

**Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
GAS ELECTRIC COORDINATION TASK FORCE MEETING
May 7, 2014, 8:00 a.m – 3:00 p.m.
Conference Call – WebEx**

• Summary of Action Items •

1. SPP Staff to develop ORWG and MWG plan for the Short Term items list.
2. SPP to send out the list of NAESB items for discussion and feedback. Providing the way SPP voted on prior strawman votes and will provide by end of the week.
3. SPP to post NAESB shaded diagram with positions and support in a single view.

Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
GAS ELECTRIC COORDINATION TASK FORCE MEETING
May 7, 2014, 8:00 a.m – 3:00 p.m.
Conference Call – WebEx

• M I N U T E S •

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order (Jake Langthorn)

Jake Langthorn called the meeting in session at 8:05 AM. He described the facilities and locations for the daily activities.

The group commented on the meeting room being offsite; the SPP facility is being used by other meetings with members.

Agenda Item 2 – NOPR, Docket No. RM14-2-00

NOPR Overview (Mike Riley)

Mike presented the meeting material provided related to the NOPR.

SPP has an obligation to respond to the NOPR near the end of November. FERC will issue a final rule after that. FERC is not under a time obligation to finalize the rules. When FERC does issue the rule, SPP has 90 days to file the compliance filing with FERC.

Once the FERC Order is determined, SPP has two potential actions.

1. Comply with the FERC Order: Stakeholder process and changes needed.
2. OR No changes and defend the reasons.

Part of the NOPR is to make sure the ISO/RTO's to change schedules to make sure the gas fired generators know their bids have been selected prior to the bid selection.

Nominations would need to be completed in time for the 1pm and 6pm deadlines. The phrase used is "sufficiently prior".

There is a table comparing the market timelines; we are close to MISO and PJM, although we are the latest for all of the postings.

Our next steps:

Discussions as are being held here.

Engage at NAESB for the 180 day process.

Jake Langthorn asked what the charge of this group should be?

- Amber suggested our processes complete 2 – 3 hours prior to the gas schedule.
- The NAESB response period is much shorter than that of the NOPR. Don Shipley said we need to get the members voices in the process. Staff is participating at the NAESB level. We need our member's voice.
- Brett Cruze requested that we talk about real time - Hourly bidding and extending generator run times.
- Richard Dillon suggested that any changes to our current process or our compliance with the order will have to be vetted, including systems for changes. Other Working Groups, such as the

MWG and ORWG must be in the cycle before we can respond with actions. Richard suggested backing up the timeline at least 2 months from the date we have to file. If this group advocates significant changes there are operational and system challenges, Mike Riley said all the filings and communications need to be through the vetting process in time for implementation.

- Rob Janssen stated that this ripples through as a change on all resources, not just gas (who is significantly affected). He is thinking the best thing we can do first is to provide information to the rest of the Pool and get to the other working groups as soon as possible; indicating that this needs to be before the July MOPC meeting. It will take 6 months to go through stakeholder groups and 2 MOPC meetings.
- Amber Metzker asked if SPP would put in comments and/or Members. Mike Riley said it could be both and the information that comes from SPP would be something discussed with this group.
- Our chance to comment and shape the rule ends Nov 28th. Richard Dillon asked if the order the default position of FERC? Mike said yes, he believes so. We must get our points in no later than November 28th. We have a chance to put them in within a month. Strawman - White Paper - How would we start this information flow?
- An attendee indicated that there are two possible ways to go, change schedules or can't change the schedules. The "not changing" position needs to include a "why" which will need to be included in the compliance filing. Both will need to be fully vetted. Brett Kruse added that the electric industry has a different timeline, guys in West think it will head to early morning. NE changed their closing time and don't want to change it again. This is something everyone will have to do. The gas people say they fixed it years ago. FERC took a look. If the membership wants to push back, he doesn't think it will go very far to being accepted. Is there an intent to make all the markets line up? Mike said he doesn't read that into the order, the electric markets. They will have to be in sync with the pipes who serve the region. The pipes cross boundaries. One line that separates is where the DC's are – a line for electric industry, not gas industry. National standardization may need to be implemented for this to work. The strawman proposals were not getting national support.
- The gas procurement process spans 2 days, Debbie James asked if they were indicating that the electric industry for the 2 day span also? Amber suggested that it is not the same for gas and electric. The order did not indicate that the electric day needed to be 9 to 9.

