

Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Renaissance Tower 42nd Floor Conference Room

May 26, 2016

8:00 a.m. – 3:00 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)**
2. SPP Staff: Create high-level annual planning schedule including ITPNT and ITP10 milestones. **(OPEN)**
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. 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)**
5. SPP staff: Review the current process for reviewing/approving Sponsored upgrades. **(OPEN)**
6. 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)**
7. **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?
8. 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.
9. **Improvement Item:** Add Operational Issues section to the ITP report. Include needs with planning. Need feedback on criteria for projects.
10. **Recommendation Item:** Suspend the ITP20 to allow for implementation work.
Incorporated into Recommendations Whitepaper.
11. **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.

- Review/approve 3/24/16 and 3/30/16 draft meeting minutes:

Brian Gedrich opened the floor for discussion regarding the draft minutes for the 3/24 and 3/30 meeting minutes. Katy Onnen provided the motion to accept and it was seconded by Lloyd Kolb. The motion passed without discussion.

Action Items Discussion

AI#7: Consider the feasibility of a system-wide stability study.

This item was added to the list as a carryover from the previous meeting to clarify the recommendation around the item. Discussion centered on how this study would differ from the TPL stability study. This system-wide study would assess transfers and identify additional stability limits associated with interfaces.

- Wayman Smith commented interfaces should be given consideration during economic studies. A process is needed to review limits and identify additional stability limits that may limit projects. Projects are approved that affect interface ratings that do not get analyzed and the interface limits do not get updated.
- Jake Langthorn shared reliability issues have to be addressed and stability issues need to be identified and honored. Stability should be an integral part of the planning process. Antoine Lucas replied it will take an economic look to justify an NTC for stability issues. Reliability issues can be managed more effectively.
- Antoine stated the Voltage Task Force is looking at transfers and wind penetration and this type of look my fall under that group.
 - Bruce Cude responded that group is just looking at tools and the recommendation of projects is not part of the group's scope.
 - Will Tootle added he agreed that was not part of the scope and the goal of the group is to review existing criteria for revisions.
- Antoine acknowledged the need for a coordinated process for local TOs and SPP to analyze and address issues, limits, and interfaces.
- Lloyd Kolb added a consideration is thermal issues are typically on-peak while stability issues are typically off-peak and asked how the off-peak stability issues and potential fixes would affect the on-peak thermal issues.
- Brian stated it would be beneficial to formalize and put structure around the use of the interfaces.
 - Antoine responded there is not a formalized process. The process today is to call and ask the TO to look at issues based on a project being put in. There is a need for the formalization of the process to facilitate coordination between TOs and SPP.
 - Bruce asked if the TWG is looking at this. Jason Davis replied not at this time but they should be looking at it.

Action Item: Add this as an agenda item for the 6/9 meeting. Jason Davis and Wayman to coordinate language for the recommendations whitepaper.

Agenda Item 2: RR Process Review (Erin Cathey)

Erin Cathey, with SPP's Market Design group, gave an overview of the SPP Revision Request process. Erin used a presentation to give a high-level overview of the process for the submittal, review/approval, and implementation of a revision request. She also discussed the roles the Primary and Secondary working groups play in the process. She stated a Primary working group is typically appointed to be the final recommendation approver before the RR goes to the MOPC and/or BOD for final approval and implementation.

- English Cook stated the ITP Manual will be constructed of different items/sections that may fall under the purview of different working groups. For instance, technical items come from the TWG while economic items typically come from the ESWG. He asked if the sections in the Manual could have different Primary working groups assigned to them. Erin replied the process could be arranged to allow the assigning of different Primary working groups for different sections of the Manual.
- Antoine Lucas asked where the RRs are settled. Erin responded typically at MOPC or the BOD, however, not all RRs may require MOPC or BOD approval. If RRs can be approved at the working group level, the TPITF will need MOPC to approve rolling the Manual into the RR process and not have it rolled into the MOPC process.
- Antoine inquired as to the typical timeframe for working RRs through the process. Erin replied a quarterly timeframe is typical in order to line up with the MOPC and BOD meetings. She added RRs can be classified as normal, expedited, or urgent which can affect the speed at which they are approved. Those classified as *normal* are run through the typical process and go through all the required working group reviews and approvals before proceeding to MOPC and the BOD. RRs are required to be posted 10 days prior to a working group meeting to allow for stakeholder review. *Expedited* RRs essentially skip the review period/posting and can proceed to the working group where the reviews and approvals will take place during the meeting. *Urgent* RRs are items of a critical and timely nature that need the immediate attention of MOPC and/or the BOD. A special call can be requested for a vote to allow the immediate implementation of the RR. Erin added the level assigned to RRs is defined in the process and assigned accordingly.

