

Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Dallas DoubleTree

March 30 & 31, 2016

3/30: 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

3/31: 8:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

• M i n u t e s •

Agenda Item 1: Welcome (Brian Gedrich)

Brian Gedrich started the meeting with a roll call of participants attending in-person followed by participants on the conference call. Brian also reviewed the open action items.

- Review Action Items:
 1. SPP Staff: Standardized Scope (**OPEN**)
 - Review the Working Group/Stakeholder approval processes considering the standardization of scope items and the use of an assumptions document.
 - Everything approved on the front-end with no further approvals for scope items during the process?
 - Reduce the amount of items that require “approval”. Push for review only.
 - Which groups are responsible for reviewing/approval which parts.
 - Develop a revision request process.
 - Determine which groups would be responsible for the review/approval of submitted requests.
 - Who would own and facilitate the process?
 - Put detail around what would require the use of the RR process.
 - Is this process for changes to assumptions or standardized items or both? Give consideration to the time it will take for items to go through the process. It may not be applicable to things that require a quick turnaround.
 - Explore scope boundaries (# of futures, meaningful sensitivities, etc.) and develop an example of a scope.
 - Will require a revision to the ITP Manual. Determine who or what group will perform the revisions?
 - Determine which scope items will be considered standard and assumptions.

- Solidify scope item descriptions. May need additional detail around those items that will be standardized.
 - For scope items that are found in both the ITPNT and ITP10 studies, determine how they will be represented in the manual.
- Recommendation for how non-standard scope items will be reviewed and approved.
 - Develop an assumptions document template.
 - Develop a process for the review and approval of the assumptions. Who will review and approve and when.
- 2. SPP Staff: Create high-level 18-month schedule including ITPNT and ITP10 milestones. **(OPEN)**
 - As part of the implementation, determine the timeline of the new planning process.
 - The start of the study will impact when the TPL studies will start and finish.
 - Give consideration to MOPC/BOD approvals of NTCs and their incorporation into the newly constructed models.
 - The MDWG models were scheduled to post 2/5/16 which I believe has been pushed out to the first of April.
 - Review how all required data submissions may be worked into the MDWG model build schedule.
 - Work with MDWG chair to develop proposal for data collection.
 - Develop data submission schedule for TOs.
 - The modeling group developed a member accountability document that covers the submission of modeling data. Leverage it as a part of member accountability.
 - Evaluate the impacts of the combining the ITPNT (TPL steady state), ITP10, and TPL short circuit timelines and study processes including the economic assessments in Years 2 and 5.
 - Develop a draft study schedule to determine feasibility and resource impacts.
 - Consideration for DPP window, number of DPPS, cost estimate (2A) timeline, solutions development.
 - Determine impacts to resources and hardware/software needs.
 - Consider the model build process which will run in parallel with the back-end processing of the consolidated portfolio.

Staff may have dual roles assisting with assessments and the model builds.

- SPP Staff: Review how economic model data submission may be worked into the MDWG model build schedule.
- 3. SPP Staff: Grid of assumptions across the various planning processes to review consistency among processes. **(CLOSED)**
This item will be addressed through the posting of a grid as informational material.
- 4. All: Create point-of-contact list for member companies. Include back-up. POC for issues with the ability to route issues through the company. Complete by mid-November. **(CLOSED)**
Incorporated into Recommendations Whitepaper.
- 5. SPP staff: Research op guides and TODs and report on the criteria around their use in the planning and the criteria around their removal and the impact on planning and stakeholders. **(OPEN)**
- 6. SPP staff: Review the current process for reviewing/approving Sponsored upgrades. **(OPEN)**
- 7. SPP Staff: Draft a transition/implementation schedule. **(CLOSED)**
 - Develop a timeline and to-do list for the transition including timelines, tariff/BP/criteria changes needed, etc.
 - Determine the start dates of the study from an implementation standpoint.
 - What will it take to perform the first study? Delay a current process? Double up on a current process? Ask for a waiver for a process?
Incorporated into Recommendations Whitepaper.
- 8. English Cook: Review the minutes of the past meetings and list any items of concern that were tabled during those meetings and bring back to the group for discussion. **(OPEN)**
- 9. **Recommendation Item:** Consider the feasibility of a system-wide stability study performed annually or in conjunction with the ITP20. **(OPEN)**
 - Determine if there is value to this type of study. If so, what is the correct timeframe?
- Review/approve 3/2/16 draft meeting minutes:
Brian Gedrich opened the floor for discussion regarding the draft minutes for the 3/2/16 face-to-face meeting. Katy Onnen provided the motion to accept and it was seconded by Jason Atwood. The motion passed without discussion. Draft minutes for the 3/24/16 net conference were not available for approval.

