

Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Net-Conference

Thursday, March 24, 2016

1:00 – 3:00 PM

Antoine Lucas started the meeting with an introduction of meeting participants.

Alan Myers asked if all changes were included.

- Antoine replied comments received to date have been incorporated and that we are still looking for comments and feedback. Looking to put some polish on the rough draft. Not final – looking for additional feedback. Have not received anything that would be considered a significant change. Cleanup draft with language to capture things we discuss today for the 3/30 meeting. That should move us that much closer to having white paper finalized and then at that point - work with other WGs to catch up and get feedback - get ready for MOPC and SPC, using April to July to finalize things. **Note:** The comments submitted by Alan Myers and Steve Gaw were not incorporated into the draft posted for the call. There were subsequently included in the draft posted for the 3/30 face to face meeting.

Slides 2- 3 - talked about conceptually so that we can try to get an idea of the will of the group to write up something in more detail. Implementation piece - discussed the things needing to be addressed to be able to make changes - governing docs, WG collaboration, and (3) transition schedule. ITP as it is today - to the proposed process we've been talking about.

Wayman Smith: Implementation - are you planning to perform an assessment from a resource perspective of what you think is required.

- **Antoine:** Part of implementation - working on that right now internally from a staff perspective. Member perspective - not sure what's the best way to coordinate that for members to say what they need. I would like us to take time to talk about that; what role SPP needs to have in helping to support that process for the membership. We hope that as we are working through this, the members of the TF have been sharing with members of their company so they can raise flags on anything.

Wayman: We're all going to wait until it's approved and come back and do that.

Antoine: Next steps - what we'll need to do to prep for MOPC/RSC/BOD cycle and what we'll need from everyone on TF.

- **Brian Gedrich:** May be an educational session in Sante Fe.
- **Antoine:** We want the next quarter to work something out. Michael Desselle may have decided to put us on the SPC agenda to work something out.

Slide 3: Staff and stakeholder accountability.

Antoine: Will take discipline to make process work when you're looking at an overlapping schedule. Recognizing that if we have time that slips - schedule slips - the impact on the overall process is not something you can just finish out and then just start over and everything will fall into in place. Relationship will require us doing a better job of staying on track. TPL compliance assessments within the study will put more pressure to maintain the schedule and hit solid deadlines. When we talked in the early TPITF meetings, there was a lot of discussion around delays in the schedules - quality of data and info - going back and having to do rework because of changes in information. We talked about

needing to address that in some form or fashion, so when we implement the new process, we won't have those kinds of issue. We talked about incorporating a RR process to help manage scope creep. Also the issues we talked about - model delays – the last several years, the models for the ITP process have been delayed, impacting the schedule - doing workshops and lessons learned - one of the things that keep coming up are deadlines not being firm and information not being provided when it is needed. Staff needs to be able to get that information, aggregate the information, and do what they need to do with it; develop models. In recognition of that, we have to have some kind of safeguard in place to increase focus on deadlines. Some of the things on the slide are for data submissions. Highlight deadlines for data solicitation and provision. We have to get better with our schedules and doing contingency planning and develop moving parts so that when developed, dates are pretty good and firm and once schedules are provided, we'll need participation with stakeholders to honor schedules. We know we'll have to make changes from where we are today in order to keep moving forward when things don't happen by the deadline. We have to get that out to members. Once out to members, we must get those reviews done and back within the timeframe for on-time quality product.

We listed thoughts on things we'd include. Reviews and approval schedules, as well. Wanted to capture issues throughout the process and be looking toward why there are abstentions in the votes throughout the process or negative votes for things in the process, because that's another area where we struggle. We get to seeking final approval and then we find out participants weren't happy with something that happened several months earlier, and then we have to do one-offs, rework, hire consultants, to get schedules back on track. Another piece is consideration for mitigations; what we would actually do if we needed data at a certain point in time. We would need to have some approach or provision to move forward without the data. If we request generation data and it's not provided by the deadline, default is we use the same data from the previous year. For the Generation Resource Plan, if we don't get feedback, data, staff would provide information to move process forward. Those are just examples, not suggestions. Essentially, you have to plug the gap or hole and move forward.

