

2024 ITP Needs Assessment Posting

Supplemental Information

Revision History

Date	Author	Change Description	Comments
2/26/2024	SPP Staff	2/26/2024 Updates Incorporated	

Economic Needs

2/26/24 Updates

SPP received an RMS ticket related to 2024 ITP Needs Assessment. This document has been created to publicly share SPP’s responses to provide clarity surrounding information in the needs posting.

- 1. Why is the generator at Gaines modeled at full summer capacity (912 MW) in the BR Y10 Summer case and only partial capacity + adjusted Hobbs capacity in the provided XML files for the Market Economic Model?**

Response: The Sidewinder resource included in the XML files is intended to be a proxy resource for the Gaines unit included in the BR models. SPP does not have full unit details to replicate a generator for the 2024 ITP MEMs. Copying Hobbs and increasing its capacity to a similar value to the Sidewinder resource for economic evaluation gives SPP and its members a chance to evaluate the situation appropriately. The 1 GW capacity of the Sidewinder resource was not matched to the BR models initially. SPP has posted an updated XML file that more

closely matches the resource capacity in the BR models.

- 2. Does SPP staff have a suggested project cost for the Gaines and Judson generation if considered as a solution? By the transmittal language, it appears that generators and their associated upgrades could be considered in the ITP outside of GI which would be funded entirely by the GI customer as opposed to regional cost allocation.**

Response: SPP cannot recommend its members construct generation via its ITP process. We can only evaluate the impact of generation on transmission needs and potential solutions. SPP expects to evaluate the impact of generation additions in the area on transmission solutions to determine if any projects are 'no-regrets' solutions.

- 3. Regarding the posted event files, what specifically does SPP Staff mean by "Southern portion of the SPS system near the Texas/New Mexico border" in the Economic Model Congestion guidance? How will SPP staff be classifying which solutions are evaluated against which event files? Are submitters supposed to choose and designate?**

Response: SPP plans on screening solutions near the areas with high emergency energy (Omaha, New Mexico, Williston) on the full E024 event file that includes the correct ratings for those facilities. Any solutions that do not fall in these areas will be screened with the alternate event file, E025. There may be some cases where SPP simulates certain projects on both event files. If DPP submitters believe their solutions should be screened using a specific event file, please indicate that in the DPP submittal form.

- 4. Why did SPP choose to evaluate SPS NM/TX, Omaha, and Williston within a single sensitivity event file scenario?**

Response: SPP combined the relaxed rating evaluations into a single event file based on our analysis that shows the 3 areas (Omaha, New Mexico, Williston) of high congestion and

emergency energy are unrelated. By limiting the alternate event files to a single file, it makes screening simpler for both staff and solution submitters. As noted in the 2024 ITP Needs Assessment Posting Document, the aforementioned areas can be realistically described primarily as reliability issues with potential for significant adjusted production cost savings.

5. Why were only selected constraints within SPP relaxed when extreme congestion also persists in MISO and Saskatchewan which could affect congestion results, APC, and BC ratios?

Response: SPP chose to focus on the facilities that relieved congestion in the inter-SPP areas with the highest emergency energy and congestion, as benefits for proposed projects should not be overstated. SPP also made these changes in hopes of improving run times while screening projects. SPP is less concerned with addressing the MISO external needs in the 2024 ITP due to upcoming coordinated system planning studies (CSP's).

6. Could SPP staff please clarify the transmittal language regarding the SPSNMTIES interface and how it will be evaluated? Does SPP plan to allow for the rating of the SPSNMTIES interface to be modified post-solution? We noticed that the rating was not relaxed in E025, and it is still listed as an economic need.

Response: The SPSNMTIES interface is a complicated issue. SPP staff has increased the rating of the interface this cycle compared to the 2023 ITP based upon analysis done within SPP System Planning, SPP Operations, and SPS. We are comfortable with the current rating and are proceeding more conservatively by not making further changes to the interface, recognizing that there are many factors that can impact changes to the rating.