Agenda Item 2: TPITF Recommendations Whitepaper (All)

A net conference was held on 3/24/16 with TPITF participants to discuss the Staff/Stakeholder Accountability, Transition, and Implementation sections of the whitepaper. These sections were not part of the previously reviewed and discussed draft whitepaper. Information and feedback gathered from the call were put into the development of those sections.

The 3/30/16 discussion started with a review of the draft Transition and Implementation sections.

Transition and Implementation

Brian started the discussion stating he has heard that some companies may have some concern over the improvements being discussed by the TPITF. He has not heard any specific concerns, just grumblings.

- Jason Atwood commented he had a company representative bring up the TWG discussion on the CBA model and dropping to one reliability model.
- Antoine Lucas added he heard the question of if the new models would reduce reliability.
- Wayman Smith said he received feedback on using the CBA as the sensitivity case for TPL.
- Antoine replied the TPL study is an RTO compliance study and not a regional reliability study. The approach for the regional study does not have to match the RTO study. He added it should not be hard to show the differences between the scenario and CBA cases with the significant increase in renewable dispatch compared to the scenario model. The reliability model provides a firm base case for the TPL. The CBA is more representative of the real world and the value from using the CBA is that it covers the old and new world. Need to clearly spell this out in the recommendations to help address questions/issues.

Antoine stepped the meeting participants through the Transition and Implementation section.

- Brian commented that with the inclusion of the ITP20 with the transition, there is no difference in what we do today.
- Steve Gaw added if the ITP20 is included and performed by someone outside of SPP staff, it will fill in the transition gap. The ITP20 would provide useful information, but SPP staff performing the study internally while working through the implementation of recommendations would be very difficult.
- Brian agreed with the impact on the Economic Planning staff and added the key is to free up staff for implementation work.
- Wayman asked if SPP had any idea of the cost.
 - Juliano Freitas responded one future from the last ITP10 took approximately 15,000 hours of work.

- Antoine added there would be a trade off with consulting that would decrease the cost but would also decrease the customization of the products.
- Bruce Cude asked if staff would oversee the work if it is outsourced. Juliano replied yes.
- Antoine shared in order to implement the new process properly, a lot of time will be needed to work items through working groups. We do not want to figure the process out as we go along. Important to get it planned on the front-end which will take a lot of time to work through the details.
- Bruce inquired to the scheduling of the upcoming ITP20.
 - Antoine replied staff will meet with SPP legal to discuss. Initial feedback was the waiver for the current ITP10 called for the planning process to be pushed out to allow the current study rather than the ITP10 replacing the ITP20. The 3-year planning process would resume with the completion of the 2017 ITP10 and the beginning of the 2018 ITP20. He added the granting of the waiver by FERC was not a slam dunk.
 - Brian opined the granting of a new waiver for the 2018 ITP20 would not make a difference if the BOD acts to accelerate the start of the next ITP10 study.
 - Antoine replied the only way to accelerate the process would be on the technical side with the new model requiring a 3rd quarter 2016 start for its build process. Procedural changes would probably take more time to complete.
 - Katy added that even with little over a year to transition, it would still be tight.
 - Wayman asked what would happen if the BOD moves forward with the ITP20 being performed by staff.
 - Antoine replied staff has not planned for that. It will be up to stakeholders as well as staff to implement the new processes and new deadlines. As of now, implementation activities are not scoped and not planned.
 - Wayman added something will suffer if we have to do both.
 - Brian replied we cannot afford for implementation not to work.
 - Antoine shared the words “if required” were added to the transition timeline regarding the ITP20. He suggested it only be performed if requested by FERC.
 - Brian added “or if it can be outsourced”.