From that, we would use something (reporting process like the MDWG) to be able to provide information on whether or not folks are actively participating in the process from A-Z or right at Z. Participating too late in the process can be counter-productive as well. We talk about providing some kind of report to MOPC so that folks have awareness so when we are at the end of the process, it's not a surprise that things are what they are at the end of the study. This is a very general outline. I'd like to open the floor for thoughts and ideas for other things to be considered. There are things we are not capturing.

- **Brian:** One contact person per Company needs to be in the white paper.
- **Bruce Cude:** I think reporting to MOPC and even BOD is a good thing. Definitely MOPC w/ report card. Are we getting the information from stakeholders and is all working or is SPP getting stuck having to provide information to go forward with models. I do feel it is important to get that exposure so people may realize maybe your group is falling behind and brings this to the forefront. One of the things we talked about internally was building in models. How does that fall into the DPP cycle? Can hurt us in terms of resources available.
 - **Antoine:** That piece gets into what Wayman brought up earlier with implementation, make sure members are able to evaluate resource impacts.
- **Brian:** How/when would we provide the report card - online? Updated more frequently? Just the quarterly perf report to MOPC? I worry if it's really getting noticed every quarter. It may be too late and the process could have already slipped. You need something more than just a quarterly report to MOPC to get companies back on line and on schedule.

- **Antoine:** We tried to address with mitigations piece. We wouldn't stop. We would use some to move forward, but with the point you mentioned, we could formalize some thoughts as far as notices staff could send - points of contact - or efforts to make to try and remind people of the deadlines and making sure they know what's coming and when we are looking at getting to a breach. Another thing we could do is post the information or provide via exploder on a monthly basis rather than waiting on F2F. Anything you want.
- **Brian:** When I was on the CWG during IS implementation, if you missed over 2 meetings, they would send a letter to CEO letting them know they had missed 2 meetings.
- **Lloyd Kolb:** If you don't submit your data when the ITP comes to MOPC for approval, you lose your right to vote on acceptance or otherwise. If they don't complain until MOPC, that might help with that. Another powerful tool.
- Group discussion on potential updates to the Membership Agreement to force participation.
- **Bruce:** If taking a vote away, take it away from them and all their affiliates.
- **Antoine:** We were thinking that the report card would help provide transparency as to why people were voting a certain way. Jason Davis also brought up that when we roll in aspects of the TPL, those NERC standards do require a certain level of participation as well. That's another thing different from the process today that also makes things a little tighter and creates exposure.
- **Brian:** Would report card go to RE if people aren't in compliance? If not submitting data, they are not in compliance.
 - **Antoine:** Everything we post to MOPC and to the BOD is public, so anyone who wants that information is able to see it.
 - **Brian:** Maybe that's another thing we need to stress, to keep on schedule, we would like the support of the Board and RE to keep on schedule.
- **Comment:** I don't see these ideas laid out.
 - **Antoine:** Yes, we are trying to get thoughts and ideas for that section.
- **Travis Hyde:** Back on NERC discussion, we've been doing this scorecard/report card with the MDWG and I'm not sure how effective it is because it stays within the group or TWG. It needs to go to MOPC or beyond. We're talking about stakeholders and SPP is also a stakeholder, so it can go back the other way.
 - **Antoine:** I think that's an important piece. Staff has to meet their commitments in the schedule just like everyone else. We're looking to make this a fair and equitable process where we are all accountable to one another.
- **Wayman:** We kind of get into this loop of yes we know there are things that are wrong in the model, but if we stop and fix them all, it will delay the schedule. On the other hand, if you don't fix them, you may end up with portfolios you know are not correct if the data were fixed. We've talked a lot about this. Is there some guidance that we can provide on how to handle that? One of the things I hear and is true, we can just re-evaluate that in the next study. That's one way. We're not going to make those corrections and if the data is not in on time, then we'll re-evaluate next time, or the other way, figure out some threshold beyond which yes, that will warrant a possible change in the schedule or reworking. We seem to struggle with it now. Is

there some guidance that this group would like to provide on how best to handle those situations?

