



Southwest Power Pool

REGIONAL TARIFF WORKING GROUP MEETING

March 24, 2016

AEP Office – Dallas, TX

• Summary of Motions •

Agenda Item 3 – Consent Agenda — Bernie Liu (Xcel) motioned and Tom Hestermann (SEPC) seconded to approve the Consent Agenda with the corrections noted in the RTWG February 25, 2016 Minutes. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.

Agenda Item 6 – BP RR156 – Modification to BP 7650 DPP Clarification Drew Robinson (KCP&L) motioned and Jim Bixby (ITC) seconded to approve BP 7650 DPP Clarification as not in violation of the Tariff and to make a recommendation to the MOPC regarding the timing applicability. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.

Agenda Item 7 – BP RR147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Robert Pick (NPPD) seconded to approve the BP RR147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades as amended and as not in violation of the Tariff. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.



Agenda Item 8 (a) – BP RR148 – Update to Business Practice 2150 Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) motioned and Bernie Liu (Xcel) seconded to approve the RR148 – Update to Business Practice 2150 - webRegistry. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.

Agenda Item 8 (b) – BP RR149 – Update to Business Practice 6150 - Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Drew Robinson (KCP&L) seconded to approve BP RR149 – Update to Business Practice 6150 – Abnormal Conditions. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.

Agenda Item 8 (c) – BP RR150 – Update to BP 4300 – Abnormal Conditions – Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Mo Awad (Westar) seconded to approve BP RR150 – Update to BP 4300 – Abnormal Conditions. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.

Agenda Item 9 (a) – MP RR142 – Quick Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility Mo Awad (Westar) motioned and Drew Robinson (KCP&L) seconded to approve MP RR –142 – Quick Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.

Agenda Item 9 (b) – MP RR145 – OOME Clarification - John Varnell (TPS) motioned and Mo Awad (Westar) seconded to approve MP RR145 – OOME Clarification. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.

Agenda Item 9 (c) – MP RR154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements – Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Mo Awad (Westar) seconded to approve MP



RR154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements. Motion passed with three abstentions (AECC), (GSEC) and (EDEC) and three oppositions (Westar), (OPPD), and (NPPD).

Agenda Item 10 – RCWG-RRTF Recommendation Report Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Robert Pick (NPPD) seconded to approve the RCWG Recommendation Report with the addition of Attachment AQ. Motion passed with no abstentions and no opposition.

Agenda Item 11 – Tariff RR160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP Robert Pennybaker (AEP) motioned and Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) seconded to approve RR160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP. Motion passed with no abstentions and no opposition.



• M I N U T E S •

Agenda Item 1—Call to Order, Proxies, Agenda Discussion

Chairman David Kays (OG&E) called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and asked for a round of introductions. The attendance (*Attachment 1—RTWG Attendance and Proxies – March 24, 2016*) was recorded and two proxies were recorded.

- Tom Christensen (BEPC) assigned his proxy to Blaine Erhardt (BEPC)
- Luke Haner (OPPD) assigned his proxy to Sam Thompson (OPPD)

Agenda Item 2—Review of Agenda and Additional Agenda Items

The group reviewed the agenda (*Attachment 2—RTWG Agenda –March 24, 2016*). There were no changes to the agenda.

Agenda Item 3 – Consent Agenda

David Kays (OG&E) asked the group for feedback on the items listed on the Consent Agenda. Tom Hestermann (SEPC) pointed out an error on the RTWG February 25, 2016 Meeting Minutes. **Bernie Liu (Xcel) motioned and Tom Hestermann (SEPC) to approve the Consent Agenda with the correction noted on the February 25, 2016 Meeting Minutes. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.**



Agenda Item 4 (a) – Review Action Items

Brenda Fricano (SPP) presented an update to the following RTWG Action Items:

- Action Item 78 – FERC accepted language in Dockets ER14-2553-003 and ER14-2553-04 (Roll-in Methodology Option)

Agenda Item 4(b) – RRR Update

Denise Martin (SPP) presented an update to the Revenue Requirements and Rates. The file is posted on SPP.org and contains information for Transmission billing effective April 1, 2016. The revisions include the Formula Rate annual update of revenue requirements and rates for Zones 3 City of Springfield and 19g North Western. The rates will become effective for service on and after April 1, 2016 for transmission service under the Southwest Power Pool (“SPP”) OATT.

Agenda Item 5— Z2 Project Update

Chuck Jennings (SPP) presented an update to the Z2 Crediting Project. Chuck stated the team continues to work on historical data and Business Processes. Chuck explained due to a design change, the Member onsite verification meeting has been moved to the end of May, 2016. This will be a Z2 Educational Meeting to display how the system is working with real production data and calculations. The information and registration will be posted on SPP.org. As Members register, a Non-Disclosure Agreement (“NDA”) Form will be emailed to the recipient. The NDA form must be completed and submitted to SPP in order to allow the member to attend the Z2 Educational Meeting.



Steve Davis (SPP) stated SPP has reached out to all parties in order to ensure SPP has the correct information on record. Steve stated if there are entities that believe they are owed credits that SPP is not aware of; please submit a RMS ticket with the quick pick option and enter the upgrade information.

Agenda Item 6 – BP RR156 – Modification to BP 7650 DPP Clarification

Tony Green (SPP) presented RR156 – Modification to BP 7650 DPP Clarification. Tony shared the revisions in RR156 will clarify the steps taken in determining which Detailed Projects Proposals (DPP) may be equivalent to transmission projects selected within a portfolio eligible for the Transmission Owner Selection Process. These changes will also further enhance SPP's ability to efficiently and accurately execute the DPP Process within the required timelines of the Integrate Transmission Planning (ITP) studies. The group agreed to approve RR156 with the recommendation that the MOPC decide the timing applicability. **Drew Robinson (KCP&L) motioned and Jim Bixby (ITC) seconded to approve BP 7650 DPP Clarification as not in violation of the Tariff and to make a recommendation to the MOPC regarding the timing applicability. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.**

Agenda Item 7 – BP RR147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades

Ben Bright (SPP) presented BP RR147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades. Ben shared the business practice describes the process by which the determination is made by SPP that a



Competitive Upgrade is 50% complete. Attachment Y, Section III.2(d)(xii) of the Open Access Transmission Tariff requires the Selected RFP Respondent(s) to provide a 2% cash deposit upon accepting the responsibilities of being the Designated Transmission Owner, and SPP will refund the deposit once the 50% completion milestone of the Competitive Upgrade is reached. The revisions in RR147 describe the methodology SPP will utilize to make this determination. **Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Robert Pick (NPPD) seconded to approve the BP RR147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades as amended. Motion passed with no oppositions and no abstentions.**

Agenda Item 8 (a) BP RR148 – Update to Business Practice 2150 -webRegistry

Ken Quimby (SPP) presented BP RR148 – Update to Business Practice - webRegistry. Ken shared the current Business Practice 2150 references a NERC-registered entity referring to the original NERC TSIN registry. The NERC TSIN registry has been retired and replaced with the webRegistry. **Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) motioned and Bernie Liu (Xcel) seconded to approve the RR148 – Update to Business Practice 2150 - webRegistry. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.**



Agenda Item 8 (b) – BP RR149 – Update to Business Practice 6150 – Abnormal

Conditions

Ken Quimby (SPP) noted the updates in BP RR149 – Business Practice 6150 – Abnormal Conditions reflect the current appropriate NERC Standard. **Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Drew Robinson (KCP&L) seconded to approve BP RR149 – Update to Business Practice 6150 – Abnormal Conditions. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.**

Agenda Item 8 (c) – RR 150 Update to Business Practice 4300 – Elevation of NITS

Service

Ken Quimby (SPP) stated the revisions in RR150 Update to Business Practice 4300, reflect the current NERC Standard. **Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Mo Awad (Westar) seconded to approve BP RR150 – Update to BP 4300 – Abnormal Conditions. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.**