- Bruce replied that even if the study was outsourced, it would still need staff and members to support the study.
- Steve Gaw added there is value in the ITP20. Its value will have to be weighed against the cost of performing the study.
 - Jody echoed Steve's comment regarding the need to be prepared to discuss cost with a recommendation to outsource the ITP20.
- Juliano asked the group to consider who would be responsible for the development of the scope. He added the development will need to start by July in order to be completed by December/January.
- Antoine summarized the recommendation of the group as the suspension of the ITP20 for 2017 in order to allow staff time to complete implementation tasks and if the study is required by the BOD or FERC, the study be outsourced with staff oversight.
 - Steve Gaw added the recommendation may need to be expanded to include FERC in regards to why staff and members need the time to focus on implementation.

Recommendation Item: Suspend the ITP20 to allow for implementation work.

Antoine asked the group if they have any interim measures to recommend for the current process since the 2016 ITPNT is coming to an end. He figured the TPITF will be asked for incremental improvements (any low hanging fruit). He added incremental improvements may be by the TPITF bargaining chip.

- Brian stated he sees questions of how this will fit in the competitive process.
- Katy asked if there was a way to include NTCs for TPL in the interim.
 - Jody replied NTCs for TPL would be competitive if they qualify.
 - Katy responded that may be dependent on the TWG agreeing to include the required contingencies in the ITP process.
 - Jody replied the TWG sees part of this (cost allocation) being a policy decision.
 - Antoine added the inclusion of the TPL with the ITPNT would have to go through the appropriate working groups since the compliance assessment will need to shift to the ITP model from the MDWG.

Antoine informed the group staff is working on developing a study schedule to help measure potential resource impacts and for TOs to use to help them determine possible resource impacts as well.

- Wayman responded for TOs, the impacts may not afford new headcount but rather put focus on how they will accommodate the work.

- Antoine commented the schedule/study process will be a negotiation between the level of work and quality of work. He added there are items in the study scope that drives resources like Futures, generation siting, etc.
- Brian suggested leveraging member-supplied data when possible like the use of IRPs for generation siting.
 - Antoine replied this type of information would be helpful and agreed to use them if provided for plans and siting.
 - Travis Hyde commented this information should be submitted to the MDWG for use with building the models.
 - Jody warned dependency on IRPs for siting is an opportunity for manipulation with the ability to place generation everywhere. He added using an independent party for siting would relieve manipulation issues.
 - Antoine described the waiver process in the NT that requires firm commitment in Years 2 and 5. Less likely firm commitments in place for Year 10 and will have to add generation at that point. If TOs are planning out 10 years and willing to provide the information, it would save time.
 - Travis commented model details will determine if the use of IRPs would be successful or not. Separate models are produced due to generation. Generator owners feel projects are preferenced toward ITP generation when their facilities are pulled from the MDWG model.
 - Lloyd Kolb inquired if IRPs include retirements.
 - Wayman replied some and Travis added his company includes them in their plans.
 - Antoine shared SPP receives some occasionally and staff are working on a process to improve notifications of resource retirements. Currently a 30-60 day notice is all that is needed for retirements.
 - Travis questioned the information utilities may be submitting to the MDWG to make up for the generation that is going away in the future.
 - Wayman responded there is no resource requirement for the 10-year out models. Suggested a rule may be needed around this in the MDWG process.
 - John Boshears commented there will always be issues with generation modeling until the dispatch is taken from the market.

Action Item: Travis and Alan Myers to facilitate working group discussion on TO-provided IRPs and collect details around what generation is being put into the models. Also consider how existing IRPs can be used and incorporated into the ITP planning models.

The group discussed the inclusion of the working group list in the Implementation section of the whitepaper. Discussion centered on the amount of detail needed for the recommendation.

