

Transmission Planning Improvement Task Force (TPITF)

Net Conference

May 12, 2017

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

• M i n u t e s •

Agenda Item 1: Welcome (Brian Gedrich)

Brian Gedrich (Chair) started the meeting by welcoming participants and taking roll.

A motion to approve the 3/16/17 meeting minutes was made by Jason Atwood and seconded by Alan Myers. The approval passed with Brian Gedrich and Bruce Cude abstaining due to a lack of prior review of the posted minutes.

English Cook provided feedback on two action items taken from the 3/16 meeting.

- Schedule meeting to review draft 20-Year Assessment scope based on meeting feedback. - **COMPLETE**
- Review tariff language referenced in RR208 regarding the rights of submitted DPPs. Forever or just for the cycle in which it was submitted. – **IN PROGRESS**
 - Awaiting feedback from SPP legal. Will incorporate feedback into the next revision of the draft document.

Agenda Item 2: Review of 20-Year Assessment Draft Scope (All)

English kicked off the discussion of the draft scope by walking participants through the Overview, Objective, and Stakeholder Process sections. He shared effort was taken, based on group feedback, to construct scope language that would separate the 20-Year Assessment from the ITP study and process as much as possible. Examples given were the use of Scenario instead Future and Project List instead of Portfolio.

Juliano Freitas led discussion starting with the Stakeholder Reviews piece. He shared the scope is similar to the last ITP20 with a few changes to reduce the overall scope and magnitude of effort.

He shared the Load Forecast Review was similar to the ITP10 process and the Renewable Policy Review is the same as the ESWG-approved process used during the last ITP10.

- John Krajewski commented language was discussed during the April ESWG meeting regarding states with no standard percentages for Goals and Mandates. He suggested this language, if found, be used. He added each utility sets its on standard and the state percentages may not match up.
- Alan Myers suggested the language for the Renewable Policy Survey match up with the standardized scope language in the ITP Manual.

- Brian Johnson suggested a Year 20 column be added to Table 1. Juliano replied the column would be added and the columns for Years 2 and 5 would be removed.

Juliano continued with the Generation Review stating the process is the same as the ITP10.

Steve Gaw asked how different the Economic Model language is from the ITP10 language.

Juliano replied it is 60-70% the same as the last ITP10 and the ITP Manual.

Steve Gaw asked if this scope/process would fall under the ITP Manual.

- Brian Gedrich replied he like the RR process as it lends a process to considering changes.
- Steve Gaw commented if it is not under a process that is not known, it may be an issue.
- English responded it might be good to have it separate from the ITP Manual so and RR cannot contain changes to both the 20-Year and 10-Year Assessment processes.

Juliano continued the discussion with the Constraint Assessment Review.

- Jason Davis asked if this would be an ESWG-only item since this is an economic analysis.
- Alan suggested the TWG will still need to be involved. Optics would be bad if the TWG was left out of the loop for a Constraint Assessment review. Need to let the TWG make the call on their involvement or not.

Regarding the Project Development Request section, English informed the group he was in contact with SPP legal regarding the need to include the Order 1000 process and DPPs. **NOTE:** SPP legal has opined the Order 1000 process is not applicable to the 20-Year Assessment process.

Brian Johnson commented the approved RR208 provides an opportunity for the 20-Year Assessment to get an NTC with Board approval. He continued there is no tariff language excluding the 20-Year Assessment from receiving an NTC. The language is not in accordance with what the understanding is.

Juliano led discussion on the Study Process section of the draft scope.

- Steve Gaw requested details be added around how a Policy need/upgrade would be justified and facilitated considering the use of APC and B/C.
- Juliano replied wind curtailments would be used for Policy needs to meet the RPS per state. B/C used for most economical project to mitigate need.
- Steve Gaw agreed with the approach and suggested that detail be added.
- Steve Sanders asked if Mandates and Goal are used to set wind for all utilities and if staff considers if the utilities are bound by those. Julian replied yes, that is considered.

In regards to the Mandate/Goal Percentages table and RPS section, Steve Sanders added Iowa needs to be added to the list and there is load in Iowa now. WAPA does not apply this to their load.

Juliano continued the discussion moving to the Data Inputs section of the document. He shared it typically takes three to four months to develop the scenarios, working with the SPC and working groups.

For the Resource Plan, it has taken ~1,300 hours per future (scenario) to develop. He shared an option to using software to develop the plans; use spreadsheets to create ratios for CT ratios instead of Strategist. This could potentially reduce the hours for developing the plans.