- **Antoine:** Internally, what we are talking about right now on accountability, this isn't mean to address errors. We don't expect TPITF will make everything perfect. Things will happen. This is really aimed more at a disregard for deadlines in the process. Requesting things by a certain time and then the deadlines are not met. When there are errors, we have to continue what we do today. Put out heads together and look at options and recommendations on how we do that and keep the process moving. I don't think that will ever go away. There's even a gray line there where you run into issues where you don't have a lot of good options re: things you can do or finding diff ways to capture same information. Those things are tough - case by case situations - but I don't want to give the impressions that we won't stop to look to see how to address errors.
- **Wayman:** Whether an error or lack of data, the result could be the same. Previous data, maybe you do that but someone didn't provide updated data, then do you just move ahead even though you may know that your ultimate solution isn't what it should be. Could be an error or something else. Always a struggle and tough to deal with. You want to get to the right answer but you still have to respect the schedule.
- **Comment:** Very easy to see who is not providing their data. What do you use? You use whatever you have, I guess.
- **Jeremy Severson:** Issues and you know there are issues - how do you resolve those? Trying to find the right answers?
 - **Antoine:** Right now, we try to figure out the part of the process that is behind us and what relevant information from that part of the process was missed, then we start trying to figure out reasonably how we can account for that using judgment and any other mechanisms we have. I don't think that will go away. I don't think we'll get to a point where our processes are push button. There will always be things to work through. I view staff's role as meeting with stakeholders to get the facts and based on facts, determine opportunities or processes based on the Tariff. If not captured at right time in the study, we can find other mechanisms via Tariff or otherwise to get us where we need to be.
- **Antoine:** The question - Wayman's question - it's a tough question. There's going to be gray areas. Addressing a gray area in a white paper is going to be hard.
- **Comment:** Hopefully this accountability section will help.
- **Brian:** When we look at implementation, one cycle may be delayed, but that doesn't stop the next cycle; it starts when the next cycle starts. That next cycle doesn't slip...separate cycle.
- **Wayman:** With the TPL as part of this, can't let it slip. This is not a new issue. When you shorten the horizon, the potential for those kinds of things to occur may be more likely when first implementing this. Standardized scope will help but it does worry me a bit. The issue may be more pronounced in the future than it is now.
- **Antoine:** Mitigations - we don't want to create a process where changes cannot be made. Those changes would go to the proper group - MOPC - full stakeholder representation to be able to direct that change. If someone wanted us to back up the process a month because of new information, we could work with them in gathering the information and allow them to make that presentation to the MOPC and put together an estimate of cost impact. Go to MOPC - then

full stakeholder representation looks at it and decides if they want to put that delay. Then, make provisions for resources - everyone had a chance. Agreement from whole group to delay or spend additional funds to address the issue. Still an opportunity to correct things, but the onus would be on the impacted party to make the recommendation. Staff would bring the costs and impacts and then we can work with stakeholders to implement.