Agenda Item 3: TPITF Recommendations Whitepaper (All)

English shared this agenda item was added to discuss any potential revisions/updates that need to be made to the recommendations whitepaper in preparation for the July MOPC meeting.

Brian asked the group if they heard Jim Eckelberger's comments regarding the performance of the ITP20 during the MOPC/SPC educational session. He shared Mr. Eckelberger commented on the lack of value of the ITP20 process and questioned the need to perform it at least once every five years as recommended by the TPITF.

- Katy Onnen suggested the possibility of revising the Tariff and moving the ITP20 to a high priority study.
- Alan Myers warned the group should not over react to his comments.
- English offered replacing the "once at least every five years" recommendation language with "at the discretion" in order to remove the five year requirement.
- Lloyd commented the study should not be performed just to do it. It should be left alone until there is a strategic need for it.

- Brian recommended the language remain unchanged with the consideration the MOPC, SPC, or BOD can request the removal of the five year stipulation if they feel it is unnecessary.

Brian gave the group a quick review of the educational workshop. He shared it went well with several questions asked but no real pushback on the recommendations. The BOD was well represented and as a group seemed to appreciate the TPITF's efforts. He added he receive some comments regarding the increased potential of the starting and cancelling of projects with an annual process.

- Lloyd added the annual cycle will help validate current projects.
- Wayman commented he has heard opinions there could possibly be more project re-evaluation requests with the annual process.
 - Antione responded a process will be needed to address re-evaluations.
 - Brian asked how often re-evaluated projects are affected.
 - Jason replied several projects were removed from the last planning cycle.
 - Katy responded that is a benefit of an annual study.

Action Item: Develop a process to guide re-evaluation requests/studies for the new annual planning process.

- Bruce shared he did not hear much from the planning companies. Most of the comments came from policy/regulatory people.
- Antoine added he received positive feedback from several MOPC members. He did not hear any dissention or negative comments. The over-arching feedback he received was people want to see the new process implemented sooner and want to hear what it will take to do it. Also received comments regarding a need for more flexibility with the process.
- Antoine shared a big challenge from a regional perspective is some issues can be noise, while for local utilities, they may be big issues.

Agenda Item 4: ITP Annual Planning Process Presentation (SPP Staff)

SPP Staff developed a presentation outlining the steps of the annual planning process along with the model develop timeline. Each of the planning tasks was broken down to give an overview of the work involved with each task along with identifying potential SPP and member impacts. Estimated resource impacts and SPP requirements were also listed.

July Timeline. Staff presented a timeline with a July end date. The timeline highlighted member-facing actions that included the Order 1000 DPP and cure period windows, TO cost estimate submittal windows, and TWG/ESWG/MOPC/BOD meetings. Highlights of the timeline are as follows:

- The timeline highlighted the DPP window falling over the Christmas and New Year's holidays starting around mid-December and closing around mid-January. This was brought to the group's attention as previous discussions around the July-July process focused mainly on coordinating the finish of the study process with the July MOPC/BOD meetings.