- Brian suggested the list be pared down to focus on the groups that will have actions coming from them.
- Jake Langthorn agreed with focusing on groups who will have to take action for the transition. He added working groups will still be used for review and unless they are specifically needed for implementation, they should not be included in the list.
- Alan shared details are good and suggested the list be moved to an appendix to keep from bogging down the review of the whitepaper.
- Jake shared that true implementation work cannot begin until the MOPC approves the recommendations. At that point, working groups will become involved in the process. He suggested removing the list and referencing the future work that will be needed by corresponding and appropriate working groups.
- Staff agreed with Jake's suggestion and removed the list from the whitepaper; acknowledging a detailed implementation plan will be needed to move items through appropriate working groups that will allow for the transition to the new process by the desired timeframe.

Staff/Stakeholder Accountability

Antoine shared the addition of the TPL and the overlapping planning cycle will add more stringent deadlines to the study process. Building better schedules to firm up needs will help along with spelling out specific responsibilities for meeting the needs. Agreement will be important on schedule deadlines and what will be done if a deadline is not met including steps to accommodate further actions after the deadline has passed in order to keep from disrupting/delaying the process. He suggested the possibility of a report card for MOPC and the BOD regarding process deadlines in order to add transparency to the process and highlight impacts to the planning process.

- Travis asked if staff has talked with the Compliance group citing the data submittal requirements of the new MOD standard. He added noncompliance with data submittal requirements would be an issue during an audit.
 - John Krajewski commented there may be some entities that are not beholden to the standard.
 - Lloyd added noncompliance with deadlines in this scenario would force companies to self-report if the deadlines are missed.
- Brian echoed Travis' comment and asked if new measures are needed or if it would be enough to leverage current requirements like those in the new MOD standard.

- Katy cautioned using these types of more aggressive measures since they are not typically reflective of SPP's culture.
- Bruce Cude reaffirmed the need to shed light on issues like missed deadlines.
- Travis shared the MDWG has a scorecard of deadlines that is shared with the TWG that lists violations. He added some companies will use the scorecard as proof they met their submission requirements.
- Jake commented the fixing of existing problems like missed deadlines are not the focus of the TPITF. This conversation is more on the order of expectations of compliance and how the process will move on without them. He did not consider the teeth to be necessary.
- English Cook asked about mitigations for working groups that do not take action when scheduled and how to proceed when they do not act.
 - Jake responded the lack of working group work when adequate time has been provided is wrong.
 - Gayle Nansel commented the fundamental flaw is with the lack of coordination with data submittal. Focusing on deadlines does not solve the problem.
 - Antoine asked if the vetting of schedules would not get buy-in on the time needed.
 - Gayle replied it depends on if she knows what other TOs are going to submit. She could see a process where submitters vetted data when submitted. This would allow TOs to see how the data affects others.
 - Antoine replied that would not change. The schedule will have time built into it for further data review and feedback. That would be true for approvals as well. The process will not cut out opportunities for reviews and approvals.
- Antoine shared deadlines are cost-causers in that delays are often augmented with contractors.
- Antoine continued things like a vetted schedule are examples of some of the steps that will be needed during implementation to address known issues.
- Gayle commented the length of the MDWG process may keep folks from participating throughout; they just wait until the end.
 - Brian asked if there was a way to know which entities wait until the end to submit the requested data.
 - Anthony Cook replied the MDWG maintains a table of submissions that lists entities and when data was submitted. This could be leveraged for review.

- Wayman commented a decrease in the number of reviews would help save time. He suggested talking with the MDWG about their efforts with addressing model issues.

Seams

Adam Bell, with SPP's Interregional Relations group, discussed the importance of accounting for seams issues within the regional planning process. For modeling, the process should allow neighbors to be involved with the development process and have accessibility to SPP modeling data. He added it would be helpful to have more structure around TO submission of neighbor data. This would not replace the work required for a joint study. For example, extensive effort was put into joint modeling for the last SPP-MISO study. Coordination would not replace the joint model build. The IPSAC process is still needed for scope and model development.

Adam also stressed the importance of considering needs on seams in the regional planning process and gave the example of market-to-market. For this year's ITPNT, MISO needs were posted along with SPP needs to give a bigger picture of what projects may address.