Agenda Item 9 (a) – MP RR142 – Quick-Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility

Jared Greenwalt (SPP) presented MP R142 – Quick-Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility. Jared explained if a Quick-Start Resource is to be operated as a Multi-Configuration Combined Cycle Resource, it would require additional software changes that were not in the scope of RR1 (Combined Cycle Enhanced Design). If Market Participants want to register Quick-Start Resources as Multi-Configuration Combined Cycle Resources, another Impact Analysis would be required and the implementation timeline would be increased. RR142 clarifies that a Resource cannot be registered as both a Quick-Start Resource and a Multi-Configuration



Combined Cycle Resource. **Mo Awad (Westar) motioned and Drew Robinson (KCP&L) seconded to approve MP RR –142 – Quick Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.**

Agenda Item 9 (b) – MP RR154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements

Micha Bailey (SPP) presented MR RR154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements. Micha explained the current SPP Protocols and Tariff allow for the repricing of the DA Market at any time and for any reason regardless of error, impact identification time, etc. The language is also unclear as to the full obligation of SPP in terms of when SPP is required to reprice. SPP believes the intent is there should not be a requirement to reprice the DA and/or RT market for every data input/software error that exists. The cost of repricing for every error and manpower required often outweigh the financial impact of the error. **Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Bernie Liu (Xcel) seconded to approve MP RR154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements. Motion passed with three abstentions (AECC), (GSEC) and (EDEC) and three oppositions (Westar), (OPPD) and (NPPD).**

Agenda Item 9 (c) – MP RR145 – OOME Clarification

MP RR145 – OOME Clarification was presented at the RTWG February 24, 2016 meeting and the group assigned multiple Action Items to SPP Staff. Raleigh Mohr (SPP) reviewed and explained the responses to the Action Items for RR145 –



OOME Clarification. **John Varnell (TPS) motioned and Mo Awad (Westar) seconded to approve MP RR145 – OOME Clarification. Motion passed with no abstentions and no oppositions.**

Agenda Item 10 – RCWG-RRTF and the RR Process

John Allen (CUS) presented the RCWG Revision Request Task Force Recommendation Report. John explained the RCWG’s review of the Revision Requests will provide expertise to other SPP’s working groups on regional compliance matters, focusing on reliability standards and SPP Criteria. John noted the Revision Request Task Force has been formed under the RCWG to review Tariff, Criteria, Market Protocols and Business Practices to determine which sections will require RCWG’s secondary approval and ensuring RCWG focuses on monitoring revisions with NERC compliance impacts.

John explained a Triage Process has been added to the Revision Request Form adding a box (NERC Standard Impact) in the Revision Request Details. This change will ensure the applicable RRs are sent to the RCWG for secondary approval. Mo Awad (Westar) stated Attachment AQ should be added to the list of Attachments for the RCWG as secondary approver. **Tom Hestermann (SEPC) motioned and Robert Pick (NPPD) seconded to approve the RCWG Recommendation Report with the addition of Attachment AQ.**



Agenda Item 11 – Tariff RR160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP

Liz Gephardt (SPP) presented Tariff RR160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP. Liz explained the Tariff language in Attachment O, Section III is unclear as to which generation interconnections and their associated upgrades are required to be modeled in the ITP assessments. The Tariff revisions in RR160 will allow generation interconnections and associated upgrades be included in the ITP studies as detailed in the ITP Manual. **Robert Pennybaker (AEP) motioned and Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) seconded to approve RR160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP as modified. Motion passed with no abstentions and no opposition.**

Agenda Item 12 – RTWG Task Force Updates

BDTF – Heather Starnes (MJMEUC) reported RR158 – Determination of Network Load was presented at the BPWG at their March 17, 2016 meeting. Comments have since been posted from SPP Members. RR158 along with all comments will be scheduled for review at the RTWG April 21, 2016 Meeting.

The BDTF will be working with SPP Staff in drafting Tariff language to determine how costs from an Upgrade Sponsor that is not a TO are allocated to the impacted zones.

CPTF – David Kays (OG&E) stated as SPP Staff progresses along with the crediting tool, the CPTF will renew efforts in the development of roll-in Tariff language. A



CPTF meeting has been scheduled for March 31, 2016 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon.

Z2PPTF – Neil Rowland (KME) stated the Z2PPTF last met on February 17, 2016. A few Action Items will be addressed as the progress on the crediting tool is complete.

Agenda Item 12 – Future Meetings

- April 21, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- May 26, 2016– Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- June 23, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- July 21, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- August 25, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- September 22, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- October 20, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- November 17, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
- December 15, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)

Agenda Item 14 –Adjournment

Chair Kays (OG&E) adjourned the meeting at 1:32 P.M.



Respectfully Submitted,
Brenda Fricano
Secretary

Attachments

Attachment 1 – Attendance and Proxies

*Attachment 2 – Agenda

*Attachment 3 – Z2 Project Update

*Attachment 5 – BP RR 156 – Modification to BP 7650 DPP Clarification

Attachment 7 – BP RR 147 – 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination
for Competitive Upgrades

*Attachment 8 (a) – BP RR148 – Update to BP148 – webRegistry

*Attachment 8 (b) – BP RR 149 – Update to BP 6150 – Abnormal Conditions

*Attachment 8 (c) – BP RR 150 – Update to BP 4300 – Elevation of NITS Service

*Attachment 9 (a) – MP RR 142 – Quick-Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility

*Attachment 9 (b) – MP RR 154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements

*Attachment 9 (c) – MP RR 145 – OOME Clarification

*Attachment 10 – RCWG-RRTF and the RR Process

Attachment 11 – Tariff RR 160 – Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP

***Please see RTWG Meeting Materials – March 24, 2016**

[RTWG Meeting Materials](#)



Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
REGIONAL TARIFF WORKING GROUP MEETING
March 24, 2016
Renaissance Tower (AEP Offices) – Dallas, TX

• A T T E N D A N C E L I S T •

Name	Company	Position	Email	Attendance
Awad, Mo	Westar Energy	Member	Mo.awad@westarenergy.com	In Person
Billinger, Michael	Midwest Energy	Member	mbillinger@mwenergy.com	Net Conference
Bixby, Jim	ITC Great Plains	Member	jbixby@itctransco.com	In Person
Busbee, Alfred	East Texas Coop	Member	Alfred.busbee@gdsassociates.com	In Person
Brown, Natasha	WFEC	Member	Natasha.brown@wfec.com	In Person
Cecil, Walt	MoPSC		Walter.cecil@psc.mo.gov	In Person
Christensen, Tom	BEPC	Member	tomc@bepec.com	Net Conference/Proxy
Doll, Aaron	Empire District Electric	Member	adoll@empiredistrict.com	Net Conference
Haner, Luke	Omaha Public Power District	Member	lphaner@oppd.com	Proxy
Hestermann, Tom	Sunflower Electric Power Corp	Member	thestermann@sunflower.net	In Person
Janssen, Rob	Dogwood Energy	Member	rob.janssen@kelsonenergy.com	Net Conference
Kays, David	Oklahoma Gas & Electric	Chair	kaysdl@oge.com	In Person
Littleton, Tom	OMPA	Member	tptconsultants@cox.net	
Liu, Bernard	Xcel Energy	Member	Bernard.liu@xcelenergy.com	In Person
Matos, Christopher	GSEC	Member	gmates@gsec.com	Net Conference