- **Bruce:** Would MOPC make recommendation or does it have to go to Board?
 - **Antoine:** It could go that far if it needed to. If MOPC unanimous, Board will generally support. If we have to go to roll call at MOPC, then they get pushed to Board for them to weigh in on. I would like to hear from you guys. MOPC plus Board or just to MOPC or Board, if that's a process you guys think is reasonable, so people still have an avenue after steps are passed.
 - **Bruce:** Stakeholder. If it goes against them, they still have the ability to take to Board.
 - **Juliano Freitas:** Depending on the milestone - if we have to take to MOPC - potentially have a decision after 3 months from identification of problem. Potential huge impact.
 - **Brian:** If we have an issue, we can't wait quarterly. We may need another avenue to get to MOPC - special email votes, etc., to keep on schedule.
 - **Antoine:** We can put something in the document that MOPC would be willing to have special email votes and request it.
 - **Brian:** I think it's appropriate. I don't know what the rest of the group thinks.
 - **Comment:** We do it in a lot of the other groups, so I don't know why not.
 - **Brian:** Hopefully it's not that frequent.
 - **Bruce:** Advantage to doing every year where things slide and redo in next year. Would like MOPC to be agreeable to roll on critical issues in a timely manner.
- **Antoine:** Waiting on any further responses before moving on. Any other thoughts, considerations? We'll bring something back. Peoples' creative juices seem to really flow whenever we put something down on paper. We can put something down and bring to next meeting for further discussion.
 - **Wayman:** Bullet points can be interpreted, but when put in black and white, less room for interpretation.
- **Antoine:** I'll be the one writing it, so I'll try not to get emotional attached, because I know what's going to happen.

Slide 4 - IMPLEMENTATION

Antoine: We mentioned this a little bit earlier in the call. Wayman called this out. White paper - these are things we identified that we will add more detail. For group review 30th/31st. Identify impacted WGs, TFs, committees, and based on milestones, identify what groups they touch and what new groups may be impacted now - capture those pieces and then list it out. That will help us point out to the groups, policy groups, these are things changing, these are things to go to other groups, and then after MOPC/BOD decision, that the work will continue on in WGs/TFs to work out details in implementing. We'd also create a timeline for revision, review and approval. Then, do a similar thing with the governing documents, like Attachment O. Identify those and point out that we will have to work with applicable groups to address those changes. Write up with TPITF. RTWG work with for Tariff changes.

NOT ON THIS SLIDE - the resources it will take to do all of this. Internally, we're working on looking at when we stack everything, both things that go away from the existing process, but then things added and take NET difference in hours and equate that to FTEs. We know that extra time doesn't mean FTEs, but could be consulting, but at least for March meeting or next week/MOPC Apr, we can give worse case. Take April to July to put finer point on it to look at short periods throughout the year for consultant, with consistent time throughout the year for FTEs. Estimate will be coming from staff that we'll be ready to talk about. Again, we really want to talk about that piece, but also want to talk about what members will need for a similar type analysis. If anything beyond the white paper, describing those items so we can help out as necessary.

- **Wayman:** This is one of the items because I've been worrying about it. Do you have any kind of a sense for what this will take? Have you looked at it to have an idea to have a range?
- **Antoine:** Jason, Juliano, any preliminary thoughts? Incremental? What are you seeing so far?
 - **Juliano:** Considering 7 models instead of 6 now, because we also model year 5, but no needs, right now, draft high level, have to add 2 FTEs in our econ planning team to cover the amount of hours we have. Right now. This is a preliminary number.
 - **Juliano:** To give you a better idea, model building 5,000 hours.
 - **Jason Davis:** I'm still doing preliminary work. We are adding some things and subtracting some things so we aren't duplicating. Currently looking at 1-2 FTEs. From our perspective, it could be services cost. For us to try and mitigate timing things by incorporating a full TPL in here. Could be licensing costs included, as well, for us to cut time down. Licenses associated with POM - about \$40K. Enfuzion nodes may be needed. Still trying to dig in from that aspect.
- **Travis:** We're trying to do the ITP process and streamline and consolidate. Any areas within SPP could use FTEs from?
 - **Antoine:** We haven't gotten that far yet. We are doing individual team looks now and then will come together. The altogether look will be different than the separate pieces.
 - **Jason Davis:** Maybe we can share resources, so once we have individual approaches, we can come together.
- **Brian:** How many one-off studies do you do now? I would hope less one-off studies. Now, the ITP20 done every 5 years. Would that cut some time back now?
 - **Antoine:** With the ITP20, we've either done the 20 or the 10, so those are kind of using the same resources to do the study. We don't have as much of the reliability in the 20, but we look at a whole lot more futures there, so we pick up more hours. We never really do the 20 at the same time as the 10, so that won't create additional hours for us. We're just replacing 20 with 10 each time.
- **Wayman:** One of the things - from a stakeholder perspective, to me one of the biggest issues - may be a near-time window and 10 window and TPL mitigations window - and now just one window. The peak requirement during that period would be significant. Curious what other stakeholders think about that.
- **Antoine:** Discussions about incremental resources and managing the transition because some things will have to be done twice.