NAESB Points of View and Schedule (Joshua Phillips)

Joshua Phillips walked through his presentation.

Each Quadrant must have 67% support. Straw polls, motions, etc... are captured as evidence to the board. Once consensus complete, the next step is to go through the board and back to gas quadrant; identifying which standards need to be changed. SPP is participating in one segment in gas and one segment in electric.

There were 9 proposals and each had a different nuance – gaps based on time zones, the number of intra-days, when the nominations clear, etc....

The goal of the group is to align gas and electric supply days.

- Amber Metzker asked if we were voting in the straw polls. When NAESB posts results, they won't show who voted what. She would like to know where SPP took positions in the process. **SPP Staff to provide information for the straw polls and how SPP voted in the NAESB votes.**

- They are moving to electronic voting for future meetings and go to motions instead of straw polls which are not binding.
- SPP supported timely nomination between 1- 2 pm and evening between 6 and 6:30 pm. Minimum 1 hour between schedules posting before evening nomination cycle begins; also to have a 4 am gas day.
- Jarod Luner's understanding was slightly different than the slide showed - the evening nomination was from 6 – 6:30 pm, with certain timing requirements for the evening cycle nomination.
- Jake Langthorn asked about the super majority requiring votes from both quadrants. Unless there is an independent governing body to interject, that they don't get anything. Josh Phillips indicated that they will probably get partial information. His example was the 4 am start, there was a general consensus but they haven't gotten into the details. The NAESB goal is to find consensus the gas day schedule. Josh doesn't believe that will occur based on the voting requirements. Josh mentioned that participation will be noted when it gets to FERC.
- Jarod Luner and Dan Buckner added that the quadrants are in segments, if they don't pass within a 40% vote, it gets kicked out. Pooled and similar resources can get information removed from the votes based on the 40%. An example was the first intra-day trading schedule, consensus around fixing a potential overlap where you would be asked to bid in before knowing the outcome of the previous.
- Rob Janssen mentioned that from a regional perspective there are a lot of pipelines and regional supply. He doesn't see a need for the change in the gas day. Now that we are doing a full day ahead market, the generator schedule has changed; the generators are finding out in the evening if they run the next day. A goal is to get the schedules to match the nominations for gas, electric earlier and gas later in the day to sync up. To what degree is that being discussed and does it need a change. This possibly creates two issues.
- Dan Buckner said there needs to be a discussion of which becomes more valuable (1) when the bids occur or more important for (2) when you clear to get the gas needed to run. There are two sides that need to be defended, or at least discussed. In the east they want to clear.
- Amber Metzker asked if there are certain questions that SPP wants input from the members for a NAESB vote. If so, we have enough representation to discuss them here. Josh would welcome the input.
- Brett asked if there was a difference in the SPP position and stakeholder position and IRC Council, which would SPP do? Jake said that is a question for the stakeholders. Josh said that if there were misalignment, he would want to make sure everyone would know.
- **SPP Staff (Josh) to put forth the top 4 – 5 topics that will be in the NAESB voting.** With regions given the opportunity to weigh in.
- Don Shipley added more detail around the ISO RTO Council Gas Electric Task Force. He doesn't believe all the SPP stakeholders are being represented. SPP's market times are outside of the other areas times. SPP Staff has represented support for the proposal from the April meeting.
- Currently SPP Staff is aligned with the other ISO RTOs. SPP is lucky to have diversity in our region with strength in our pipes and electricity. If we are together with the others in the council instead of splitting off for different perspectives. This provides some strength based on the numbers. There is not clarity between the IRC and the Regional preferences. If this group can

provide the information and discussion to other working groups. Josh is voting based on IRC Council at this point for SPP.