RTWG - March 24, 2016 Webex Attendance

Participant	Name	Email	Date	Start time	End time	Duration
1	Brenda Fricano	bfricano@spp.org	3/24/2016	8:37 AM	1:36 PM	299 mins
2	Blaine Erhardt	berhardt@bepc.com	3/24/2016	8:48 AM	1:36 PM	289 mins
3	Heather Starnes (MJMEUC)	heather@healylawoffices.com	3/24/2016	8:50 AM	1:33 PM	283 mins
4	Mark Eastwood	mark.eastwood@cityutilities.net	3/24/2016	8:50 AM	1:23 PM	273 mins
5	Jack Clark	jack.clark@nee.com	3/24/2016	8:53 AM	1:29 PM	277 mins
6	Ella Caillouette (NWE)	ella.caillouette@northwestern.com	3/24/2016	8:53 AM	11:36 AM	163 mins
7	Dan Trent	dtrent@aeci.org	3/24/2016	8:55 AM	1:36 PM	281 mins
8	Jill Jones (MEAN)	jjones@nmppenergy.org	3/24/2016	8:56 AM	1:36 PM	280 mins
9	Rob Janssen	rjanssen33@hotmail.com	3/24/2016	8:56 AM	1:36 PM	280 mins
10	Dennis Reed	dennis.reed@mwregcon.com	3/24/2016	8:57 AM	9:28 AM	32 mins
11	Chuck Jennings - SPP	cjennings@spp.org	3/24/2016	8:57 AM	9:43 AM	46 mins
12	Tony Green	tgreen@spp.org	3/24/2016	8:57 AM	10:23 AM	86 mins
13	David Daniels (SPP Settlements)	ddaniels@spp.org	3/24/2016	8:58 AM	11:17 AM	139 mins
14	Matt Harward	mharward@spp.org	3/24/2016	8:58 AM	1:34 PM	276 mins
15	John Stephens (SPRM)	john.stephens@cityutilities.net	3/24/2016	8:58 AM	1:36 PM	278 mins
16	Sam Thompson	srthompson@oppd.com	3/24/2016	8:59 AM	1:33 PM	274 mins
17	Ben Bright	bbright@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:00 AM	10:22 AM	82 mins
18	Robert Safuto (Customized Energy Solut	rsafuto@ces-ltd.com	3/24/2016	9:00 AM	1:30 PM	271 mins
19	Brian Buffington (Xcel)	brian.g.buffington@xcelenergy.com	3/24/2016	9:00 AM	1:36 PM	276 mins
20	J.P. Maddock	jpmaddock@bepc.com	3/24/2016	9:00 AM	1:33 PM	273 mins
21	David Binkley	dbinkley@itctransco.com	3/24/2016	9:01 AM	10:49 AM	109 mins
22	Raleigh Mohr - SPP	rmohr@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:01 AM	11:32 AM	152 mins
23	Patti Kelly	pkelly@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:01 AM	11:44 AM	163 mins
24	Robert Shields	rshields@aecc.com	3/24/2016	9:01 AM	1:31 PM	270 mins
25	Ray Bergmeier (Sunflower)	rbergmeier@sunflower.net	3/24/2016	9:01 AM	1:05 PM	244 mins
26	Gayle Freier	gfreier@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:03 AM	1:26 PM	263 mins
27	Steve Davis - SPP	sdavis@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:03 AM	1:29 PM	267 mins
28	Denise Martin	dsmartin@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:03 AM	1:36 PM	273 mins
29	Mike Mushrush	mmushrush@ompa.com	3/24/2016	9:03 AM	1:36 PM	273 mins
30	Sherry Hamilton (SPP)	shamilton@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:04 AM	1:04 PM	241 mins
31	John Luallen (SPP)	jluallen@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:04 AM	1:05 PM	242 mins

32 Steve Gaw	rsgaw1@gmail.com	3/24/2016	9:04 AM	1:33 PM	270 mins
33 Michael Billinger (MWE)	mbillinger@mwenergy.com	3/24/2016	9:05 AM	1:33 PM	268 mins
34 Luke Haner	lphaner@oppd.com	3/24/2016	9:05 AM	1:36 PM	271 mins
35 John Bell	j.bell@kcc.ks.gov	3/24/2016	9:05 AM	1:32 PM	268 mins
36 Nicole Wagner (SPP)	jwagner@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:05 AM	1:36 PM	271 mins
37 Jeff Knottek (SPRM)	jeff.knottek@cityutilities.net	3/24/2016	9:06 AM	12:58 PM	232 mins
38 Ken Quimby	kquimby@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:06 AM	11:47 AM	161 mins
39 Chris Matos (GSEC)	cmatos@gsec.coop	3/24/2016	9:08 AM	11:34 AM	147 mins
40 Richard Seide (Apex)	richard.seide@apexcleanenergy.com	3/24/2016	9:10 AM	12:17 PM	187 mins
41 Aaron Doll (EDE)	adoll@empiredistrict.com	3/24/2016	9:11 AM	1:36 PM	265 mins
42 Charles Locke	clocke@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:15 AM	10:07 AM	53 mins
43 Matt Binette	binette@wrightlaw.com	3/24/2016	9:28 AM	1:20 PM	233 mins
44 Dennis Reed	dennis.reed@mwregcon.com	3/24/2016	9:33 AM	11:26 AM	114 mins
45 Shawnee Claiborn-Pinto	shawnee.claiborn-pinto@puc.texas.gov	3/24/2016	9:38 AM	1:19 PM	222 mins
46 Liz Gephardt (SPP)	lgephardt@spp.org	3/24/2016	9:49 AM	1:31 PM	223 mins
47 Robert Pick (NPPD)	rjpick@nppd.com	3/24/2016	9:50 AM	1:36 PM	227 mins
48 Micha Bailey (SPP)	mcb Bailey@spp.org	3/24/2016	10:04 AM	1:06 PM	183 mins
49 Erin Cathey (SPP)	ecathey@spp.org	3/24/2016	10:05 AM	1:36 PM	211 mins
50 Tom Christensen	tomc@bepc.com	3/24/2016	10:11 AM	12:36 PM	145 mins
51 John Allen (SPRM)	john.allen@cityutilities.net	3/24/2016	10:12 AM	12:29 PM	138 mins
52 Jared Greenwalt	jgreenwalt@spp.org	3/24/2016	10:31 AM	11:32 AM	61 mins
53 Nick Parker (SPP)	nparker@spp.org	3/24/2016	10:38 AM	1:23 PM	165 mins
54 David Binkley (ITC)	dbinkley@itctransco.com	3/24/2016	11:29 AM	1:36 PM	127 mins
55 Dennis Reed	dennis.reed@mwregcon.com	3/24/2016	12:57 PM	1:36 PM	39 mins
56 Richard Seide (Apex)	richard.seide@apexcleanenergy.com	3/24/2016	1:00 PM	1:32 PM	33 mins
57 Tom Christensen	tomc@bepc.com	3/24/2016	1:01 PM	1:33 PM	32 mins



**Southwest Power Pool
REGIONAL TARIFF WORKING GROUP
AEP – Dallas, TX
March 24, 2016
(9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)**

AGENDA

1. Call to Order & Introductions, Receipt of Proxies (5 Min) 9:00
2. Review of Agenda and Additional Agenda Items (5 Min) 9:05
3. Consent Agenda (*Approval Item*)..... (5 Min) 9:10
 - RTWG Minutes and Attachments – February 25, 2016
4. RRR Update Denise Martin (5 Min) 9:15
5. Z2 Project Update..... SPP Staff (40 Min) 9:20
6. BP RR 156 (*Secondary Approval Item*) Tony Green (30 Min) 10:00
 - Modification To BP 7650 DPP Clarification
7. BP RR 147 (*Secondary Approval Item*) Ben (30 Min) 10:30
 - 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades
8. BP RRs (*Secondary Approval Items*) Ken Quimby (30 Min) 11:00
 - RR 148 – Update to Business Practice 2150 – webRegistry
 - RR 149 – Update to Business Practice 6150 – Abnormal Conditions
 - RR 150 – Update to Business Practice 4300 – Elevation of NITS Service
- Lunch (30 Min) 11:30
9. MP RRs (*Secondary Approval Items*) SPP Staff (90 Min) 12:00
 - RR 142 – Quick-Start Multi-Configuration Ineligibility
 - RR 154 – Repricing Timelines and Requirements