- Staff highlighted the TO cost estimation submittal windows and their coordination with a proposed planning summit to take place in early April prior to the MOPC/BOD meetings. The intent of the scheduling is to use the April summit as an educational workshop for MOPC participants on the draft portfolio before their meeting in order to reduce the amount of pushback or questioning that has been experienced in past meetings when participants did not have the opportunity to review the draft portfolio in more detail prior to the meeting.
- Brian commented he has become a member of the CTPTF and that group does not see value with DPPs and the Order 1000 process. He does not see where the process is worth the cost of the effort. He also questioned if the BOD would award a project based on 100 bonus points if the project in question was not the most cost-effective project.
 - Katy replied the BOD has the right to choose who gets awarded the project regardless of the points. The BOD saw the process as a way to get more options to address issues.
 - Jake added the CTPTF chose this path early on and they saw the issue with the awarding of the points. He encouraged members of the group to keep pushing the CTPTF to review and fix the process.
 - Brian commented it is not the TPITF's responsibility to address DPPs but he suggested the TPITF take a recommendation to the SPC and BOD and request a re-evaluation of the value of the process because of its impact on the planning process.
 - Jake responded that eliminating DPPs would be reworking the process after one cycle. He added it may be more appropriate to re-visit the process after a 2nd cycle if the same issues occur.

Action Item: Draft a recommendation to the SPC and BOD and request a re-evaluation of the value of the process because of its impact on the planning process.

- Antoine pointed out the updating of the planning model with approved NTCs has a big impact on the overall schedule due to carving out two months from the assessment timeframe effectively dropping the assessment timeframe from 12 to 10 months.
 - Jason added consideration is also needed for the impacts of re-evaluations. Re-emphasized the need for a process/criteria around them.
- Antoine acknowledged the re-evaluations are a gap that needs to be addressed. He shared he has received questions about finalizing a project so TOs can start construction. Need a proposal.
 - Jason replied he has a high-level proposal that will need to go through working group review. He added delays with re-evaluations will delay the update to the economic model. He shared he is looking to use the planning summit as a workshop to address issues that need to be evaluated before finalizing the study.
 - Katy shared there were issues with the past March summit because the portfolio was still in flux and a good look at the projects could not be taken.
 - Jason responded he is looking to put out a draft portfolio and cost estimates for review with the hopes of receiving feedback and updating the portfolio before the summit. Cost estimates are impacted if not

received. He shared the 2A process needs to be reviewed to buy additional time for the study. Projects change from the draft portfolio due to local knowledge. He added a better process for sharing local knowledge would be beneficial as well.

- Antoine shared the ITPNT went to MOPC in April for approval and requests were made to change the portfolio. MOPC did not know what to do with it since it was approved by the TWG and ESWG. Staff did not have background information available to immediately address the changes. Instead of approving, MOPC sent the portfolio back to Staff and set a vote for the following meeting. He added the summit will have the benefit of giving MOPC two looks at the portfolio instead of one.
 - Katy asked if comments were made at the TWG and ESWG meetings and Antoine replied yes.
 - Katy added TOs see the MOPC meeting as the last chance for change and she does not see that changing.
 - Jason responded staff wants to be able to evaluate within the process and not outside of it.
- Wayman questioned how to make the summit more effective. He suggested feedback could be provided through RMS.
 - Antoine replied SPP is looking at an educational meeting in conjunction with MOPC.
 - Katy warned MOPC reps are different people from summit people. She added the nature of the process limits discussion in the summit.
 - Antoine responded the summit can be handled in different ways. The goal is to get the draft portfolio in front of the MOPC reps so they can review and forward questions/concerns prior to taking the final portfolio to MOPC. He added the summit needs to be organized in such a way as to be able to address technical and policy concerns.

October Timeline. Staff presented a timeline with an October end date. The timeline highlighted member-facing actions that included the Order 1000 DPP and cure period windows, TO cost estimate submittal windows, and TWG/ESWG/MOPC/BOD meetings. Highlights of the timeline are as follows:

- The Needs Assessment will start the first of January. The Christmas and New Year's holidays will not have an impact on the assessment process as they fall outside of the annual assessment timeline.
- Solutions Evaluation will include the DPP window and cure period. The 30-day DPP window will open around mid-March with the window and cure period taking up most of April.
- Portfolio Development will commence around the second week of June with a summit held during the first part of July. Like the July schedule, the summit would line up with a

MOPC meeting and allow for an educational workshop to inform MOPC members prior to the October MOPC meeting.