- **Steve Gaw:** Stakeholder perspective, doubling up as well. Needs to be anticipated and planned for.
- **Antoine:** We plan on doing that piece, as well. I would like to dig a little deeper on Travis' comment. Were you expressing a concern that the time is shorter -- I didn't quite catch the point?
 - **Travis:** I thought the goal of this whole group was to try to consolidate, make quicker. From what I'm hearing, it doesn't sound like you're accomplishing that much. Sounds like you're squashing it down into a pretty tight timeframe. Don't want to make my life more complicated by more data requests if not necessary. If we're just squashing down into a tighter timeframe, are we doing what we set out to do? Just one thought.
 - **Antoine:** I know one of the things we've been talking about as far as reducing time. We talked about the need for us to gather all of the data for what we will need to do once - at one time - rather than 2-3 times - as it may happen today. That actually being an area that provides member savings and staff savings. More efficient for staff and stakeholders. Cuts down on multiple wait times. We talked about that being one of the times we really needed to work on there. Saving time on scope. Locking down aspects and save time in schedules. Combining DPP windows or doing more studies in one and being able to know full needs for the system that was in 3 separate studies before. Do it in one window/horizon. That may be a bit of a squeeze. But it also will save us in years where ITPNT and ITP10 done at same time. A lot of the things we are adding are being added b/c they need to be added to combine these processes. Need to flush out the resource impacts to see where stacking up and we'll share with you where we see a log jam of activities and where we see things improving.
 - **Wayman:** Shoving all down into one window saves in some respect but increases peak for both stakeholders and SPP. That is helpful. I appreciate the estimates and I know it is preliminary.
 - **Brian:** I don't think we were hard and fast on 30 days.

[Missed a portion]

- **Brian:** It won't create more competitive projects.
- **Wayman:** There will just be a lot to respond to. Now you have one shot.
- **Antoine:** I think we need to try to simulate as much as possible to see what kind of resources we will need and seeing where the problems are. We always mention the DPP window, but there are other areas where we can shave off time.
 - **Wayman:** From a stakeholder viewpoint, that's one of the biggest impacts - one window for everything.
- **Antoine:** Member impacts - have you guys thought much about what you will need beyond a more refined white paper to start gaging member/stakeholder impacts?
- **Wayman:** The main thing is having that schedule laid out in detail.

Slide 5 - TRANSITION

Antoine: Trying to figure out when could this be implemented. Staff took an action item. We took that information to try to explain and show where this process could start. That's really what this is all

about. For 2017, we would suggest that we would still have our same processes. Pickup with ITP20, that's the next study. We got a waiver to do ITP10. Legal said it doesn't mean we were taking the ITP20 out of the process. The current ITP10 was not in place of ITP20. We start back over with the ITP20 next. In 2017, perform a ITP20 and IPTNT. Along with ITP20, do the TPL assessments, but moving into 2018, that's when we would be able to implement. Use the second half of 2016 and 2017 to work through implementation aspects. Stakeholders and staff working through recommendations - Tariff changes, working out details of how studies will work consistent with whitepapers....second half of 2016. Then, through the first three quarters of 2017.