RR 145 – OOME Clarification

10. RCWG-RRTF Recommendation Report John Allen (30 Min) 1:30
 - RCWG and the RR Process (*Secondary Approval Item*)
11. Tariff RR 160 (*Approval Item*) Liz Gephardt (30 Min) 2:00
 - Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP
12. RTWG Task Force Update (20 Min) 2:30
 - BDTF
 - CPTF
 - PITTF
 - Z2PPTF
13. Future Meetings (10 Min) 2:50
 - April 21, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - May 26, 2016– Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - June 23, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - July 21, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - August 25, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - September 22, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - October 20, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - November 17, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
 - December 15, 2016 – Dallas, TX (9:00 A.M. – 3:00 P.M.)
14. Adjournment3:00

Revision Request Recommendation Report

RR #: 147		Date: 1/6/2016
RR Title: 50% Project Completion Milestone Determination for Competitive Upgrades		
SUBMITTER INFORMATION		
Submitter Name: Cary Frizzell	Company: SPP	
Email: cfrizzell@spp.org	Phone: 501-688-1792	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION FOR MOPC AND BOD ACTION		
OBJECTIVE OF REVISION		
<p>Objectives of Revision Request: This new business practice describes the process by which the determination is made by SPP that a Competitive Upgrade is 50% complete. Attachment Y, Section III.2(d)(xii) of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff requires the Selected RFP Respondent(s) to provide a 2% cash deposit upon accepting the responsibilities of being the Designated Transmission Owner, and that SPP will refund the deposit once the 50% completion milestone of the Competitive Upgrade is reached. The process described below is the methodology SPP will utilize to make this determination.</p>		
SPP STAFF ASSESSMENT		
IMPACT		
<p>Will the revision result in system changes? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Summarize changes:</p> <p>Will the revision result in process changes? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Summarize changes:</p>		
<p>Is an Impact Assessment required? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>If no, explain:</p>		
Estimated Cost: \$	Estimated Duration: months	
Primary Working Group Score/Priority:		
SPP DOCUMENTS IMPACTED		
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Protocols	Protocol Section(s):	Protocol Version:
<input type="checkbox"/> Operating Criteria	Criteria Section(s):	Criteria Date:
<input type="checkbox"/> Planning Criteria	Criteria Section(s):	Criteria Date:

<input type="checkbox"/> Tariff	Tariff Section(s):
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Business Practice	Business Practice Number: New Practice
WORKING GROUP REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS List Primary and any Secondary/Impacted WG Recommendations as appropriate	
Primary Working Group: BPWG	Date: 2/18/2016 Action Taken: Approved as modified Abstained: None Opposed: None
Secondary Working Group: RTWG	Date: 3/24/2016 Action Taken: Approved as modified Abstained: None Opposed: None
Reasons for Opposition:	
Secondary Working Group: ORWG	Date: 3/3/16 Action Taken: Approved Abstained: None Opposed: None
Reasons for Opposition:	
Secondary Working Group:	Date: TBD Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
MOPC	Date: Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
COMMENTS	
Comment Author: David Binkley	
Date Comments Submitted: 2/4/2016	

Description of Comments:

The purpose of this business practice is to describe the process for determining when the 50% completion milestone has been reached for a Competitive Upgrade. After a Notification to Construct (NTC) is issued to the Selected RFP Respondent(s), Attachment Y, Section III.2(d)(xii) of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) requires the Selected RFP Respondent(s) to provide a cash deposit representing 2% of the estimated cost of the Selected RFP Proposal upon accepting the responsibilities of being the Designated Transmission Owner (DTO)(s). The cash deposit will be held in escrow by SPP and will be refunded, plus any interest the deposit accrued while in escrow [at the XX rate](#), to the DTO(s) once the 50% completion milestone of the Competitive Upgrade is reached.

A Competitive Upgrade will be considered to have reached the 50% completion milestone when [all of](#) the following criteria have been met:

1. Actual cash-out expenditures ~~equaling or exceeding of the reach~~ 50% of the RFP Response Estimate (RRE)¹
2. Construction of major project elements mobilized
3. Attestation from Company Officer that 1 and 2 have been met

Once SPP receives the attestation from the DTO(s), the 2% cash deposit, plus any interest the deposit accrued while in escrow [at the XX rate](#), will be refunded to the DTO(s)

Status: To be reviewed at the BPWG meeting 2/18/2016

Comment Author: David Binkley/ITC Holdings Group

Date Comments Submitted: 2/4/2016

Description of Comments: See red-line above

Status: Modification declined by the BPWG 2/18/2016

PROPOSED REVISION(S) TO SPP DOCUMENTS

Market Protocols

Tariff (OATT)

SPP Operating Criteria

SPP Planning Criteria

¹ The RFP Response Estimate (RRE) is defined in Business Practice 7060 as the cost estimate provided by the DTO included in its response to an RFP for a Competitive Upgrade.

Business Practice

The purpose of this business practice is to describe the process for determining when the 50% completion milestone has been reached for a Competitive Upgrade. After a Notification to Construct (NTC) is issued to the Selected RFP Respondent(s), Attachment Y, Section III.2(d)(xii) of the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) requires the Selected RFP Respondent(s) to provide a cash deposit representing 2% of the ~~estimated cost~~ RFP Response Estimate (RRE) of the Selected RFP Proposal upon accepting the responsibilities of being the Designated Transmission Owner (DTO)(s). The cash deposit will be held in escrow by SPP and will be refunded, plus any interest the deposit accrued while in escrow, to the DTO(s) once the 50% completion milestone of the Competitive Upgrade is reached.

A Competitive Upgrade will be considered to have reached the 50% completion milestone when the following criteria have been met:

1. Actual ~~cash-out~~ expenditures ~~of~~for the Competitive Upgrade reaches 50% of the RFP Response Estimate (RRE)²
2. Construction has mobilized for major project elements ~~of major project elements mobilized~~
3. Attestation from Company Officer that 1 and 2 have been met and the attestation has been sent to SPP via the Request Management System

Once SPP receives the attestation from the DTO(s), the 2% cash deposit, plus any interest the deposit accrued while in escrow, ~~shall~~will be refunded to the DTO(s) within 60 days.-

² The RFP Response Estimate (RRE) is defined in Business Practice 7060 as the cost estimate provided by the DTO included in its response to an RFP for a Competitive Upgrade.

Revision Request Recommendation Report

RR #: 154	Date: 2/23/2016
RR Title: Repricing Timelines and Requirements	
SUBMITTER INFORMATION	
Submitter Name: Jodi Woods	Company: Southwest Power Pool
Email: jwoods@spp.org	Phone: 501.614.3282
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION FOR MOPC AND BOD ACTION	
OBJECTIVE OF REVISION	
<p>Objectives of Revision Request: <i>Describe the problem/issue this revision request will resolve.</i></p> <p>The current SPP Protocols and Tariff allow for the repricing of the DA Market at any time for any reason, regardless of error, impact, identification time, etc. The language is also unclear as to the full obligation of SPP in terms of when SPP is required to reprice. I.e. SPP believes the intent is that there should not be a requirement to reprice the DA and/or RT market for every data input/software error that exists. The cost of repricing for every error and manpower required often outweighs the financial impact of the error.</p> <p><i>Describe the benefits that will be realized from this revision.</i></p> <p>SPP Staff and Market Participants will have better clarification as to when SPP would perform a repricing of the DA and RT Markets.</p>	
SPP STAFF ASSESSMENT	
IMPACT	
<p>Will the revision result in system changes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Summarize changes:</p> <p>Will the revision result in process changes? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Summarize changes:</p>	
<p>Is an Impact Assessment required? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>If no, explain: This revision will remove duplicity between NERC standard FAC-002-2 and the SPP Planning Criteria</p>	
Estimated Cost: \$	Estimated Duration: months
Primary Working Group Score/Priority:	
SPP DOCUMENTS IMPACTED	

