generation contingency.

Greg McAuley was concerned that no one saw the overload. He thinks both sides should have seen that coming. No line tripped, so no flowgate information would show up in RTCA.

Bryn Wilson asked for more information about the flowgate created. A concern he expressed is that when the SPS armed, the windfarm only offered about 20 MW on the line. Tripping the windfarm may not provide the relief needed. Jason Smith said SPP may need to build an interface flowgate. The other flowgate that was built was because of the realization that the wind may not cover the need.

Unless the system reverses flow before it can be activated, we shouldn't have any surprises now. SPP needs to study and review the new lines and windfarms before the flowgate becomes permanent.

New Windfarms will have an entry in CROW. They enter it in an outage, with the end of the outage the effective online date/time. SPP should do more studies for effects of the new equipment.

The system changes rapidly and the pieces they would have known about beforehand for system utilization, fuel requirements, etc...are changing quickly and all the time.

OGE and SPP need to touch base about the flowgate separate from the ORWG.

Agenda Item 5 – Unit Starts/Commitment Process Discussion

Jason Smith provided a RUC Philosophy document.

Ron Gunderson said they are seeing units being started that haven't run in years and they are out of the commitment range, for which they have to be made whole. Just because they have short lead times, the unit(s) may not be the best solution. SPP should consider committing intermediate units instead of primarily peaking units. Jason Smith suggested that the energy prices are optimized looking at the whole day (one day). Ron hasn't seen data to show that running a more expensive unit for a short period of time is more cost effective than running a longer min run unit for the required time. Ron said they have units that are becoming a concern for the number of starts allowed before maintenance. What is causing the unit to run when it's that far out of the money? To Ron this is an indication that SPP is either short of ramp or capacity, which is a concern going into summer. Forensics is looking into the reserves and the effects on the solution. Ramp is likely a reason that they are getting committed. It should be priced accordingly and added to the offer. On the financial side of the system, they get made whole unless they don't stay on the setpoints. The number of starts allowed annually and the number remaining before maintenance may be information we need to obtain from the old BAs.

- Ron Gunderson needs some kind of data to support the statements that indicate that this is a good solution to help his level of comfort.
- There is an MPRR being drafted that allows for longer lead time units to be started if there is an indication that they will be economically sound to start up.
- The studies now for multi-day are not optimized over 7 days; there is internal hard coded components that may fail trying to run longer periods of time. The goal is to get a full 7 day look ahead.

There is a TOP report that goes on the market portal. It includes information that says the unit, possibly to run, with commitment information in the COP. Mark Eastwood asked about the information in the report containing the list of units that are possible may not actually get committed in real time. Jason Smith confirmed. The report also indicates which type of study put the resource in play. MD – multi day, DB – day before, etc...COP means it's been given a start order. DBDA means it hasn't been committed yet.

- Jessica Tucker asked about the portion available to the TOP. From the perspective of getting the potential of unit start-ups, currently they scramble to get multiple units started up. The GOP would find the information helpful. Jason can see where a 4 – 6 hour heads up would be useful. The balance of reliability would benefit.
- Reliability Reports (All) → MOA-GEN has the information with MW amounts.
- Don Shipley commented that there is a vision to have around 4 meetings for these types of discussions, including visits to the RUC desk in the control room. Allowing the entities to hear results, see results and have the group discussion. Possibly in September.
- Casey Cathey put together a survey that will be going out. Jason Smith displayed the questionnaire to the group. Bryn Wilson suggested adding a target audience to questionnaire information.
- Call Will Tootle or Jason Smith for unit specific characteristics that SPP may not know about. Make sure the operators are aware that they can contact SPP for issues with things like voltage, and unit run requirements.

- If we are using historical information, we may be making a mistake because in the EIS market, we had 2000-3000 more MW generating, commented by John Stephens.

Neil Robertson commented that NSI changes stack up across the top of the hour. John Stephens suggested forcing or incenting some of that to move to different times. Ron Gunderson said the Interchange following the load causing problems. Jason Smith said they track it as a generation change. Start/Stop instructions are at the top of the hour, maybe they could be staggered. Some of this happens manually now.

Break 3:16 to 3:30 p.m.