- Jake Langthorn asked about the 4 Intraday as proposed by FERC. There are 2 intraday scheduling periods now. The proposal is to put it to 4. If we can RUC on a unit, the generator may be able to get the gas needed.
- Matt McCoy, of Southern Star Pipeline suggested that adding cycles will add a requirement for staff. Adding cycles does not increase the pipeline capacity.
 - Rob Janssen said for our area the intraday cycles may add liquidity. May give us an opportunity for a reasonable cost to match better for suppliers and consumers.
 - Matt said 96% of Southern Star is based on barge gas. Most are a 24 hour day. One issue they see is in the Rocky's, multiple outlets direct through one pipe. There may be gas on gas competition that may not be able to swing to Southern Star. Individual lines may have capacity limited lines, in which case an additional cycle will not fix it. Nebraska is having a capacity issue.
 - An attendee from Lincoln Electric, said in the winter they put in a timely nomination, blind at the moment. The only flexibility they may have is based on balancing. If they knew the day ahead commitments, it would help.
 - Rob Janssen suggested that New England is chronically constrained; SPP has some constraints in the winter, including the ones frequently in Nebraska.
 - John Bogatz provided some comments from the Gas side, specifically Tenaska, natural gas piece.
- One thing that is coming up is the cost-benefit ratio – the timelines and cost associated with staff and software changes. Northern Natural Gas conducted a con call recently for initial impressions. One was that they went through several peaks in winter, represented that 11% of the Natural gas load was used in the peak. The costs for making changes need to line up.
 - He also suggested that the timelines changing does not create additional capacity. The timing nomination keeps coming up.
 - The gas schedule is 9 – 9, active trading around 6 – 9:30 because of the timely nomination at 11:30 in the morning. Firm gas has to be nominated by 11:30 to avoid a risk of being bumped. After that, secondary basis, which may not be firm. They want to know the price before nominating for SPP. Are the areas constrained? Firm capacity is more needed for the constrained areas. The FERC Order in 1988, led to separation of pipelines to sell gas, then 1992 Order 436 led to the firm transportation as being as efficient as possible.
- Jake Langthorn stated that the changes are for 2 (gas and electric) aspects of the same product – energy. The thought is to make the most effective use of the cost and what is available for both.
 - John Bogatz added agreement for Jakes comments, and that the natural gas was originally developed for peak times, such as winter. It has expanded and the demand increased, in a case where the grid is not easily changed. Brett Kruse added that the producer has some cost possibly based on getting their product to the pipelines. It has changed all the way around, gas, pipeline, and transmission.

- Valerie Price added that many months ago of the cost impacts. They were told that cost could be included in the argument back to FERC, but it won't sway them from issuing the rules.
- Jack Hilton, Xcel, commented that they are responsible for getting the gas to the generation. The timely cycle alignment – firm transport assuring the gas will flow, but if you don't know the electric market's unit commitments, you may not procure the gas. Secondary firm out of path may take up the space, if they don't do the timely cycle even with firm. During the cycle, you cannot bump secondary firm, even with firm. The pipeline infrastructure will be built based on firm purchases. Xcel has made a proposal to secure firm space.

Break 10:06 - 10:21a.m.

Agenda Item 3 – Winter/Fuel Reliability Discussion (Carrie Simpson/Jodi Woods)

Don introduced Carrie Simpson to discuss the next topic. Carrie manages the Reliability Unit Commitment and Real Time Markets at SPP

Carrie Simpson discussed issues/questions and improvements for Short Term and Long Term. There will be system and member impacts for the longer term discussion.

Event Analysis

- Amber Metzker asked if the data has been analyzed and will the event information (2013/2014) be available to members? How much was forced off, how much was gas related, forecasts of wind, etc... The EIS side may not provide good insight because the information was being managed by the separate BA's. The March 3rd weekend does have some information and statistics. They do not have the detail on the reason for a failed start, or even fuel problem. Brett added that there are mechanical issues that may have appeared as a fuel issue, switching from gas to oil. John Bogatz added that gas may not be a problem, but capacity (gas transport) may have been. Richard Dillon added that all SPP knows is that they couldn't get gas, that gas was unavailable to that unit, not why. John said 95.5% of the time the problem is likely to be gas transport. SPP made calls to find units with firm gas transport which played into decisions on the units to keep online. Brett Kruse suggested that SPP get plugged into the NERC GADS process which differentiates between the availability of the unit. Firm delivered vs. firm gas transport – different flavors should weigh in.
- The communication process during the March 1-3, 2014 cold snap does not include specifics that everyone can get to. Does the obligation change because of the new BA and Marketplace?