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Market Protocols	Protocol Section(s): 7.2.2, 7.2.2.1, 7.2.2.2, 7.2.2.3, 7.2.2.4	Protocol Version: 35a
<input type="checkbox"/> Operating Criteria	Criteria Section(s):	Criteria Date:
<input type="checkbox"/> Planning Criteria	Criteria Section(s):	Criteria Date:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tariff	Tariff Section(s): Attachment AE 8.4	
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Practice	Business Practice Number:	
WORKING GROUP REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS List Primary and any Secondary/Impacted WG Recommendations as appropriate		
Primary Working Group: Market Working Group	Date: 2/23/2016 Action Taken: Approved Abstained: EDE, GSEC Opposed: NPPD, OPPD, WR	
Reason for Opposition: NPPD voted "No" on RR 154- Repricing Timelines and Requirements due to concerns on the 20% overall market threshold. NPPD has concerns when there is there is an events that impacts one or a few entities on a large scale to them but when looking at the impacts is less than 20% impact thus no rerunning the market will occur. So for example: An entity was negatively impacted by \$1 million dollars due to an event that if the threshold would be high enough the DA Market would have been rerun. Even if this event had a high impact on that entity with it being less than the 20% this entity was not able to rerun the DA Market and ended up the only one impacted. Based on being denied other SPP Entities may not know this event even occurred. As stated if the DA Market was rerun there would be money changing hands and likely an overall increase in costs for that day (making everyone whole to their costs) that would likely end up ending up in the RNU bucket. Based on this likely everyone would share in the event and would have much more interest in the event and work together to mitigate these types of events in the future. There is a need of finding a way to help mitigate this risk for everyone and one way is to share in the risk. Today you could be on your own and the event that you had no part of but was impacted and was an overall high negative impact to them.		
Secondary Working Group: RTWG	Date: 3/24/2016 Action Taken: Approved Abstained: AECC, GSEC and EDEC Opposed: Westar Energy, NPPD and OPPD	
Reasons for Opposition: Westar voted "No" on RR 154- Repricing Timelines and Requirements due to concerns that the 20% overall market threshold is too high.		
Secondary Working Group:	Date: Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:	

Reasons for Opposition:	
Secondary Working Group:	Date: Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
MOPC	Date: Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
BOD/Member Committee	Date: Action Taken: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
COMMENTS	
Comment Author: Micha Bailey on behalf of the MWG	
Date Comments Submitted: 2/23/2016	
Description of Comments: MWG changed “48 hours” to “two business days” during the meeting. The MWG felt that the time of “two business days” would be appropriate to allow SPP to check to see if SPP needed to rerun the DAMKT during a two day holiday scenario.	
Status: The MWG approved these comments.	
COMMENTS	
Comment Author: Rebecca Schwarz (AEP)	
Date Comments Submitted: 2/24/2016	

Description of Comments: There needs to be greater clarification on this RR before we can support it. Based on our understanding of the language added:

1. There is no need to correct errors in LMP/MCP when they are identified beyond the first 48hrs;
2. When an error is identified within 48hrs, SPP will only issue a notice and make a correction if the error is greater than 20% of the "total DA Market Production Cost for the Operating Day". This means that an error of 18% of the "total DA Market Production Cost for the Operating Day" would not be corrected.

Communication from SPP to participants when repricing events are discovered beyond the 48hr window needs to occur - maybe a threshold for repricing notifications can be inserted instead. Also, there is potential for material changes (up/down) to invoices when errors are less than 20% assuming the threshold is applied at the "total DA Market Production Cost for the Operating Day".

Status: The MWG has not reviewed these comments.

PROPOSED REVISION(S) TO SPP DOCUMENTS

Market Protocols

7.2.2 Procedures for Revising Prices in Response to Market Software and Data Input Errors

SPP shall revise LMPs and MCPs when they deviate from what would be produced absent an identified market software and/or data input error per the defined process.

For DA Market, if an error is identified within two business days of the posting of the market results for the Operating Day, and the impact of the identified error is greater than 20% of the total DA Market Production Cost for the Operating Day, SPP will follow the notification process per Section 7.2.2.1 and complete the Process for Recalculating DA Market Cleared Amounts and Prices as defined in Section 7.2.2.3.

For RTBM, if an error is identified in which the impact is greater than 20% of the total RTBM Production Cost for the impacted interval, SPP will follow the notification process per Section 7.2.2.1 and complete the Process for Recalculating RTBM Prices per Section 7.2.2.4.

7.2.2.1 Notice to Market Participants and the Public

If SPP determines that a data or software error has occurred during an Operating Day that ~~requires~~ a correction of one or more LMPs and/or MCPs per the rules defined in Section 7.2.2, SPP must post on its OASIS and website a description of its proposed price correction and shall notify Market Participants as soon as reasonably practicable.

For DA Market, SPP must provide a notification within two business days of the posting of the DA Market results of the potential for recalculating the DA Market prices. After this notification, ~~in any event~~, SPP must post a description of the proposed price correction no later than 5:00 p.m. five (5) Calendar Days after the Operating Day.

For RTBM, SPP must post a description of the proposed price correction no later than 5:00 p.m. five (5) Calendar Days after the Operating Day.

7.2.2.2 Price Corrections Identified After the End of the Notice Period

If SPP identifies a market software and/or data input error requiring a price correction subsequent to the issuance of the Final Settlement Statement, but does not (a) ~~post a notice of price correction for DA Market, post a notice of a potential price correction within two business days of when the DA Market results were posted~~ or (b) ~~for DA Market and RTBM,~~ post a description of the proposed price correction within the required time periods, SPP shall request a Tariff waiver from FERC to perform the necessary price correction. SPP shall utilize the following process for requesting such Tariff waiver:

- (1) First, SPP shall review with the appropriate SPP organizational group the need for the price correction and the schedule for fixing the market software and/or data input error causing the need for price correction;
- (2) Second, SPP shall seek approval of the SPP Board of Directors for filing a price correction Tariff waiver request at FERC. Prior to seeking the Board's approval, SPP shall submit its request proposal to the SPP Market Working Group and the SPP Markets and Operations Policy Committee for approval; and
- (3) Third, after approval by the SPP Board of Directors, SPP shall file the price correction Tariff waiver request at FERC as soon as reasonably practicable.

This process ensures that SPP stakeholders are consulted prior to the implementation of any price correction that does not occur within the allotted time frame for such corrections.

7.2.2.3 Process for Recalculating DA Market Cleared Amounts and Prices

SPP shall recalculate LMPs, MCPs and DA Market cleared amounts in a manner that reflects, as closely as practicable, the DA Market results that would have resulted but for the market software and/or data input error while maintaining the original DA Market unit commitment, and shall perform a resettlement using these recalculated values, if required. Such recalculated DA Market results shall be provided to Market Participants in the same manner as LMPs and MCPs determined in the ordinary course of business (i.e. in a programmatically downloadable file). SPP will provide the final recalculated results no later than 5:00 p.m. ten (10) Calendar Days after the Operating Day.

7.2.2.4 Process for Recalculating RTBM Prices

SPP shall recalculate LMPs and/or MCPs while maintaining the original cleared Operating Reserve amounts and shall perform a resettlement using these recalculated values, if required. Such recalculated LMPs and/or MCPs shall be provided to Market Participants in the same manner as LMPs and MCPs determined in the ordinary course of business (i.e. in a programmatically downloadable file). SPP will provide the final recalculated results no later than 5:00 p.m. ten (10) Calendar Days after the Operating Day.

Attachment AE

8.4 Price Corrections

If LMP and MCP corrections are required due to software errors and/or data input errors, the Transmission Provider shall impose corrective measures and take immediate action to remedy such errors and recalculate LMPs and MCPs in accordance with the following procedures:

For the Day-Ahead Market, if an error is identified within two business days of the posting of the market results for the Operating Day, and the impact of the identified error is greater than 20% of the total Day-Ahead Market production cost for the Operating Day, the Transmission Provider will follow the notification process per Section 8.4(1) and complete the process for recalculating Day-Ahead Market cleared amounts and prices as defined in Section 8.4(3).