- Portfolio Assessment, which is the different analyses performed on the final portfolio, will start in mid-August and produce the final report and portfolio that will be reviewed and approved by the TWG and ESWG toward the end of September.
- Final approval by the MOPC and the BOD will be scheduled for the October MOPC meeting.
 - MISO's plan is approved in the October/November timeframe.
- Development of the MDWG and ITP Reliability models will be pushed out a couple months with the ITP model posting around mid-April instead of the first week of February, as is currently scheduled. This will require a significant change to the MDWG model build schedule. The updating of the ITP Economic model with approved NTCs will fall over the Christmas and New Year's holidays which will have a larger impact on SPP Staff than the membership.

August Timeline. Staff presented a timeline with an August end date. The timeline highlighted member-facing actions that included the Order 1000 DPP and cure period windows, TO cost estimate submittal windows, and TWG/ESWG/MOPC/BOD meetings. Highlights of the timeline are as follows:

- The Needs Assessment will start the first part of November. The Christmas and New Year's holidays will occur during this phase which will have a larger impact on SPP Staff than the membership.
- Solutions Evaluation will include the DPP window and cure period. The 30-day DPP window will open around the third week of January with the window and cure period encompassing all of February and the first part of March.
- Portfolio Development will commence around mid-April with a summit held during the first part of May. Unlike the July and October schedules, the summit would not line up with a MOPC meeting. However, MOPC members would still be engaged from a draft portfolio review/feedback perspective.
- Portfolio Assessment, which is the different analyses performed on the final portfolio, will start the last part of June and produce the final report and portfolio that will be reviewed and approved by the TWG and ESWG toward the end of July.
- Final approval by the MOPC and the BOD will require an off-cycle meeting specifically designated for the approval of the report and portfolio. This meeting will occur during August.
 - MISO's plan is approved in the October/November timeframe.
 - Some concern over the possibility of study-impacting decisions coming out of the July MOPC preceding the August approval.
 - General thought was an approval-specific MOPC meeting might be appropriate considering the potential size of the study and the large amount of discussion that could take place.

- Development of the MDWG and ITP Reliability models will be pushed out one month with the models posting the first part of March instead of February, as is scheduled currently.

Needs Assessment. Staff reviewed slides describing the Needs Assessment that included work performed, member impacts, study requirements, and FTE impacts. Highlights of the group discussion are as follows.

- Jake emphasized the need for members to maintain the models through feedback into the model build process.
 - Jason responded time spent on models within the assessment process is a waste. He recommended reaching out to the MDWG to discuss how they may be able to shorten their model build cycle and ease their process. An example he gave was the contrast between building a new model from scratch as opposed to maintaining a base model/use last year's model. Have a discussion on metrics to determine what is "good enough" from a model standpoint. He also commented on the need for accountability documentation to raise awareness on the timely submittal of required data.
 - Wayman commented his company showed over 3,000 voltage needs from the last model build. He stated the process must go away from making adjustments to fixing the model before finalizing it. He cited an example of cleaning up the model by using appropriate data ranges. His modeling group received a list of voltage issues from a Docucheck list with a voltage range of .90-1.1 instead of .95-1.05 which had a significant impact on the number of violations identified.
 - Anthony Cook provided background on the voltage range. The .90-1.1 range is required for the MDWG model build which is based on MMWG criteria. SPP Voltage Criteria and TPL CAT A criteria has a range of .95-1.05. Anthony will bring this information to the TPITF and ask for support for a recommendation to change the MDWG voltage range to .95-1.05.
 - Jason shared Staff needs help with non-cons during the needs assessment. Wayman replied it is easier to fix model issues while building the model than during the DPP process.
- Wayman inquired as to the amount of time spent on validating needs. He has been questioned on why they were limited to the Top 20 rather than listing all of them. Antoine replied the limit is more of a resource issue rather than a technical issue. Limiting needs also helps limit the number of DPPs.
- Wayman asked about the performance of up-front screening for TPL issues. Jason replied his group is doing a good job of it but there are some improvements that can be made.
- Brian asked about the need for additional Enfuzion nodes.
 - Jason replied he is still looking at the numbers needed and the cost associated with it.
 - Katy responded the cost of additional Enfuzion nodes should not be included if they are already needed. Just those that are incremental to the ITP assessment.