- Antoine commented the inclusion of marker-to-market would be new to the process and an approach would need to be developed.
- Katy replied she did not see market-to-market as bad since we will always have congestion with a seam.
- Adam McKinnie added there has been lots of discussion over the predictability of future costs. Not sure payments are a benefit metric.
- Jake commented this is a major concern that everyone gets compensated appropriately.
- Antoine responded a process would be needed that a majority would agree to. Questions asked would be why pay for a project when you are getting money and why not pay for a project when you are paying out more money than the TCR/ARR.
- David Kelley shared he hears how the planning process does not address real-time issues and market-to-market is real-time that is tracked. Planners can take the information and use it in planning. He added he was unsure how to do that yet but the reference to market-to-market just speaks to data; a tool that can be used with planning.
 - Wayman responded we should be careful with how financial impacts are translated to planning. He pointed to other things like FTRs possibly being tracked and how they benefit firm transmission.
 - David commented the reference to market-to-market was a mechanism to get the discussion started.
 - Brian added there is a need to give more consideration to things like market-to-market and their place in planning.

- Wayman asked if this was the same as congestion in real-time. Antoine replied yes, just over the seams.

Steve Sanders commented the Seams section focused more on process than on what changes can be proposed to impact the planning process. He suggested updating the section to focus on improvements.

- Katy suggested adding the process language to the standardized scope for Seams.

The comment was made to consider cost-sharing when picking seams projects and do not assume 100% of the projects would be paid for by SPP.

Operational Assessments

Will Tootle with SPP Operations reviewed the Operational Assessments section of the whitepaper. He shared the goal was to identify operational issues and feed information to planning to consider with assessments. Currently sees reoccurring issues that are not being fixed. Will look to reduce the amount of scenarios planning would need to do to identify operational issues. It is difficult to replicate what is happening in real-time.

Will added there are no IROL planning flowgates while there are four in operations. There are specific processes to follow to address them. He commented plans are needed to fix the IROL limits.

- Wayman asked if Will had a proposal for incorporating the IROL information. Will replied an option could be adding the issues to the planning needs list and inserting them into the DPP process.
 - Brian asked how the TO cost/benefit would be quantified.
 - Wayman asked how projects would be evaluated against the needs.
 - Will replied there will be economic projects with which to calculate benefits.
 - Katy responded if there is no congestion in the planning model, you cannot determine benefits; would need a separate model and assessment.
 - Will replied a separate model can be created.
 - Wayman shared PAT or TARA can be used to pull out data to use with the analysis and feed the solution back in to see if it affects other projects.

Steve Gaw shared the results of the WITF study showed a couple of projects recommended for acceleration due to a cost/benefit analysis. They looked at curtailments verses building projects. That type of analysis is a possible option. He added PJM has a quick-pick program that will pull data on an operational issue for examination.

Brian commented it comes down to what it would take to get comfortable paying for a project based on operational data.

Jake responded with his thoughts on constraints and congestion. We can see what is creating constraints and congestion and gave the example of Woodward. He added if we know about IROLs and are not addressing them in planning, we are missing the boat. Anything congestion related and economic; we all benefit from it. He also shared there have been no projects approved due to wind congestion stating the difficulty with replicating the system for a particular hour.

- Antoine responded planning currently uses wind capacity above the accredited capacity and firm service. Also uses wind profiles and looks for issues in Year 10 and stages based on Year 5. He added data in the Year 2 model should be similar to operations considering there is less than 2% load growth in the models and very little added generation. Should better see chronic issues in the near term.
 - Jake commented if the Year 2 analysis is not close enough to real-time, it will need to be re-adjusted to get it closer.

Scott Jordan shared the WITF study used N-X to mimic operational data. Planning can take a look at mimicking it as derating or a scenario.

- Brian asked Scott if multiple N categories were used to mimic outages. Scott replied yes, will help mimic congestion you may see.
- Jason Atwood agreed and asked where we would draw the line. He suggested something on the line of Quick Pick, outside of the process, may be an option.
- Brian commented he was not sure TOs would want to build projects from outage congestion.
 - Scott Jordan responded methodology would be the hard part.
 - Brian replied if it is done wrong, could overbuild. May provide information as a sensitivity in the 2nd year.
 - Scott added it may be more of an option to accelerate a project rather than build a project.