Headroom Discussion

- For Reliability Reasons, SPP can modify the amount of headroom. Extra capacity on top of everything we have to have on to balance. Operating Reserves, Contingency, regulating, and the energy. The headroom is embedded in the logic of the RUC process. The DA Mkt is cleared based on bid in load, without headroom, it is only economical. The resources cleared in DA Mkt are pushed into the Day Ahead RUC process, comparing resources in DA Mkt to energy + Reserves + Headroom, ensuring that there is enough capacity to cover the hour to hour gap allowing us to balance every 4 seconds. The headroom is not based on ramp. It is extra megawatts committed (ahead of being online). If 1000 MW resource, the full 1000 MW would be included in the capacity available, the ramp rate is taken into consideration. The full 1000 would be considered online.
- How did headroom play into the March 1-3 event? We had additional headroom based on the switch to the Integrated Marketplace. Two problems. Over 50 units were asked to come on and couldn't either because it was too cold or they didn't have the gas. Or, they didn't want to run on oil because of the cost.
 - Forecast was off, considerably colder than expected. Sunday to Monday is a big swing in consumption.
 - The Wind forecast was off based on turbines freezing. SPP had to commit additional resources in addition to what was already online.

- Rob Janssen added to the discussion of Operating Reserves – biggest unit and half of the other. In severe winter weather, there is the possibility of other units being offline for various reasons.
- Carrie pointed out that the headroom also covers the gap between steps in the timing for the ramp. It's for conservative operations. The forecast isn't perfect and this makes up for that, too. EIS market had between 3000 and 5000 MW headroom across the BAs. The IM allows us to be more like 500 MWs.
- Brett added that there are 2 more points to bring up for this. Gas for weekends has particular scheduling parameters. We have had several nice weekends followed by a storm Sunday into Monday, which is tricky for scheduling. There is a problem for expecting a unit to run and then not running, where the unit has the additional gas that is no longer needed.
- Several day out analysis introduces risk for bringing on units. Headroom added to the RUC process may be too late, according to Amber Metzker. Moving it earlier adds cost to everyone. The MWG did not want the headroom in the DA Mkt, which was voted no several months ago. The problem then was ramp related, not necessarily emergency or reliability related. In a system advisory condition may mean we need to add headroom to the DA Mkt.

Emergency Logic

- DA Market and RUC have emergency logic built in. A reliability situation is defined as an emergency condition according to the current protocols. During the March 3 event, we did not go into the emergency logic that is built in. That could be adjusted based on a system advisory.
 - Protocols aren't clear where to go look for an emergency type situation notification.
- Reliability Coordination responsibilities allow SPP to keep a unit online for reliability. There are rules for keeping the unit whole. **(Review the language with MWG to make sure it still fits appropriately.)**
- Amber added that transmission operators have an emergency procedure, not available to all. Need an emergency ops procedure for everyone. Also needed for summer operations not just winter. Don Shipley suggested that SPP should perform a review of the Emergency Operations Plan for the BA to broaden some aspects of that plan. This review would be to more clearly define and document expectations during a system capacity advisory type situation.

Communication with all Parties

- Don Shipley asked Matt McCoy to explain the experience as a gas pipeline operator. Matt discussed the event, to eliminate some concerns on the morning. SPP dispatched 4 -5 plants in Kansas City all hanging off the same line. They had nominations, not the dispatch time (from SPP or the plant operators). Nominations came in around 120. The plant can at times handle almost double that. They started calling because they were dealing with pressure issues. They did not know that they were oversubscribed for the period of time going in. Amber suggested that there are 3 parties, SPP, Unit Operator, and the Merchant operating the plant. The merchant should talk to SPP. Amber suggesting that SPP has a contact on the gas contacts list. If it were communicated directly to SPP, SPP could have changed to a different solution. Don Shipley said that according to the protocols and rules, SPP would be stepping into situations where other solutions may be more economical and could not be in that. (Oversubscribing the Pipeline)
- Marguerite Mills agreed that there is a 3 part communication issue. Unfairly disadvantages the generator for them to be out of the discussion. Brett wanted to be sure the point is clear. The pipe knows the contract; they can (with permission) talk to SPP, but SPP may not know of other contracts that may be with a different gas entity. Pipe and Suppliers change frequently in some cases.

Market Participant actions:

- Be conservative about the unit costs or put the unit on outage if gas can't be procured.
- Max capability of resource may change based on a fuel switch. 30 minute cut off for next hour.
- Communications between RUC and MP improved, proactive communication is helpful.

Misalignment of the Gas Day to Power Day and also the Weekend issue.