For the RTBM, if an error is identified in which the impact is greater than 20% of the total RTBM production cost for the impacted interval, the Transmission Provider will follow the notification process per Section 8.4(1) and complete the process for recalculating RTBM prices per Section 8.4(4).

(1) Notice to Market Participants:

If the Transmission Provider determines that a software error or data input error requires correction of one or more LMPs and MCPs, the Transmission Provider shall make publicly available on its OASIS a description of its proposed price correction. For the Day-Ahead Market, the Transmission Provider shall provide a notification within two business days of the posting of the Day-Ahead Market results of the potential for recalculating the Day-Ahead Market prices. Following this notification~~In any event~~, the Transmission Provider shall post a description of the proposed price correction no later than 1700 hours five (5) calendar days following the day in which the LMPs and MCPs would be affected by the contemplated price correction. For the RTBM, the Transmission Provider shall post a description of the proposed price correction no later than 1700 hours

five (5) calendar days following the day in which the LMPs and MCPs would be affected by the contemplated price correction.

- (2) Price corrections identified after the end of the notice period:

If the Transmission Provider identifies software or data input errors requiring a price correction subsequent to the issuance of the final Settlement Statement, but does not (a) ~~post a notice of price correction~~ post a notice for the Day-Ahead Market of a potential price correction within two business days of when the Day-Ahead Market results were posted or (b) for both the Day-Ahead Market and the RTBM, post a description of the proposed price correction within the required time periods, the Transmission Provider shall request Commission approval prior to making the necessary price correction.

- (3) Process for recalculating prices and compensation for the Day-Ahead Market:

The Transmission Provider shall recalculate LMPs, MCPs and Day-Ahead Market cleared amounts for the Day-Ahead Market in a manner that reflects, as closely as practicable, the LMPs and MCPs that would have resulted but for the software or data input error for the Day-Ahead Market while maintaining the original Day-Ahead Market unit commitment. The Transmission Provider shall perform any necessary resettlement using the recalculated Day-Ahead Market results. Such recalculated Day-Ahead Market results shall be provided to Market Participants in the same manner as the original Day-Ahead Market results determined in the ordinary course of business. The Transmission Provider will provide the final recalculated results no later than 5:00 p.m. ten (10) calendar days after the Operating Day.

- (4) Process for recalculating prices and compensation for the RTBM:

SPP shall recalculate LMPs and MCPs for the RTBM in a manner that reflects, as closely as practicable, the LMPs and MCPs that would have resulted but for the software or data input error for the RTBM and shall perform any necessary resettlement using these recalculated values. Such recalculated LMPs and MCPs shall be provided to Market Participants in the same manner as LMPs and MCPs determined in the ordinary course of business. The Transmission Provider will provide the final recalculated results no later than 5:00 p.m. ten (10) calendar days after the Operating Day. Compensation to Market Participants results from the recalculated prices shall be as follows:

- (a) For instances where the recalculated RTBM LMP is less than a Resource's Energy Offer Curve price, compensation shall be as described under Section 8.6.6(1);

- (b) For instances where a Resource's recalculated RTBM LMP is greater than the Day-Ahead Market LMP and the Market Participant is buying back its Day-Ahead Market position as a result of a Dispatch Instruction, compensation shall be as described under Section 8.6.6(2) except that, the MW amount eligible for compensation shall be equal to the difference between the Resource's Day-Ahead Market MW position and the greater of that Resource's actual MW output in the Dispatch Interval or the Resource's average Setpoint Instruction in the Dispatch Interval;
- (c) For instances where a Resource's recalculated RTBM Operating Reserve product MCP is greater than the Day-Ahead Market Operating Reserve product MCP and the Market Participant is buying back its Day-Ahead Market Operating Reserve product position resulting from the Transmission Provider clearing all or a portion of that Operating Reserve product on a different Resource in the market solution, compensation shall be as described under Section 8.6.6(3).

SPP Operating Criteria

SPP Planning Criteria

SPP Business Practices

Revision Request Recommendation Report

RR #: 160	Date: 3/17/2016
RR Title: Generation and Transmission Service in the ITP	
SUBMITTER INFORMATION	
Submitter Name: Liz Gephardt	Company: SPP
Email: lgephardt@spp.org	Phone: 501-482-2236
OBJECTIVE OF REVISION	
<p>The Tariff language in Attachment O, Section III is ambiguous as to which generation interconnections and associated upgrades are required to be modeled in the Integrated Transmission Planning (ITP) assessments. SPP is currently following a process documented and approved in the Integrated Transmission Planning (ITP) Manual in this regard. Language pointing to the existing process should be clarified in the Tariff so the potential for other interpretations is minimized for upcoming ITP model builds.</p>	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION	
IMPACT ANALYSIS REQUIRED: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Estimated Cost: \$ <i>Cost is a <u>rough order of magnitude</u> estimate, approx. +/-50%</i>	Estimated Duration: months <i>Duration is a <u>rough order of magnitude</u> estimate, approx. +/-50%</i>
Priority Rank for System Change: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 – Critical <input type="checkbox"/> 2 – High <input type="checkbox"/> 3 – Medium <input type="checkbox"/> 4 – Low	
SPP DOCUMENTS IMPACTED	
<input type="checkbox"/> Market Protocols	Protocol Section(s):
<input type="checkbox"/> Criteria	Criteria Section(s):
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tariff (OATT)	Tariff Section(s): Attachment O Section III
<input type="checkbox"/> Business Practice	Business Practice Number:
WORKING GROUP REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS List Primary and any Secondary/Impacted WG Recommendations as appropriate	
Primary Working Group: RTWG	Date: 3/25/2015 Vote: Unanimously Approved Abstained: Opposed:
Reason for Opposition:	
Secondary Working Group:	Date: Vote: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	

Secondary Working Group:	Date: Vote: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
Secondary Working Group:	Date: Vote: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
MOPC Recommendation:	Date: Vote: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
BOD/Member Committee Recommendation:	Date: Vote: Abstained: Opposed:
Reasons for Opposition:	
COMMENTS	
Comment Author:	
Description of Comments:	
Status: describes any action taken on the comment. SS will complete this... Comments incorporated, comments rejected...	
Comment Author:	
Description of Comments:	
Status:	
PROPOSED REVISION(S) TO SPP DOCUMENTS	
Market Protocols	

III. The Integrated Transmission Planning Process

The ITP process is an iterative three-year process that includes 20-Year, 10-Year and Near Term Assessments. The 20-Year Assessment identifies the transmission projects, generally above 300 kV, and provides a grid flexible enough to provide benefits to the region across multiple scenarios. The 10-Year Assessment focuses on facilities 100 kV and above to meet the system needs over a ten-year horizon. The Near Term Assessment is performed annually and assesses the system upgrades, at all applicable voltage levels, required in the near term planning horizon.

1) Commencement of the Process

At the beginning of each calendar year the Transmission Provider shall notify stakeholders as to which part(s) of the integrated transmission planning cycle will take place during that year and the approximate timing of activities required to develop the SPP Transmission Expansion Plan. Notice of commencement of the process shall be posted on the SPP website and distributed via email distribution lists. Such notice shall include a timeline indicating when stakeholders are able to submit transmission needs, including transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, and solutions to such needs as described in this Section III.

2) Transmission Planning Forums

The transmission planning forums include planning summits and sub-regional planning meetings and these are conducted as follows:

a) Planning Summits

- i) The purpose of the planning summits is for the Transmission Provider and the stakeholders to share current SPP transmission network issues, develop the study scopes, provide solution alternatives and review study findings. These summits also provide an open forum where all stakeholders have an opportunity to provide advice and recommendations to the Transmission Provider to aid in the development of the SPP Transmission Expansion Plan.