Will continued his discussion covering non-congestion issues. He asked if the Year 2 study would be a snapshot or 8760. Antoine replied 8760 with voltage when converted from AC to DC which would then become a snapshot.

- Will shared his concern with the snapshot. Operations sees a lot of voltage issues in off-peak conditions. A snapshot would not capture those issues.
- Brian commented addressing voltage issues causes uplifted costs.
- Will responded an assessment can be run that would look at uplift costs. Units turned on are made whole. There is a cost to load.
- Brian suggested the use of uplift costs for chronic problems to justify a project.
 - Wayman responded uplift costs can be used to identify a problem but would see an issue with using those costs to justify a project.

Lloyd suggested a start to the process could be a list of chronic problems from operations.

- Will replied he can query information and provide a *top issues* list. He added the majority of issues are seen in the off-peak season which is not looked at in planning.
- Jason Atwood added if a peak hour and a low-load hour are used, he was not sure issues mentioned by Will would be picked up.
- Antoine shared it is hard to hit specific points because of the variance in the generation.
 - Scott replied the generation stack is replicated in the light load model using operations data.
 - Gayle added WECC creates operational cases to mimic generation. The model may not consider other analysis like voltage stability.
 - Brian commented there would be issues with justifying a project based on a different model.
 - Steve Gaw asked if it was necessary to mimic to justify.
 - Will replied it seems inefficient to simulate what is already known in operations.
 - Katy responded it would help identify the best solution.
 - Will offered operations could archive the model of the system at the time of the problem and use it for the analysis.
 - Jerry Bradshaw commented he was not sure models needed to be added since it would be difficult to exactly predict after the fact. He added even though they may be sponsored projects, help will still be needed to identify issues and fixes.
 - Brian replied the fixes would be zonal and sponsored.
 - Katy responded if zonal, can get an NTC.
- Antoine shared there are a couple of issues: 1) TOs comment they have had and are having issues, but we do not know how long they will happen. 2) To make a long-term investment, people want evidence to show the significance of the issue being addressed. “A long time” can vary by the person; 3 weeks versus 3 years. People want an optimized solution and to compare the cost against the benefit. He suggested we show candidate solutions (small fixes) that people can consider because justifying and approving big lines is tough.
 - Brian asked if identifying those types of solutions would be from one-offs or part of the process.
 - Wayman replied he would prefer they are found in the process; solutions may be separate on a case-by-case basis.

- Brian asked if the Year 2 CBA model would identify chronic problems, how hard would it be to dump a case from it and give it to Will to examine.
 - Juliano replied it would take his group approximately 10 hours to create the case.
 - Will added it would provide value if the planning model identified the same issue.
 - Juliano shared a big issue with the model would be the difference between the constraints found in the Year 2 and Year 10 models.
 - Wayman agreed looking into the future is a big issue since operations does not.

Jake commented it is not right to not have a process or a tool to address operational issues outside of a sponsored project.

Antoine suggested the following: 1) receive a combination of operational data showing issues and uplift associated with a set of time; 2) take the solutions from the ITP study and plug them into the operational case; 3) if the solutions address the issues, okay. If not, based on the cost, would it replace the solution?

- Wayman offered a variation to Antoine's suggestion. Operations identifies issues and the needs are inserted into the planning process. Add a validation step to the needs assessment and validate them based on future issues. If valid, add them to the final needs list and fix in the planning process.
- Antoine responded if a DPP is developed, how would it address the need and the operational issue without the model. Not sure how staff could select the best project. Sounds like a waiver without a model.
- Brian replied he does not see competitive projects coming out of operations within the 3-year window.
- Will commented if we look at NTCs and do not find a project that will fix the issue; it would remain a problem as these issues would fall between the cracks. A chronic reliability concern where the only operational option is load shed. He questioned if a threshold could be set for these issues.
- Wayman shared we plan to meet NERC and individual company plans. There may be issues that are "okay" according to criteria.