- Steve Gaw commented he does not like hardwiring an approach into the language. He suggested staff look for ways to build flexibility into the scope items for future studies and needs, processes, etc. change.
- Brian Johnson asked if the spreadsheet results are comparable to Strategist. Juliano replied if there are no significant change in the resources, normal to moderate, the numbers should be close. If there are significant changes, for example gas prices increase drastically, it would take a decent effort from staff to research previous resource plans to determine the new levels. He added the spreadsheet will also include tier-1 resources and he is talking with consultants for recommendations on resource planning.

Tim Owens asked if staff's intent was to make the language on curtailments and O&M costs consistent with the ITP Manual. Juliano replied that is a question for the group with a 20-year look. He was not sure if O&M will change between a 10- and 20-year comparisons. Not sure if this needs to be standardized or leave it open for unknown future scenarios.

- Steve Gaw commented language could be added to show there is potential for cost to change over time. Particularly with capital costs. Should consider O&M costs will change over the years.

Tim suggested staff leverage ITP Manual language where possible to maintain consistency where the processes are similar.

For Siting, Juliano suggested the option of siting all proxy generation at 345kV buses which could reduce the work effort by 40-50%.

- Tim responded this sounds reasonable but he would need to talk with his transmission group to verify.
- Steve Gaw commented he likes the idea of leveraging past studies but questioned the consistency of methodology between the studies and how to reconcile the differences.

Steve Gaw again suggested staff incorporate process flexibility in the DC Ties and Lines section considering the currents talks with the west and the possibility of the footprint changing in the future. What if we want to study above the 3-year historical flows?

Discussion moved to how this document would be handled going forward; separate or as part of the ITP Manual.

- Jason Davis commented if it was part of the ITP Manual, it would fall under the RR process.
- English responded the document could be placed separately under the RR process to avoid someone trying to make ITP and 20-Year process changes at the same time.
- Mo and Bruce voiced support for a separate document.
- The opinion of the group was for the document to remain separate from the ITP Manual and placed under the RR process.

Action Item: Staff to post a redline draft of the manual on Friday, 5/19, and participants will have until Friday, 6/2, to provide feedback. Staff will post a new revised manual on Friday, 6/9, and a determination of a follow up meeting will be made at that time.

Agenda Item 3: Update on Recommendations Implementation (SPP Staff)

Juliano informed the group all the language for the ITP Manual will be approved by mid-June in preparation for the July MOPC.

- Still having discussion on methodology for several items.
- Looking to have all methodologies approved and pushed to the ITP Manual Task Force in early June. ITPMTF meeting set for June 14 to finalize all manual language.
- Then push to TWG/ESWG for final approval to post at the beginning of July for MOPC.

Agenda Item 4: Review Action Items (English Cook)

- Post revised 20-Year Assessment Manual on 5/19 for participant review.

Agenda Item 5: Future Meeting Dates and Locations (Brian Gedrich)

A determination of the need for the next meeting will be made upon the second revision of the 20-Year Assessment Manual.

Agenda Item 6: Adjourn (Brian Gedrich)

Brian adjourned the meeting at 11:05 am.

Meeting Attendees below

First Name	Last Name	Company
Alan	Myers	ITC Holdings, Inc
Amber	Greb	SPP
Brian	Gedrich	GridLiance
Brian	Rounds	AESL Consulting
Bruce	Cude	Xcel Energy / SPS
Chris	Matthes	
David	Binkley	
Derek	Brown	Westar Energy
English	Cook	Southwest Power Pool
Jamie	Hajek	NorthWestern Energy
Jason	Atwood	Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative
Jeremy	Harris	Westar Energy Inc
Joe	Fultz	Grand River Dam Authority
John	Krajewski	Nebraska Power Review Board
Juliano	Freitas	SPP
Katy	Onnen	Kansas City Power & Light
Kelsey	Allen	SPP
Krista	Kisch	NextEra Energy Transmission, LLC
Marisa	Choate	Southwest Power Pool
Michael	Wegner	ITC Holdings
Mo	Awad	Westar Energy
Nathan	Shults	
Ryan	Yokley	Sunflower Electric
Shawnee	Claiborn-Pinto	Public Utility Commission of Texas
Steve	Sanders	Western Area Power Administration - UGPR
Steve	Gaw	Wind Coalition
Tessie	Kentner	SPP
Tim	Owens	Nebraska Public Power District