- ii) The planning summits shall be open to all entities.
- iii) The Transmission Provider shall chair and facilitate the planning summits.
- iv) Planning summits shall be held at least semi-annually, including sub-regional breakout sessions of the SPP Region. Teleconference capability will be made available for planning summits. Planning summit web conferences shall be held as needed.
- v) Notice of the planning summits and web conferences shall be posted on the SPP website and distributed via email distribution lists.

b) Sub-regional Planning Meetings

- i) The Transmission Provider shall define sub-regions from time to time to address local area planning issues.
- ii) The purpose of the sub-regional planning meetings is to identify unresolved local stakeholder issues and transmission solutions at a more granular level. The sub-regional planning meetings shall provide stakeholders with local needs the opportunity to provide advice and recommendations to the Transmission Provider and to the Transmission Owners. The sub-regional planning meetings shall provide a forum to review local planning criteria and needs as specified in Section II of this Attachment O.
- iii) The sub-regional planning meetings shall be open to all entities.
- iv) The Transmission Provider shall facilitate the sub-regional planning meetings.
- v) A planning meeting shall be held at least annually for each individual sub-region.

- vi) The sub-regional planning meetings shall be held in conjunction with the stakeholder working group meetings. Teleconference capability will be made available for sub-regional planning meetings. Sub-regional planning web conferences shall be held as needed.
- vii) Notice of the sub-regional planning meetings, teleconferences and web conferences shall be posted on the SPP website and distributed via email distribution lists.

3) Preparation of the 20-Year Assessment

- a) The Transmission Provider shall perform a 20-Year Assessment once every three years. The timing of this assessment shall generally be in the first half of each three-year cycle.
- b) The 20-Year Assessment shall review the system for a twenty-year planning horizon and address, at minimum, facilities 300 kV and above needed in year 20. This assessment is not intended to review each consecutive year in the planning horizon. The Transmission Provider shall work with stakeholders to identify the appropriate year(s) to study in developing the assessment study scope.
- c) The 20-Year Assessment shall assess the cost effectiveness of proposed solutions over a forty-year time horizon.
- d) The Transmission Provider shall develop the assessment study scope with input from the stakeholders. The study scope shall take into consideration the input requirements described in Section III.6.
- e) The assessment study scope shall specify the methodology, criteria, assumptions, and data to be used.

- f) The Transmission Provider, in consultation with the stakeholder working groups, shall finalize the assessment study scope including the identification of those transmission needs that will be studied, such as transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, as further described in the Integrated Transmission Planning Manual.
 - g) The assessment study scope shall be posted on the SPP website and will be included in the published annual SPP Transmission Expansion Plan report. The assessment study scope shall include an explanation of which transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements will be evaluated for potential solutions in the local and regional transmission planning process, as well as an explanation of why other suggested transmission needs will not be evaluated.
 - h) In accordance with the assessment study scope, the Transmission Provider shall analyze potential solutions following the process set forth in Section III.8.
- 4) Preparation of the 10-Year Assessment
- a) The Transmission Provider shall perform a 10-Year Assessment once every three years as part of the three year planning cycle. The timing of this assessment shall generally be in the second half of the three-year planning cycle.
 - b) The 10-Year Assessment shall review the system for a ten-year planning horizon and address, at minimum, facilities 100 kV and above needed in year 10. This assessment is not intended to review each consecutive year in the planning horizon. The Transmission Provider shall work with stakeholders to identify the appropriate year(s) to study in developing the assessment study scope.
 - c) The 10-Year Assessment shall assess the cost effectiveness of proposed solutions over a forty-year time horizon.

- d) The Transmission Provider shall develop the assessment study scope with input from the stakeholders. The study scope shall take into consideration the input requirements described in Section III.6.
 - e) The assessment study scope shall specify the methodology, criteria, assumptions, and data to be used.
 - f) The Transmission Provider, in consultation with the stakeholder working groups, shall finalize the assessment study scope, including the identification of those transmission needs that will be studied, such as transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, as further described in the Integrated Transmission Planning Manual.
 - g) The assessment study scope shall be posted on the SPP website and will be included in the published annual SPP Transmission Expansion Plan report. The assessment study scope shall include an explanation of which transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements will be evaluated for potential solutions in the local and regional transmission planning process, as well as an explanation of why other suggested transmission needs will not be evaluated.
 - h) In accordance with the assessment study scope, the Transmission Provider shall analyze potential solutions, including those upgrades approved by the SPP Board of Directors from the most recent 20-Year Assessment, following the process set forth in Section III.8.
- 5) Preparation of the Near Term Assessment
- a) The Transmission Provider shall perform the Near Term Assessment on an annual basis.
 - b) The Near Term Assessment will be performed on a shorter planning horizon than the 10-Year Assessment and shall focus primarily on identifying solutions required to meet the reliability criteria defined in Section III.6.

- c) The assessment study scope shall specify the methodology, criteria, assumptions, and data to be used to develop the list of proposed near term upgrades.
 - d) The Transmission Provider, in consultation with the stakeholder working groups, shall finalize the assessment study scope, including the identification of those transmission needs that will be studied, such as transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, as further described in the Integrated Transmission Planning Manual. The study scope shall take into consideration the input requirements described in Section III.6.
 - e) The assessment study scope shall be posted on the SPP website and will be included in the published annual SPP Transmission Expansion Plan report. The assessment study scope shall include an explanation of which transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements will be evaluated for potential solutions in the local and regional transmission planning process, as well as an explanation of why other suggested transmission needs will not be evaluated.
 - f) In accordance with the assessment study scope, the Transmission Provider shall analyze potential solutions, including those upgrades approved by the SPP Board of Directors from the most recent 20-Year Assessment and 10-Year Assessment, following the process set forth in Section III.8.
- 6) Policy, Reliability, and Economic Input Requirements to Planning Studies

The Transmission Provider shall incorporate, as appropriate for the assessment being performed, the following into its planning studies:

- a) NERC Reliability Standards;
- b) SPP Criteria;
- c) Transmission Owner-specific planning criteria as set forth in Section II;

- d) Previously identified and approved transmission projects;
- e) Zonal Reliability Upgrades developed by Transmission Owners, including those that have their own FERC approved local planning process, to meet local area reliability criteria;
- f) Long-term firm Transmission Service;
- g) Load forecasts, including the impact on load of existing and planned demand management programs, exclusive of demand response resources;
- h) Capacity forecasts, including generation additions and retirements;
- i) Existing and planned demand response resources;
- j) Congestion within SPP and between the SPP Region and other regions and balancing areas;
- k) Renewable energy standards;
- l) Fuel price forecasts;
- m) Energy efficiency requirements;
- n) Other relevant environmental or government mandates;
- o) Transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements identified through a survey of stakeholders to identify Public Policy Requirements and additional Public Policy Requirements as determined by the Transmission Provider and stakeholders during study scope development; and
- p) Other input requirements identified during the stakeholder process.

- q) In developing the long term capacity forecasts, the studies will reflect generation and demand response resources capable of providing any of the functions assessed in the SPP planning process, and can be relied upon on a long-term basis. Such demand response resources shall be permitted to participate in the planning process on a comparable basis. These studies will consider operational experience gained from markets operated by the Transmission Provider.
- 7) Inclusion of Upgrades Related to Transmission Service and Generator Interconnection in Planning Studies

a) The studies performed under this Section III of Attachment O shall accommodate and model in accordance with the Integrated Transmission Planning Manual, the specific long-term firm Transmission Service of Transmission Customers and specific interconnections of Generation Interconnection Customers when such Service Agreements and interconnection agreements have been accepted by the Commission.

ab) Transmission upgrades related to requests for Transmission Service are described in Sections 19 and 32 of the Tariff and Attachment Z1 ~~to~~of the Tariff. ~~These~~ ~~u~~Upgrades associated with the modeled long-term firm Transmission Service are included as part of the future expansion of the Transmission System, upon the execution of the various Service Agreements with the Transmission Customers. Transmission upgrades related to an approved request for Transmission Service may be deferred or supplemented by other upgrades based upon the results of subsequent studies. Changes in planned upgrades do not remove the obligation of the Transmission Provider to have adequate transmission facilities available to start or continue the approved Transmission Service.

bc) Interconnection facilities and other transmission upgrades related to requests for generation interconnection service are described in Attachment V. ~~These~~ ~~u~~Upgrades associated with the Modeled generation interconnection service are included as part of the future expansion of the Transmission System upon the

execution of the various interconnection agreements with the Generation Interconnection Customers. Transmission upgrades related to an approved interconnection agreement may be deferred or supplemented by other upgrades based upon the results of subsequent studies. Changes in planned upgrades do not remove the obligation of the Transmission Provider to have adequate transmission facilities available to start or continue the approved interconnection service.