The gas buyers buy gas for Sat, Sun, and Mon which is misaligned for the Day Ahead Market. They bought gas for the forecast, didn't have the gas available for the actual, which was lesser than they needed. You can buy Sunday only or Monday only but that includes storage costs.

Lunch break from 11:43 until 12:30.

Agenda Item 4 – Issues List (Amber Metzker)

Amber Metzker discussed the short term issues list. Jake Langthorn reviewed the making up and workings of the MOPC and other working groups within SPP.

The Short Term issues list included topics included in Carrie Simpson's presentation related to Headroom. Need the definition of an extreme cold weather event.

- If we add headroom or change reserve quantities based on an extreme weather event. This could be based on regions. Regions affected would need to be included.
- Mid Term Commit – DA clearing isn't coming through until after the timely cycle is due. Could lean on this during the cold weather events.
- The SPP wind forecast uses the Mid term forecast for DA. The longer look will use the mid-term forecast. There is only a mid-term and a short term forecast.
- The FERC technical conference brought up public appeals and demand response. Demand response is typically built on a summer look – MISO didn't use demand response in any of the events. Do the public appeals come from SPP or individual members? Don Shipley mentioned that the CBA means we have a public appeal process that resides within the TOP up through the entities. Some reasons are for state regulation; the ability of the utility to call on a demand reduction is not for SPP to do.
- If a Max Gen alert is issued during a weather event. As a reliability condition, there may not be an end time. If there is a tentative stop time they could plan accordingly and let SPP know how many hours they can cover with their gas supply and SPP can also plan based on that information.
 - Within SPP this is also considered a Capacity Shortage event in the Protocols. This is also the emergency logic that is tied into the systems that Carrie Simpson referred to in her presentation.
- SPP Staff for necessary changes has grown; we will also need members to drive the requests for changes. SPP has the responsibility to get some information to the members to allow them to formulate tracks of ownership and supply SPP Staff to assist.
- Offer Cap Waiver – added because the Offer Caps are in the Longer Term list, but if a waiver is needed for the next winter. The offer can currently is \$1000. \$500 for regulation and +1000 for an energy price. Gas prices within SPP reached \$80. Brett suggested allowing the Offer Caps to move as the prices of gas.
 - LMP – Locational Marginal Price, which includes congestion prices. The next incremental price to move up. Multiple pieces of the system that move for that area. The LMP to send energy out would include the cost of gas.
 - GECTF/MWG/ORWG/RTWG groups that should be included. And Mitigated Offer Task Force.

- These are short term items because they need to go to the July MOPC and also because none (except the Offer Cap Waiver) do not need protocol or system changes.
 - Protocol changes would have to go to the RTWG. They would approve/confirm that it does not impact the Tariff.
- Brett Kruse and others aren't aware of specific actions as part of an extreme cold weather alert. New England has one. One market on the Eastern side has the market clearing come up earlier and accepts other offers.

Market Protocol Changes

Carrie Simpson reviewed the Market Protocols document. We would have to expedite the process. MWG meeting is on May 20th. Section 4 is the operating section of the protocols.

- (4.6.1.1) System Capacity Advisory would be the first step and so it was moved to the beginning section of the protocol.
 - If it's registered, they have to offer it in.
 - Some have designated resources outside of SPP BA. In a capacity advisory event, we want the resource coming to us. The only way to get it to us is through an Interchange Transaction.
 - Visibility into what is behind the meter to help offset the load if they turned them on.
 - Rob Janssen asked if not registered how they will let SPP know. Contact SPP's RUC operator and/or BA. Are they all Market Participants? No, Load Serving Entities have designated resources behind the meter. They are represented by either a MP or LSE. If it's a DNR, Brett says SPP should be able to get their hands on it. If not, should it be designated as a DNR. This should be in the Capacity Margin discussions. Carrie agreed that they are connected.
 - Jim Jacoby asked if there are any of grid switchers that are DRs? If so, shouldn't we be getting them. Richard said no – while they are on another grid they are undesignated.
 - This goes along with the "everything available is online" portion of the Energy Emergency Alerts.
 - There is a concern that this will lead to discussion in the MWG that will be more based on Capacity Margin ongoing discussion.
 - Jake said this is a capacity issue, suggesting that it is something that the MWG should take on and fix.
- (4.6.1.2) Energy Emergencies
- (4.6.1.3) Adequate Fuel Supply and Fuel Transportation
 - As a load serving member you must have sufficient capacity (generation or transaction), as an LSE you have to have the energy available.
 - SPP staff will make it an MPRR. For discussion as part of the Joint meeting.
 - The question came up for the ability to provide fuel and fuel transport in the Fuel supply. This could be interpreted that you must have firm transport capabilities.
 - LSE must be able to deliver the capacity – needs more information to link it to that specific.
 - If you are a LSE, you have a firm obligation for load and reserves. Under Criteria.
 - Headroom, SPP has the authority to change the headroom at any time for reliability reasons. Not addressed here because it is already within our rights. A System Capacity Advisory may not be defined at this point. It is tough to tie this down too much and limit options. Headroom is defined and includes the calculation in the protocols. May want to add to the May 21st discussion with MWG.