- Juliano Freitas shared there were no Policy needs identified in the last assessment. If the Policy criteria changes, that may impact the Policy piece. Antoine added Public Policy was a required assessment by Order 1000. He added a review of Order 1000 language would confirm our current process and possibly identify areas where planning time and effort could be minimized.

Action Item: SPP Staff review Order 1000 language to confirm the current process and possibly identify areas where planning time and effort could be minimized.

Solutions Evaluation. Staff reviewed slides describing Solutions Evaluation that included work performed, member impacts, study requirements, and FTE impacts. Highlights of the group discussion are as follows.

- Juliano shared PROMOD would have to be run for each DPP in order to calculate a B/C ratio. Each project would then be tested against the base case.
- Wayman commented his company spent a significant amount of time developing solutions that were not realistic or had unintended consequences, etc. Bad solutions get into the portfolio; which in turn goes back out to TOs to review; who in turn have to justify why the solution is bad.
 - Jason responded it would be good to have a process to share information on known issues like an un-expandable substation.
 - Antoine added if we can work around confidentiality issues, we may be able to give projects to TOs to review for their areas.
- Juliano commented a lot of time spent on projects that are considered noise.
- Antoine added lot of process questions are received from TOs that take time to address. Hope is a standard would help reduce the volume of questions.

Portfolio Development. Staff reviewed slides describing Portfolio Development that included work performed, member impacts, study requirements, and FTE impacts. Highlights of the group discussion are as follows.

- Jason highlighted the change to the first cost estimate (2A) submittal window duration. It was originally six weeks but was reduced to four weeks for the current ITPNT and further reduced to two weeks for the proposed ITP schedule.
 - Katy commented two weeks is tight for submitting cost estimates.
 - Wayman commented folks from his company will push back on a two week window.
- Juliano described a potential staff impact by sharing the grouping of projects has to wait on the reliability portfolio. If the reliability portfolio changes during the process, grouping will have to be reworked.
- Wayman asked about the evaluation of economic benefits of reliability projects and if the economic benefit is used to select one reliability project over another.
 - Kelsey Allen replied that has been discussed but it has not been incorporated into the assessment.
 - Antoine added this type of evaluation can be performed but a vetted approach would need to be developed on how to do it.

- Antoine asked the group if they had an issue with TOs submitting cost estimates along with the DPPS assuming a reasonable volume of projects to estimate. He added needs could be given to TOs for their areas to estimate.
 - Wayman responded TOs may develop estimates on projects that might not be selected.
 - Jason commented a large majority were submitted during the first round of cost estimates. Wayman predicted there will be a lot more estimates with this new process.

Portfolio Assessment. Staff reviewed slides describing the Portfolio Assessment that included work performed, member impacts, study requirements, and FTE impacts. Highlights of the group discussion are as follows.

- Juliano shared calculating the benefits metrics is the bottleneck for the Portfolio Assessment phase.

Brian commented on the lack of slides describing the Operations Assessment and corresponding work, requirements, and resource impacts. He suggested that information be collected and added to the presentation.

Brian also requested additional information on Staff ideas for reducing FTEs and how much the additional FTE request will affect the admin fee (adder).

Agenda Item 5: Miscellaneous Planning Considerations (All)

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

Agenda Item 6: Review Action Items

1. Add system-wide stability assessment to the 6/9 meeting agenda. Jason Davis and Wayman to coordinate language for the recommendations whitepaper.
2. Develop a process to guide re-evaluation requests/studies for the new annual planning process.
3. Draft a recommendation to the SPC and BOD and request a re-evaluation of the value of the process because of its impact on the planning process.
4. SPP Staff review Order 1000 language to confirm the current process and possibly identify areas where planning time and effort could be minimized.
5. SPP Staff provide additional information on:
 - Operational Assessment: corresponding work, requirements, and resource impacts.
 - Ideas for reducing needed FTEs and how much the additional FTE request will affect the admin fee (adder).

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

- June 9: Dallas. AEP office. 8th floor conference room.
- June 22: Dallas. DoubleTree Hotel.

