

Southwest Power Pool
GAS ELECTRIC COORDINATION TASK FORCE MEETING
October 2, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Conference Call

• **Summary of Action Items** •

NOTE: The list below includes the Item Number used in the GECTF Action Item list.

1. (71) Update presentations for MOPC based on discussion. *NOTE: This is an on-going task from the previous meeting. Kathy Myhand to send updated presentations to the GECTF exploder.*
2. (81) Provide Tariff response information to group, related to Multi-Party Communication.
3. (82) Request an update to the Informational Memorandum to include the NAESB Comments.
4. (83) Kathy Myhand and Jason Smith to determine possible agenda items based on recommendations for the GECTF/ORWG joint meeting on Nov 6.
5. (84) Kathy Myhand and Don Shipley to develop talking points for the Pre-Winter discussion with ORWG.
6. (85) Set up a meeting the week of November 10th for a conference call to discuss EOP fuel sections.

Southwest Power Pool
GAS ELECTRIC COORDINATION TASK FORCE MEETING
October 2, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Conference Call

• M I N U T E S •

Agenda Item 1 – Administrative Items

Chair Jake Langthorn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

See the attachment for attendance information.

Agenda Item 2 – Review/Update MOPC Presentation Material

The group reviewed and reworded the GECTF Written Report, GECTF Presentation for MOPC and the GECTF Whitepaper. The changes were captured during the meeting. Additional items requested will be updated after the meeting, along with requested attachments, and provided for MOPC meeting material.

- Attach the filing from NAESB in the materials
- Request the Informational Memorandum be updated to include a summary of the filing.
- Add a comparison chart for the timelines including other ISO/RTOs
- Add more detail to the Risk/Benefit bullets on the slides.
- Correct the hours on the timeline slides to be more closely aligned.

Agenda Item 3 – General Discussion

- The group needs to determine a separate time for the EOP discussion related to the Fuel portions of the current procedure.
- The Multi-Party Communication language has been reviewed for changes to the SPP Tariff, none are needed.
- How does SPP compare to other ISO/RTOs making changes? Don Shipley suggested that SPP's goal is to align with the gas day to make the most effective for the SPP Market. He assumes other ISO/RTOs will be doing the same.
- Is the Pinnacle Project feasible for the 4 hour timeframe with integration for additional resources? With the Enhanced Combined Cycle on hold, the Pinnacle Project and system changes could be managed with current staff.
- The proposed recommendation to move the timely gas nomination from 1300 to 1400 is unlikely to be accepted. The GECTF will still make the recommendation in comments and will work towards a successful solution closing the market at the proposed noon timeframe with the timely gas noms at 1300.
 - o Trading and scheduling in one hour would be tricky, but if the process changes and the known information could be before the market results are posted and the unknowns are reviewed after the noon posting, it may be possible.
 - o The market won't be as liquid.
- To compress the timeline beyond the recommended 4 hours, SPP would need to revisit some market features. These include, but are not limited to the following:
 - o Separation of Regulation
 - o Turn-around ramp rate
- There is an undocumented risk that if the SPP Market lines up with the gas market, penalties and overages that are overlooked now, will likely incur cost.

- The possible agenda for the joint GECTF/ORWG meeting on November 6 should include items such as Pre-Winter preparedness (Action items 48 and 49), Multi-Day Reliability Assessment possibilities, and Multi-Party Communication.
 - o Kathy Myhand to get with Jason Smith to determine if this is acceptable and if the EOP fuel discussion should be included in the joint meeting.
 - o The GECTF will need discussion points for handling winter events for the joint meeting (Kathy Myhand and Don Shipley to develop).

Agenda Item 8 – Adjourn

Upcoming meetings

10/2/2014: 9 a.m. – noon meeting, WebEx

11/6/2014: 9 a.m. – noon joint meeting with ORWG; WebEx or attendance onsite in Little Rock with the ORWG.

Meeting needed week of 11/10/2014. Kathy Myhand to determine date/time.

11/25/2014: 9 a.m. – noon meeting, WebEx

Jake Langthorn adjourned the meeting at 12:14 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kathy Myhand
Secretary

Attachments:

Attendance

Multi-Party Communication Response from Tariff Review

Southwest Power Pool
GAS ELECTRIC COORDINATION TASK FORCE MEETING
October 2, 2014, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Conference Call