- If RUC committed you and you got turned off, you will only be made whole for the amount that was offered in at the time that you were committed.

Long Term Portion

Amber discussed the Long Term portion of the list of issues.

- What does gas availability need to be considered for capacity criteria for winter? (Resource adequacy discussion).
- Flexibility in Mitigated Offer piece isn't what was expected and may not be what is needed.
- Multiple Pipelines – when looking at winter capacity credit, SPP only looks at summer capacity planning, does multiple pipelines allow your capacity to be greater than a single pipeline. Without Firm on either one, it may not matter. Capacity accreditation and LSE discussion.
- SPP should look into the Offer Flexibility Project with NE-ISO. Offers can be updated in real time, the NE-ISO has more embedded into the project. They changed the timeline for DA Market clearing.
- SPP has forecasting for AFC purposes, not for the Market. Does an Interchange forecast schedule need to be developed? (SPP/MISO SEAMS agreement discussion possibly according to Brett.)

NOPR Portion

What are the gas start times that the group can support?

SPP Staff (Don, Les, and Josh) will put together a list, they welcome input.

- 4 am start time of the gas day (SPP Supported)
- Timely nomination at 2pm. Starts between 1pm and 2pm and evening between 6 and 6:30 pm. SPP support it. Came out favorable. 183/20/3
- 4 intraday cycles (no strawpoll on this item)
- Min time between timely cycle and posting 1 hour vs 1.5 hours. SPP supports either.
- Hourly nominations in the gas market. (SPP abstained, IRC has not developed a position.)
- 2 gas days did not pass (SPP supported this, but did not get consensus.)

What should SPP do if the IRC is in conflict around what some SPP members would like? Rob Janssen said some don't show an inherent value, without a straw poll of the member representation in the meeting.

Don Shipley proposed putting out a document to the group with the IRC position and what SPP voted, including the other items that will have strawpolls. To capture opinions of the groups and internally discuss. Then send it back to SPP, which will be summarized and provided back to the group. Discussion would be prior to the next NAESB meeting.

Agenda Item 5 - Long Term Timelines (Jodi Woods)

Jodi Woods discussed the presentation provided in the meeting material.

The 1600 deadline is hard coded; the case is not ready before 1600 very often now. MISO shortened their timeline by an hour recently.

Summer will provide more information related to how quickly the solutions and engines that run the solutions will determined.

Agenda Item 5 – Next Steps/Work Plan

- Staff to work on the NAESB document
- Short Term information for MWG Joint Meeting.
- Educational pieces, for stakeholder community about the issues related to the NOPR.

- ORWG discussion prior to MWG.

Items prepared will be posted for comment. MWG posting should be posted a week prior to any working group meeting or next Wednesday.

Proposed agenda at a minimum.

Go through NOPR and make a list of what all should be responded to. Issues that Amber and others brought up that should be addressed by the MOPC by July. Most were heard today, though the discussion may not have been all inclusive.

Rob Janssen will bring this up for ORWG meeting tomorrow; he already has an agenda item. He can represent the GECTF information as preparation for that meeting.

Agenda Item 6 – May 21st Meeting

- Market Protocol change language as an MPRR
- Headroom discussion (language, calculation, authority)
- Define System Capacity Advisory and actions expected.
- Review the language with MWG to make sure it still fits appropriately related to keeping a unit online for reliability.

The meeting will be at Crowne Plaza instead of AEP building.

Agenda Item 6 – Adjourn (Jake Langthorn)

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Myhand
Secretary

Attachments:
Meeting attendance