Agenda Item 6 – Outage Coordination Discussion

A. Outage Coordination Subgroup Update

TCR/ARR funding. Ron Gunderson suggested that there was one month that was underfunded. All outages are considered to be taken at the same time. How do we get information for the TCR/ARR that is not to the level supplied in CROW?

Abu Elteriefi said a recent discussion was to submit the outages but not include dates, this was with MISO. CROW seemed to allow this.

There will need to be a discussion on the financial burden for this change, which was not part of the Integrated Marketplace planning.

Terry, from AEP, commented that the group knows it won't be perfect. At PJM the outages are included in the annual process, they have a single season. SPP has 7 seasons. They include outages that are 1 months or longer. Outages 5 days or longer must be submitted 6 months prior to the outage with the timeframe reducing based on the outage duration time period.

B. Reporting Metrics

Jason Smith displayed the presentation that was included in the meeting materials. They do weekly snapshots for 4 years out, but the volume of outages doesn't get reflected accurately.

Have there been discussion about changing the types of units, breakers, etc... Jason Smith did a requisition for a patch to turn other equipment outages on. Once they get it, they will start working with entities to populate reactors, breakers (not all), switching devices, etc.. SPP would use the planning model or EMS model for cap reactors, or other items as a starting point then have the entities add to it.

Are there any plans to change timing requirements? Not at this time. The outage request priorities may/may not feed off the same thing. The timelines will be the same as for transmission equipment today.

Greg McAuley asked about the timing of the changes. It will be a month or so to get the patch back from the vendor, the patches include bug fixes, so it can be rolled out separately, the change will need to go through CWG.

Kyle McMenamin said they are taking RTU outages and currently contacting the RC every day to discuss what is changing.

SPP will use the reactors and cap bank information for studies. SPP only wants to know unavailable, not necessarily statuses. The actual status is supplied through EMS.

Abu Elteriefi asked about relay systems in this process. Jason Smith said you can submit an outage now, and it can be submitted as a general protection system. It is not counted as an outage; SPP uses the

comments to determine the details. The table in Appendix 12 describes how they are treated in studies. This is also meeting the requirement of supplying the information to SPP.

C. SPP Seasonal/Forward Capacity Assessments (EPA impacts, outages, etc...) Included in other discussion in this section.

Meeting ended at 4:30 p.m. followed by a tour of the OGE Control Room.

Agenda Item 7 – MPRR Review (Micha Bailey, Jared Greenwalt)

MPRR 178 – DVER and NDVER Operating Limit Clarification

The discussion ended by adding this MPRR to the Approval group.

MPRR 179 – MP Agreement with BSS Usage

There was discussion at November’s MWG meeting related to this which made the MWG determine more language was needed to provide clarification. Terry Gates added that this was related to future commodities.

This is bilateral settlements related language.

Allan George asked if the Participant must do anything differently, Micha said there is no change to the participant.

The discussion considered this MPRR as No Reliability Impact

MPRR 182 – Offer Mitigation Transparency

The discussion considered this MPRR as No Reliability Impact

MPRR 183 – Re Pricing Clarification

The discussion considered this MPRR as No Reliability Impact

MPRR 185 – OOME Setpoint Clarification for VER’s

The language in the MPRR may conflict with MPRR 170. The ORWG determined to table the discussion and expedite the effort to correct MPRR 170 and revisit this as a single MPRR (155, 170, and 185 information).

John Stephens moved to approve MPRR 178, no reliability impact for MPRR 179, 182, 183 and to table MPRR 185. Paul Lampe seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 8 – Capacity Accreditation Review (Scott Jordan/Mitch Williams)

Mitch Williams discussed the CRR12 provided as part of the meeting material.

Jim Useldinger commented that the confidence factor is the driver. They would like to see the various levels. Mitch Williams discussed the information using a chart that was presented to the MOPC.

Scott Jordan commented that he created a chart and with the 17 wind farms that the GWG looked at. He provided the information in the table below.

Confidence Factor (%)	% of Name Plate
50	14
55	12
60	10
65	8.3
70	6.6
75	4.5
80	3.0
85	1.9

Rob Janssen presented material that had been presented at the SPP Board Meeting. Amber Metzker added that the charts Rob presented are based on 2013 data. DNR capable wind needs to be reviewed. The change will be to resources with firm transmission service... this reduces the number of resources that need to be reviewed. Scott Jordan has the 2010 – 2012 information.