Agenda Item 7: Adjourn (Brian Gedrich)

Brian Gedrich adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm on 5/26/2016.

First Name	Last Name	Company
Adam	McKinnie	Missouri PSC
Alan	Myers	ITC Holdings, Inc
Antoine	Lucas	Southwest Power Pool
Brian	Gedrich	NextEra Energy Transmission LLC
Brian	Rounds	AESL Consulting
Bruce	Cude	Xcel Energy / SPS
David	Binkley	ITC Holdings Corp.
Dawn-Marie	Coggins	Southwest Power Pool
English	Cook	Southwest Power Pool
Eric	Burkey	GridLiance
Erin	Cathey	Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
Jake	Langthorn	Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co.
Jarred	Miland	Xcel Energy
Jason	Davis	SPP
Jason	Terhune	Southwest Power Pool
Jordan	Schmick	Xcel Energy
Josephine	Daggett	Western Area Power Administration-Upper Great Plains Region
Juliano	Freitas	SPP
Katy	Onnen	Kansas City Power & Light
Kelsey	Allen	SPP
Kirk	Hall	Southwest Power Pool
Lloyd	Kolb	Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Matthew	Stoltz	Basin Electric Power Cooperative
Michael	Wegner	ITC Holdings
Nathan	McNeil	Westar Energy
Pat	McCool	Kansas City Power & Light
Ryan	Yokley	Sunflower Electric
Sam	Loudenslager	Southwest Power Pool
Shawnee	Claiborn-Pinto	Public Utility Commission of Texas
Sherri	Maxey	Southwest Power Pool
Steve	Sanders	Western Area Power Administration - UGPR
Steve	Hardebeck	OG&E
Steve	Gaw	Wind Coalition
Toby	Hu	Ameren Services
Wayman	Smith	American Electric Power
Will	Tootle	Southwest Power Pool
Amber	Greb	SPP
Aravind	Chellappa	SPS
Dee	Edmondson	SPP
Greg	McAuley	OG&E
John	Pratley	Continuum Associates
Michael	Odom	SPP
Patrick	McPhail	GRDA
Travis	Hyde	
Jeff	Knottek	
John	Allen	SPRM
Aaron	Pupa	LS Power



Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Renaissance Tower 42nd Floor Conference Room

May 26, 2016

8:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

• A G E N D A •

1. Welcome Brian Gedrich
 - Roll call of participants
 - Review Action Items
 - Approve Draft Minutes – 3/24 Conference Call & 3/30 Face-to-Face Meeting
2. RR Process Review Erin Cathey
3. TPITF Recommendations Whitepaper All
 - Jim Eckelberger’s ITP20 comments
4. ITP Annual Planning Process Presentation SPP Staff
5. Miscellaneous Planning Considerations All
 - Planning Summits
 - STEP Report
 - Load Forecast Task Force
6. Review Action Items..... English Cook
7. Future Meeting Dates and Locations Brian Gedrich
 - June 9
 - June 22
8. Adjourn..... Brian Gedrich