~~e) The studies performed under this Section III of Attachment O shall accommodate and model the specific long-term firm Transmission Service of Transmission Customers and specific interconnections of Generation Interconnection Customers no later than when the relevant Service Agreements and interconnection agreements are accepted by the Commission.~~

8) Process to Analyze Transmission Alternatives for each Assessment

The following shall be performed, at the appropriate time in the respective planning cycle, for the 20-Year Assessment, 10-Year Assessment and Near Term Assessment studies:

- a) The Transmission Provider shall perform the required studies to analyze the potential alternatives for improvements to the Transmission System, provided by the Transmission Provider and by the stakeholders, in order to address the final assessment study scope agreed to with the stakeholders. This analysis shall consider the current and anticipated future needs of the SPP Region within the parameters of the study scope. The analysis shall also consider the value brought to the SPP Region by incremental changes to the proposed solutions.
- b) After the study scope has been approved, the Transmission Provider shall notify stakeholders of identified transmission needs and provide a transmission planning response window of thirty (30) days during which any stakeholder may propose a detailed project proposal (“DPP”). The Transmission Provider shall track each DPP and retain the information submitted pursuant to Section III.8.b(i). If the project described in a DPP is included in the ITP plan, the submitting stakeholder

may qualify for incentive points as described in Section III of Attachment Y of this Tariff. A stakeholder that submits a DPP that is equivalent to a DPP or Transmission Provider identified project submitted in a previous assessment during the current three (3) year planning cycle shall not be eligible for incentive points.

- i) The information supplied by the stakeholder must be sufficient to allow the Transmission Provider to evaluate the project described in the DPP. At a minimum, the DPP must include the following information:
 - a. description of the project including one-line diagrams, configuration(s), proposed line routing, preliminary transmission line and substation engineering and design data;
 - b. description of the needs identified in the ITP process to be addressed;
 - c. proposed project schedule including, at a minimum timelines for completing regulatory, right-of-way, environmental, engineering, procurement and construction activities;
 - d. description of any known or anticipated risks to the project schedule and any recommended mitigation plans;
 - e. description of any known or anticipated environmental impacts;
 - f. engineering and modeling data required by the Transmission Provider;
 - g. identification and justification of any changes in modeling assumptions from those used in the current ITP process;
 - h. results of transmission project economic or reliability analysis, if applicable; and

- i. any other information available to support the evaluation of the project.
- ii) Any Stakeholder providing a DPP that meets the requirements set forth in Section III.8.b(i) of this Attachment O will be recorded by the Transmission Provider for the ITP planning assessment for the which the DPP was submitted, including the contact information of the stakeholder that submitted the DPP.
- iii) If the Transmission Provider, in its sole discretion, determines that the information provided in a DPP is incomplete, the Transmission Provider shall provide written notice to the stakeholder that submitted the DPP. The stakeholder shall be permitted to cure the such deficiency by the later of the end of the transmission planning response window or 10 days after the Transmission Provider issues such notice. Failure to cure the deficiency shall result in the submission being disqualified as a DPP.
- iv) The Transmission Provider shall hold all DPPs in confidence until the thirty (30) day transmission planning response window has closed. Subsequent to the close of the transmission planning response window, information contained in a DPP shall be disclosed to stakeholders only as the Transmission Provider determines is necessary for review and documentation of the reason(s) why the DPP was or was not chosen in the current ITP assessment. The remaining information in the DPP will remain confidential.
- v) A stakeholder that submits a DPP may remain eligible for incentive points, in accordance with Section III of Attachment Y of this Tariff, for the remainder of the current three (3) year planning cycle of the ITP process. In order for the stakeholder to maintain its eligibility for incentive points in any subsequent ITP assessment within the current three (3) year planning cycle, the stakeholder must resubmit the information required by

Section III.8.b(1) of this Attachment O, including identification of the need(s) in the ITP assessment that the DPP is proposed to solve. If the stakeholder does not provide the updated information, the stakeholder will not be eligible for incentive points for the DPP for that subsequent assessment; however, the stakeholder would be eligible for incentive points in any other ITP assessment during the current three (3) year planning cycle, provided that the stakeholder updates the DPP information for that assessment.

- c) For all potential alternatives provided by the stakeholders, including reliability upgrades that Transmission Owners (which includes those Transmission Owners that have their own FERC approved local planning process), propose to address violations of company-specific planning criteria pursuant to Section II.5 of this Attachment O, and upgrades to address transmission needs driven in whole or in part by identified Public Policy Requirements, the Transmission Provider shall determine if there is a more comprehensive regional solution to address the reliability needs, economic needs, and needs driven by Public Policy Requirements identified in the assessment.
- d) In addition to recommended upgrades, the Transmission Provider will consider, on a comparable basis, any alternative proposals which could include, but would not be limited to, generation options, demand response programs, “smart grid” technologies, and energy efficiency programs. Solutions will be evaluated against each other based on a comparison of their relative effectiveness of performance and economics.
- e) The Transmission Provider shall assess the cost effectiveness of proposed solutions. Such assessments shall be performed in accordance with the Integrated Transmission Planning Manual, which shall be developed by the Transmission Provider, in consultation with stakeholders, and approved by the Markets and Operations Policy Committee. SPP shall post this manual on its website.

- f) The analysis described above shall take into consideration the following:
- i) The financial modeling time frame for the analysis shall be 40 years (with the last 20 years provided by a terminal value).
 - ii) The analysis shall include quantifying the benefits resulting from dispatch savings, loss reductions, avoided projects, applicable environmental impacts, reduction in required operating reserves, interconnection improvements, congestion reduction, and other benefit metrics as appropriate.
 - iii) The analysis shall identify and quantify, if possible, the benefits related to any proposed transmission upgrade that is required to meet any regional reliability criteria.
 - iv) The analysis scope shall include different scenarios to analyze sensitivities to load forecasts, wind generation levels, fuel prices, environmental costs, and other relevant factors. The Transmission Provider shall consult the stakeholders to guide the development of these scenarios.
 - v) The results of the analysis shall be reported on a regional, zonal, and state-specific basis.
 - vi) The analysis shall assess the net impact of the transmission plan, developed in accordance with this Attachment O, on a typical residential customer within the SPP Region and on a \$/kWh basis.
- g) The Transmission Provider shall make a comprehensive presentation of the preferred potential solutions, including the results of the analysis above, to the stakeholder working groups and at a planning summit meeting or web conference. The presentation shall include a discussion of all the Transmission Provider and stakeholder alternatives considered and reasons for choosing the particular preferred solutions.

- h) The Transmission Provider shall solicit feedback on the solutions from the stakeholder working groups and through the stakeholders attending the various planning summits. The Transmission Provider will also include feedback from stakeholders through other meetings, teleconferences, web conferences, and via email or secure web-based workspace. Stakeholders may propose any combination of demand resources, transmission, or generation as alternate solutions to identified reliability and economic needs.

- i) Upon consideration of the results of the cost effectiveness analysis and feedback received in the subsequent review process, the Transmission Provider shall prepare a draft list of projects for review and approval in accordance with Section V.

SPP Criteria

SPP Business Practices