Year (Peak hour from Operations data)	% of Name Plate
2010	21.9
2011	16.01
2012	5.15
2013	5

Concerns expressed include the following:

- Worst case/worst hour needs to be considered for Reliability
- Increase in the absolute value of quantity of MW
- Retirement of coal unit plants.
- Increase in wind farms increases the likelihood that the wind will produce necessary MWs. Some say this is an increase in risk, too. The wind generation in the SPP footprint may go up to 30,000 MW of wind over the next few years.

Further analysis should include:


- All resources, for comparison.
- An annual review to determine if the numbers should be adjusted.
- Accreditation timeframes and force outage ratings.

Going with 60% is too aggressive, we will be going with 75% to see how things go and make a change in the future.

Abu Elteriefi asked what amount of the wind this number represents, considering this is for NDRs only. The number is unknown.

Jim Useldinger summarized that the 3% is not under the debate.

Kyle McMenamin motioned to approve CRR 12 as written. Greg McAuley seconded the motion. Jason Smith captured the outcome of the vote, 6 to approve 5 against. The motion passed.

 Operating Reliability Working Group							
Motion to accept CRR 12 as presented (3%/60%)							
Motion Passed						6	5
Y/N	Name	Status	Company	Yes	No		
yes	1 Allan George	M	Sunflower Electric Power	1	0		
no	2 Allen Klassen	M	Westar Energy	0	1		
n/a	3 Danny McDaniel	M	CLECO	0	0		
yes	4 Darrel Yohnk	M	ITC Great Plains	1	0		
yes	5 Dennis Sauriol	M	American Electric Power	1	0		
yes	6 Gregory McAuley	M	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	1	0		
yes	7 Jim Useldinger	M	Kansas City Power & Light	1	0		
no	8 John Stephens	M	City Utilities of Springfield Missouri	0	1		
yes	9 Kyle McMenamin	M	Xcel Energy (SPS)	1	0		
no	10 Mike Wech	M	Southwest Power Administration	0	1		
no	11 Paul Lampe	M	City of Independence	0	1		
no	12 Ron Gunderson	M	Nebraska Public Power District	0	1		
n/a	13 Steve Haun	M	Lincoln Electric System	0	0		
n/a	14 Walter (Todd) Gosnell	M	Omaha Public Power District	0	0		

Mitch Williams asked if the solar information could be presented/proposed as written in the CRR 12, removing the wind from the list.

Amber Metzker presented Solar data information related to CRR 12.

Break 10:40 – 10:50 a.m.

Jim Useldinger asked the group if additional items were needed for the agenda. No additional items were added. The goal will be to wrap up close to noon.

Agenda Item 9 – TOP/IRO Standard Drafting Team Update (Robert Rhodes/Allen Klassen)

Robert Rhodes reviewed the presentation that was sent out during the meeting.

There is a correction on slide 8 of the presentation, IRO-002-2 will be retired, not IRO-002-4 as indicated in the slide.

There is a 9 am call on 6/27. The announcement should have gone out this week. Robert Rhodes will be hosting a discussion for comments.

Allen Klassen added this information related to the drafting team:

- There are many masters in the group.
- Many of the proposed changes weight of implementation complications require information on how the auditor will determine compliance. There may not be tools available to capture the equipment information that is being included in the proposed language.
- Flowgates are SOLs is no longer true, anything with a facility rating.
- Known operating state is removed.

Agenda Item 10 – NERC Operating Committee Update (Jim Useldinger)

No information presented.

Agenda Item 11 – Governing Doc/Criteria/Revision Request Process update (Jason Smith)

Jason Smith provided an update based on information discussed with the Staff Secretaries at SPP recently. There is a project at SPP to define a revision request process. They are currently defining how it will work for various sets/types of changes; an RMS form would be the central tool to do a revision request, vague or very specific. Document information and key words will initiate routing to staff secretaries within SPP.