- **Alan Myers:** Timing on the ITP20 - the way your legal is interpreting. Was it their opinion it had to be in 2017. Start in 2018?
 - **Antoine:** The current ITP10 didn't start when it was supposed to...delayed 6 mos. We made an assumption on this document, but we can get back with Legal on that question for the timeframe of the study.
- **Alan:** It's material to answer how you work out that timing. How we treated the 2017 ITP10 - we stretched to 24, which leaves gap of a year. I'm not sure Tariff requires 2017 ITP20. Just my thoughts. Material to how we transition.
- **Antoine:** Okay, let's work through the rest of this. The new process starts in 2017. A couple of things to draw to the groups' attention. Already know an issue. We've called it an 18-month Cycle. It's from the time Economic Model build starts forward, not including all the time that goes into building the MDWG/ITP reliability models and scope development. We talked about it a lot internally. We have a little difference today. We call NT a 12-month process. The NT doesn't start until models are complete. When we do an ITP10, we include the model build as part of the process. Depending how we show that, I figured I'd go ahead and get that out on the table. If you want to call it something different or what we want to do, but that's just a call out to think on. Not really looking for feedback, just thoughts, but not answers right now. Middle red block where the process starts. Outlined that first year, a full TPL under old process in 2018 and starting and doing part of the assessment for the new process in 2018, to be completed by mid-year 2019. From that point, everything as we planned it. This was our crack as when we saw the earliest that we could execute a transition. I'll open the floor to you guys.

Suggestion to remove ITP20 - Antoine responded he's not sure that will help. We can't force FERC's hand as far as Tariff changes. We'll have to draft those and work through RTWG and allow FERC time to review and accept. I don't know that removing the ITP20 would be a good use of time. Wouldn't have bugs worked out at that time.

- **Sam Loudenslager:** Reminded them that the waiver of the ITP20 this time did not happen without some significant effort. He would be surprised if FERC would say yes, we'll waive a second time.
- **Brian:** I think it's a great schedule. I can just see the Board pushing back.
- **Alan:** If we're doing an ITP20 in parallel getting revved up, it will distract people from one or the other or both.
- **John Krajewski:** When would Tariff filing be submitted?
 - **Antoine:** We haven't gotten to that level of detail yet. We haven't gone thru the sections of the Tariff yet that will need changes to define. The thought I had was, if

we're at the end of 16, middle of 17, that eliminates or moves ITP20 onto 5 year platform.

- **Antoine:** A couple of aspects in the process that makes it hard. MDWG model build - we haven't touched that b/c it's more of a NERC process. That happens around the last quarter a little before that. We need that to build the models. Even if we were able to move it up, if you look at 2016 at like month 9, purple box - model build - we would have to know everything around that time frame, because that's when they start building. Month 7 is about the earliest we could get approval. So that leaves a month. We had a couple.
- **Comment:** No problem in current Tariff in moving.
- **Antoine:** We'd just have to get the funding for 3rd party to do it.
 - **Wayman:** That's where I was heading, too, if that is the case, and you pass that over to Jay and do an ITP20, it doesn't mean Juliano's group has to do it.
- **Antoine:** Are you suggesting using those resources to work through the implementation.
 - **Wayman:** I'm suggesting.
 - **Comment:** That makes sense.
- **Antoine:** Whitepaper now says would be consulted out (ITP20). Even someone would have to oversee.
 - **Wayman:** Clean way to take to MOPC/BOD whoever, yes, we can do it again, but here's the cost. We're going to consult it out and see if they really want to do it.
- **Steve Gaw:** It's if FERC has an issue, too. All that together. You can argue either way about the value.
- **Antoine:** We will get with Legal and discuss ITP20 and look at options (if not) - not doing it - if it is - what it will look like consulting it out and how to allocate resources to make sure implementation is thorough. I think it will be pretty involved to make all of these changes - working group activities, etc.
- **Wayman:** We don't want to be scrambling from an implementation standpoint and stumble out of the gate and miss some pieces.
- **Antoine:** The Board will push us to speed it up.
- **Brian:** I'm sort of leaning toward next ITP20, if we can send that to a consultant to do to free up time for SPP Staff to implement - that we want to do it right - outsource the next ITP20. To make sure we set the schedule you have laid out.
 - **Steve Gaw:** I like that. The other thing that might be helpful if the SPC really did take more of a role in taking some of the pressure off the other WGs while working on transition stuff.
- **Brian:** If we have to do the ITP20, if it's too hard to get ITP20 waiver from FERC, see about it being out-sourced so we can hit implementation.
- **Alan:** Jump step into the new process by doing it that way.
- **Bruce:** Sam, does FERC expect all RTOs to do a 20-year study?
 - **Sam:** No, but that's what they've approved for us.