Who?	What?
Jeff Knotek/Mo	Brookline Flowgate (low hydro output in NW AR and SW MO)
Antoine	Antoine Lucas shared a point to consider with speeding up the approval process is the issue with working groups not being full-member representation while MOPC is.
Lloyd Kolb	If looking for quicker approvals from WGs, they will need more review time.
Steve Gaw	Pre-MOPC meeting for the working groups to discuss major decisions that will be made during the corresponding meeting. He described it as a decision summit that would be important for feedback prior to the MOPC meetings.
John Krajewski	Selection process for futures: stakeholders provide SPP futures options and SPP would select the futures based on the input received. Looking to reduce churn of future discussions and approval. SPC can be a pinch point.
	Process for determining Futures.
	Process for the consolidation of projects that are not part of all the Futures.
Alan Myers	Remove the Renewable Survey from the scope.
Mo	Need one constraint methodology. Different methodologies between the ITPNT and ITP10.
	Consolidation methodologies are different between the ITPNT and ITP10 studies.
	Generation addition assumptions. Proxy generation siting. Congestion due to proxy generation not being captured.
Alan Myers	The use of a hybrid resource plan that will site proxy resources in the plan. Response to discussion around generation assumptions used in the ITPNT and ITP10 studies.
Steve Sanders	DC tie modeling. A tie line can be historically studied in the direction that will serve the load but a scenario can arise where the flow is in the opposite and may look like a generator
	Use deadlines in criteria, MOD Manual, and Tariff to force compliance for data submittal for the model build.
	Need detail around how the ITP20 would be treated outside of the ITP process.
Steve Gaw	Development of criteria around exceptions and how to get them included/reviewed.
Antoine Lucas	Need to determine how to incorporate market-to-market into the planning process.
Mo	Tariff change to allow NTCs for compliance and keep the ITP and TPL separate. May be an easier way to get NTCs for compliance issues.
Wayman	Continued issues with the retirement of units.
SPP Staff	Alternative software to PROMOD for economic analysis
Mo Awad	TPL schedule is due in December for NERC compliance.
	Review the process for Sponsored Upgrades.
Wayman	Create a Load Forecasting Working Group.
Brian	Consider the performance of a system-wide stability study.
	SPP-requested annual updates to constraints and flowgates.
	Use uplifted cost to justify a project.

	Operational constraint study during implementation.
John Krajewski	Consider the removal of planning summit requirement from the planning process
John Krajewski	Consider the removal of the tariff requirement for the annual STEP report

Comments
Jeff brought this flowgate up during the 3/25 TWG call. Mo replied the TPITF will look into moving to 8760 look for this type of analysis.
He has heard this stated at MOPC meetings in the past. This issue will need to be addressed in order to keep things from being questioned at MOPC.
Add detail in scope regarding who will review and approve what.
Options: SPP staff recommends when producing the assumptions document; ESWG selects futures and takes to SPC; stakeholders provide SPP options and staff selects based on input received. More up-front involvement of the SPC.
SPC's approval of the Futures needs to be shortened to 1 meeting from 2. How are the initial Futures proposals create? From Staff? Through member input to Staff? From SPC?
Weight the Futures. Discount benefits based on the weight of the Future.
What else can be removed from the standardized scope. Policy survey?
Need one consolidation methodology for the ITP study.
Use a hybrid resource plan that will site proxy generation. Will need criteria to meet margin requirements. Standardize proxy siting.
Would need criteria around generation to meet margin requirements.
May need a scenario for tie lines. Maybe a sensitivity.
Move under the SPC or BOD. Preferably use consultants to avoid resource/process impacts.
Within model development.
Reducing the duplication of effort was a driver for combining the studies along with the issuance of NTCs for compliance issues.
Develop a process for the notification of generator requirement.
Look for software that will not require the DC/AC conversion
If there is a change, the RE will need to be informed.
Work to improve the development and submittal of load forecasts. Help create consistency with standardizing load forecasting best practices to increase quality.
Annually? Part of the ITP20?

Study chronic operational issues during the implementation phase (2017) to address the top issues before starting the new ITP process.

Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

• Action Items •

1. Standardized Scope. **OPEN**
2. Create high-level annual planning process schedule including ITPNT (TPL steady state), ITP10, and TPL short circuit milestones. **OPEN**
Presented at 5/26 meeting. Open for additional discussion.
3. 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. **OPEN**
4. Review the current process for reviewing/approving Sponsored upgrades. **OPEN**
5. 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**
6. **Recommendation Item:** Consider the feasibility of a system-wide stability study performed annually or in conjunction with the ITP20. **COMPLETE**
Added to 6/9 meeting agenda.
7. Develop a process to guide re-evaluation requests/studies for the new annual planning process. **OPEN**
8. Draft a recommendation to the SPC and BOD and request a re-evaluation of the value of the process because of its impact on the planning process. **OPEN**
9. SPP Staff review Order 1000 language to confirm the current process and possibly identify areas where planning time and effort could be minimized. **OPEN**
10. SPP Staff provide additional information on: **OPEN**
 - Operational Assessment: corresponding work, requirements, and resource impacts.
 - Ideas for reducing needed FTEs and how much the additional FTE request will affect the admin fee (adder).