Addending	First Name	Last Name	Member	Company
x	Amber	Metzker	M	Xcel Energy
x	Amy	Jeffries	M	Public Service Company of Oklahoma
x	Dirk	Dietz	M	Nebraska Public Power District
x	Jacob	Langthorn, IV	M	Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company
	Matt	Moore	M	Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc.
x	Robert	Janssen	M	Dogwood Energy, LLC
x	CJ	Brown	S	Southwest Power Pool
x	Don	Shipley	S	Southwest Power Pool
x	Kathy	Myhand	S	Southwest Power Pool
x	Les	Dillahunty	S	Southwest Power Pool
x	Sam	Ellis	S	Southwest Power Pool
x	Brad	Johnston	G	Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation
x	Bryan	Feemster	G	City Utilities of Springfield
x	Clifford	Franklin	G	Westar Energy, Inc.
x	Dan	Buckner	G	ACES
x	Eric	Alexander	G	GRDA
x	Farrokh	Rahimi	G	OATI
x	Gary	Gottsch	G	Kansas City Power & Light Company
x	Heather	Starnes	G	
x	Jason	Fix	G	Lincoln Electric System
x	Jim	Fort	G	The Energy Authority
x	John	Tennyson	G	City Utilities of Springfield
x	Kenneth	Hale	G	City Utilities of Springfield
x	Michael	Moffet	G	Sunflower Electric Power Corporation
x	Randy	Root	G	Grand River Dam Authority
x	Rick	Yanovich	G	Omaha Public Power District
x	Robert	Day	G	
x	Ronald	Thompson Jr.	G	Nebraska Public Power District

On Fri, Sep 19, 2014 at 3:05 PM, Nicole Wagner <jwagner@spp.org> wrote:

Hello Les,

Based on Patti's research, we are not required to revise the Tariff, unless our Tariff includes existing provisions that precludes communication as referred to below. We tend to agree with you that an appropriate place for this information would be the EOP but we are not precluded from adding clarification into the Tariff if there is a strong feeling by SPP or the members that it needs to be there.

Paragraph 135 of Order 787 states:

In response to NRECA's comments regarding the relationship of this Final Rule to existing tariff provisions, we note that this Final Rule does not supersede any existing tariff provisions. ¹⁹⁴ Thus, to the extent an electric transmission operator or interstate natural gas pipeline has an existing tariff provision that precludes a communication that would otherwise be authorized under the regulations adopted here, before it may share such precluded information under the express authorization provided in this Final Rule, it must make a filing under the FPA or NGA to revise that provision to permit such exchanges of information. In short, if a transmission operator wants to take advantage of the explicit authority provided by the Commission under the Final Rule, and that transmission operator has tariff provisions prohibiting the communications permitted under this rule, it must make a filing with the Commission to revise the relevant tariff provisions to permit such exchanges of information. Similarly, we clarify that any existing tariff provisions requiring notice regarding the disclosure of confidential information, including the non-public, operational information at issue here, remain in place unless proposed revisions to those tariffs are approved by the Commission.

Have a great weekend!

Nicole

Nicole Wagner

Manager, Regulatory Policy

Southwest Power Pool

[501-688-1642](tel:501-688-1642) (Office) [501-539-1930](tel:501-539-1930) (Cell)

From: Les Dillahunty [mailto:ledillahunty@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2014 8:21 AM
To: Nicole Wagner
Cc: Kathy Myhand
Subject: GECTF Request

Nicole,

The Gas/Electric Coordination Task Force (GECTF) wishes to document the need for SPP to communicate with generators, fuel suppliers and/or transporters under certain conditions regarding reliability or planning issues. We've entitled this, Multi-Party Communication, and have prepared the following draft. The draft is still a work in progress and will be undergoing further review by the ORWG, MOPC and others. The initial thought is to place this new Multi-Party Communication section in the EOP; however during the GECTF meeting on September 17th a question arose about whether or not this language needed to also be included in the Tariff. Hence, we turn to you. I did not sense that there was a specific desire concerning inclusion in the Tariff by those participating in the GECTF, rather a question that they wished to be answered. Here's the current draft language.

Multi-Party Communication

SPP in its role as the RTO and CBA is in a unique position in terms of its need to periodically communicate with generators, fuel suppliers and/or transporters concerning reliability or planning issues. FERC in its Order No. 787 has specifically provided the explicit authority to interstate natural gas pipelines and public utilities that own, operate, or control facilities used for the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce to share non-public, operational information with each other for the purpose of promoting reliable service or operational planning on either public utilities' or pipelines' system. Transmission operators are permitted to share information with each other that they deem necessary to promote the reliability and integrity of their systems. In the Order FERC further included additional protections to ensure that any non-public, operational information shared remain confidential and that information that is shared among transmission operators be done in a manner that is consistent with the prohibition on undue discrimination.

It will not be uncommon for the SPP, Market Participant contacts (or their agent), fuel suppliers and/or transporters to either individually or collectively develop more than one option to address planning or reliability concerns. For proprietary reasons it may not be appropriate for all the options to be discussed with all parties. However, SPP will be diligent to insure that all parties necessary to address an issue are included in communication being mindful that it is the Market Participants (or their agents) with whom SPP has the contractual obligation.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with questions and we'll look forward to your answer.

Les