Slide 6: NEXT STEPS

Antoine reviewed Slide 6. Post draft whitepaper on Monday. This whole thing has been just in time deal. Whitepapers are rough. We'll get updates made and we'll try to get a draft cut about how that will work over the weekend about how that will work. Meeting on 30th/31st. We really want to get consensus at that point; pretty well representative of group's discussions and where we want to go. Getting ready for MOPC, so we'll have to post where we are on the recommendations - whitepaper - preliminary. We'll put together a presentation for MOPC. Try to do same thing as last time so you can work with your MOPC reps. We'll really be leaning on you guys to give your MOPC reps the details they need for mid-April and also for SPC on 4/13.

Question about RSC? Erin Cullum <-- need to add them in.

Need updated whitepaper sent out prior to next meeting.

First Name	Last Name	Company
Aaron	Pupa	LS Power
Aaron	Stewart	SPP
Adam	Bell	Southwest Power Pool
Alan	Myers	ITC Holdings, Inc
ALEXANDER	SCHNEIDER	QUANTA TECHNOLOGY
Antoine	Lucas	Southwest Power Pool
Brian	Gedrich	NextEra Energy Transmission LLC
Brian	Johnson	AEP
Bruce	Cude	Xcel Energy / SPS
David	Binkley	ITC Holdings, Inc
Dawn-Marie	Coggins	SPP
Geoffrey	Rush	Oklahoma Corporation Commission
Jason	Davis	SP
Jason	Terhune	SPP
Jeff	Knottek	SPRM
Jeremy	Severson	BEPC
Jerry	Bradshaw	
Jody	Holland	South Central MCN, LLC
John	Allen	SPRM
John	Krajewski	Nebraska Power Review Board
John	Boshears	SPRM
John	Boshears	SPRM
Juliano	Freitas	SPP
Kelsey	Allen	Southwest Power Pool
Kirk	Hall	SPP
Michael	Wegner	ITC Holdings, Inc
Moses	Rotich	SPP
Nathan	McNeil	Westar Energy
Pat	McCool	
Sam	Loudenslager	SPP
Sherri	Maxey	Southwest Power Pool
Steve	Gaw	Wind Coalition
Steve	Sanders	WAPA-UGP
Travis	Hyde	
Wayman	Smith	AEP



Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Recommendations Whitepaper

Net Conference- March 24, 2016

Recommendations Review

- **Staff/Stakeholder Accountability**
- **Implementation**
- **Transition**
- **Next Steps**

Accountability

- **Program components**
 - **Data Submissions**
 - Expectations of Staff and Stakeholders regarding schedules for data solicitation and provision
 - **Required reviews and approvals**
 - Expectations of Staff and Stakeholders regarding the schedules for required review and approval of study items
 - Reasons for negative or abstaining votes
 - **Mitigations**
 - Use of previously supplied data
 - Cost estimates for re-work due to lack of compliance with deadlines – Stakeholder assigned?
 - **Reporting**
 - Report Card
 - Quarterly performance report to MOPC

Implementation

- **Identify impacted working groups, task forces, and committees**
 - List the items for which the groups will be responsible
 - Create a timeline for the revision, review, and approval of required items to facilitate the transition to the new planning cycle
- **Identify impacted governing documents**
 - List the corresponding documents and impacted areas

Next Steps

- **Post draft recommendations whitepaper on Monday, 3/28**
- **Face-to-face meeting; 3/30 & 31**
 - Finalize whitepaper
- **Post recommendations whitepaper and corresponding presentation for MOPC on Monday, 4/4**
- **April MOPC; 4/12 & 13**
- **April SPC; 4/13**
- **April BOD; 4/26**