Agenda Item 12 – MOPC Capacity Margin Review (Rob Janssen)

The discussion was introduced at the MOPC meeting, discussed at the Board of Directors educational session. Answers to some of the questions are due on Monday. Rob Janssen would like to get the ORWG's perspective on these items.

Jason Smith suggested a call for an hour to do comments. This is needed before MOPC; July 3rd is the deadline for MOPC materials. July 1 agenda addition.

Agenda Item 13 – Value of Transmission Study (Jason Smith)

This is related to the VSAT presentation that was supplied in the meeting material. The conceptual scope is being developed now for the July MOPC. Need to know what the information will be used for to help target the study results. There is no action needed by the ORWG at this time.

Agenda Item 14 – Next Meeting

7/1/2014 WebEx (930 – noon)

8/7/2014 WebEx (930 – noon)

9/4/2014 WebEx (930 – noon)

10/3/2014 WebEx (930 – noon)
11/5-6/2014 Face to Face (tentative - Grand Island, NE)
12/4/2014 WebEx (930 – noon)

Agenda Item 15 – Action Item Review (Kathy Myhand)

See action item list above.

Agenda Item 16 – Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jason Smith
Secretary

Attachments:
Attendance
Proxies

Southwest Power Pool
OPERATING RELIABILITY WORKING GROUP MEETING
June 18-19, 2014
OG+E Energy Technology Center – Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

• ATTENDANCE LIST •

Name	Company
✓ Kathy Myhand	SPP
✓ Jim Useldinger	KCP&L
✓ Greg McAuley	OG+E
✓ Bryan Wilson	OG+E
✓ Abu Elteriefi	ITC
✓ Robert Rhodes	SPP
✓ Don Hargrove	OG+E
✓ SING TAY	OG+E
✓ Mark Gustafson	City Utilities
✓ Don Shultz	SPP
✓ Ron Gunderson	WPPD
✓ Allen Klassen	Westar
✓ Allan George	SECI
✓ John Stephens	SPRM
✓ Paul Lampe	INDN
✓ Neil Robertson	SPP
✓ Jason Smitt	SPP
✓ Bryce McNameham	SFS
✓ Bob Reynolds	SPP RE
✓ Mitchell L Williams	WFEL

From: Steve Haun [<mailto:shaun@les.com>]
Sent: Thursday, June 12, 2014 1:21 PM
To: Jason Smith; Kitty McArthur
Cc: Fix, Jason; Pietzyk, Bruce; Anderson, Lee
Subject: ORWG Meeting June 18 -19

Good Afternoon Jason,

I will not be able to attend the Face to Face meeting of the ORWG in Oklahoma City next week.

I will be in the backwaters of central Missouri. I am planning on calling in, but I was told that cell service will be spotty if even available. So, just to be sure LES is covered Jason Fix at LES will listen in for me. (jfix@les.com 402.467.6867)
I also would like to give Jason Fix my proxy for any required voting.

I noticed that there is not an agenda yet posted on the website. Will one be posted soon?
I would like to review the agenda with him before the meeting.

We are especially interested in the update the ORGW is supposed to receive from SPP the BA regarding how generation is committed in the DA and RT markets.

Thanks again Jason,

Steve

Steve Haun | Lincoln Electric System | Supervisor, Energy Management
☎ 402.467.7582 Cell: 402.304.0834 Fax: 402.474.3080 | ✉ shaun@les.com

From: Yohnk, Darrel [<mailto:dyohnk@Itctransco.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2014 8:48 AM
To: Useldinger Jim; Smith Jason (jsmith@spp.org)
Cc: Elteriefi, Abubaker
Subject: Proxy for 6/18 ORWG Meeting

Jim/Jason,

Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the 6/18 ORWG meeting. Abu Elteriefi will attend in my place and I am designating him as my proxy for any voting matters that come up.

Enjoy Oklahoma City,

Darrel

From: Mike Wech [<mailto:mike.wech@swpa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Useldinger Jim
Subject: RE: ORWG June 18-19, 2014

Jim,

John Stephens from City Utilities of Springfield will have my proxy.

I should also have John Norman (SPA's outage coordinator) sitting in for some of the portions of the ORWG discussions as well.

Again, my apologies for not being available.

Thank you!

M. Wech