Antoine summed up the previous discussions regarding the incorporation of operational issues into the planning process and offered the following process to the group:

- Conduct the ITP planning process.
- Operations develops needs list (economic and reliability) and gathers required information like uplift, number of occurrences, etc.
- ITP solution set provided to Operations.
- Operations tests solutions to see if they fix the operational issues.

- For issues/needs not addressed, develop candidate projects as fixes.
- Add candidate projects to ITP solutions list and provide to appropriate working groups for review.
- Develop final list of projects (ITP and operational) and take to MOPC and the BOD for approval.
- Antoine commented criteria around the definition of chronic operational issues will need to be developed.
- Brian responded the operational information may be needed before the development of the final ITP portfolio in case a project needs to be accelerated.
- Antoine pointed out there may be an impact to the study schedule which will need to be analyzed.
- Jason Davis stated we may consider taking the project review outside of the process.
- John Krajewski suggested the development of a cost threshold that may be used to decrease the needs list.

Improvement Item: Add Operational Issues section to the ITP report. Include needs with planning. Need feedback on criteria for projects.

Brian recommended the performance of a study to take an initial look at chronic operational issues and then incorporate the operational issues assessment process into the new ITP planning process. This would give planning an opportunity to address chronic operational issues before starting the new planning process.

- Antoine commented this study may be able to be performed during the transition period.
- Katy added the possible need to make this a high priority study in order to have the ability to issue NTCs.
- The TWG, ESWG, and ORWG would define the criteria around the operational assessment.

Recommendation Item: Perform High Priority study to take an initial look at chronic operational issues and then incorporate the operational issues assessment process into the new ITP planning process.

Agenda Item 3: 18-Month Planning Timeline (All)

SPP Staff will develop a detail 18-month study schedule to review at the next schedule TPITF meeting.

Agenda Item 4: Miscellaneous Planning Considerations (All)

This agenda item will be carried over to a future meeting.

Agenda Item 5: Review Action Items

1. Travis and Alan Myers to facilitate working group discussion on TO-provided IRPs and collect details around what generation is being put into the models. Also consider how existing IRPs can be used and incorporated into the ITP planning models.
2. **Improvement Item:** Add Operational Issues section to the ITP report. Include needs with planning. Need feedback on criteria for projects
3. **Recommendation Item:** Suspend the ITP20 to allow for implementation work.
4. **Recommendation Item:** Perform High Priority study to take an initial look at chronic operational issues and then incorporate the operational issues assessment process into the new ITP planning process.

Agenda Item 6: Future Meeting Dates and Locations (Brian Gedrich)

- May 26: Dallas. Renaissance Building. 42nd floor conference room.
- June 9: Dallas. AEP office.
- June 22: Dallas. DoubleTree Hotel.

Agenda Item 7: Adjourn (Brian Gedrich)

Brian Gedrich adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm on 3/31/2016.

First Name	Last Name
Aaron	Stewart
Adam	McKinnie
Adam	Bell
Alan	Myers
Amber	Greb
Anthony	Cook
Antoine	Lucas
Brian	Gedrich
Gayle	Nansel
Jake	Langthorn
Jason	Davis
Jason	Atwood
Jason	Terhune
Jeremy	Severson
Jody	Holland
Joe	Fultz
John	Krajewski
Juliano	Freitas
Katy	Onnen
Kelsey	Allen
Kirk	Hall
Lloyd	Kolb
Michael	Wegner
Mo	Awad
Nathan	McNeil
Shawnee	Claiborn-Pinto
Steve	Gaw
Steve	Hardebeck
Tom	Hestermann
Wayman	Smith
Will	Tootle
Scott Jordan	
Aaron	Pupa
Brian	Rounds
Ryan	Yokley
Sherri	Maxey
Travis	Hyde
John	Varnell
Moses	Rotich
John	Allen
John	Mills
Sandeep	Baidwan
Steve	Sanders
Bruce	Cude
Chris	Giles
David	Kelley
Michael	Odom
Eric	Burkey
Josie	Daggett
Matthew	Stoltz

Jerry	Bradshaw
-------	----------