

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Southwest Power Pool, Inc.

)

Docket No. ER15-____-000

**PETITION OF SOUTHWEST POWER POOL, INC.
FOR WAIVER OF TARIFF PROVISIONS**

Pursuant to Rule 207 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure,¹ Southwest Power Pool, Inc. ("SPP") petitions the Commission to grant a limited waiver of the provisions in Attachment O of SPP's Open Access Transmission Tariff ("Tariff")² to enable SPP to modify the study schedule for its Integrated Transmission Planning ("ITP") process.

I. ITP Process

The ITP process is an iterative three-year planning process that includes 20-Year, 10-Year and Near Term Assessments ("ITP-20", "ITP-10" and "ITP-NT," respectfully) designed to identify transmission solutions that address both near-term and long-term transmission needs.³ Specifically, the ITP process is conducted over a three year period with the ITP-20 being conducted during the first half of this three-year cycle⁴ and the

¹ 18 C.F.R. § 385.207.

² See Southwest Power Pool, Inc., FERC Electric Tariff, Sixth Revised Volume No. 1.

³ The ITP process is described in Section III of Attachment O of the Tariff.

⁴ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section I; see also *id.* at Attachment O, Section III.3(a).

ITP-10 being conducted in the second half of the three-year cycle.⁵ The ITP-NT is conducted annually.⁶ The ITP-20 seeks to identify transmission needs in year 20 and generally focuses on extra-high voltage transmission solutions.⁷ The ITP-10 focuses on facilities 100 kV and above to meet the system needs identified over a 10-year period.⁸ The ITP-NT assesses system upgrades, at all applicable voltage levels, required in the near term planning horizon to meet reliability criteria.⁹ SPP's Board of Directors does not typically direct construction of any project recommended as part of an ITP-20 solution set until the need is manifested in one of SPP's nearer-term planning evaluations.

II. Environmental Protection Agency's Proposed Rule

On June 2, 2014, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") proposed carbon dioxide emission reduction guidelines for states to follow in developing plans to address greenhouse gas emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric generating units.¹⁰ A final rule is expected by June 2015 and, as proposed, states must develop plans by no later than 2018 to bring about reductions by 2020. As a Commission-approved Regional

⁵ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section I; *see also id.* at Attachment O, Section III.4(a).

⁶ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section I; *see also id.* at Attachment O, Section III.5(a).

⁷ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section III.3(b).

⁸ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section III.4(b).

⁹ See Tariff at Attachment O, Section III.5(b).

¹⁰ See 79 FR 34830 (June 18, 2014) ("Clean Power Plan").

Transmission Organization with delegated authorities to ensure the reliability of the bulk electric system within the SPP region, SPP submitted comments to the EPA on October 9, 2014 (“SPP Comments”) identifying concerns with the Clean Power Plan.¹¹ The SPP Comments identified three primary areas of concern: 1) the Clean Power Plan will impact reliability of the bulk electric system; 2) the timing proposed by the EPA for compliance is infeasible; and 3) the proposed Clean Power Plan will have material impacts on the market-based dispatch of electric generating units within the SPP region.¹²

III. Need for a Waiver

SPP plans to present results of the 2015 ITP-10¹³ to stakeholders in the January 2015 meeting cycle. At that time, SPP will complete the three-year planning cycle that commenced in January 2012.¹⁴ In accordance with Attachment O of the Tariff, upon the conclusion of the 2015 ITP-10, a new three-year planning cycle should commence with an ITP-20.

Since the 2015 ITP-10 began about a year before the Clean Power Plan was issued, it did not specifically evaluate transmission needs in support of the EPA’s stated goals. SPP and its stakeholders determined that given the potentially short time frame for compliance with the Clean Power Plan and the time it has historically taken to study,

¹¹ A copy of SPP’s October 9, 2014 comments are attached hereto as Attachment 1.

¹² SPP Comments at 1.

¹³ SPP commenced the current ITP-10 in July 2013.

¹⁴ The ITP-20 began in January 2012 and concluded with approval by the SPP Board of Directors on July 30, 2013.

design, and construct transmission upgrades, SPP needed to begin its analysis of transmission needs resulting from the Clean Power Plan as soon as feasible following the issuance of a final rule by the EPA.

In preparation for the upcoming ITP-20, SPP began discussing the upcoming three-year planning cycle in its stakeholder groups.¹⁵ Given the considerations above, SPP and its stakeholders determined that SPP should perform an ITP-10 beginning in January 2015 rather than an ITP-20 as required under Attachment O of the Tariff. Therefore, for the three-year planning cycle commencing in January 2015, the SPP Board of Directors directed SPP to request a waiver of 1) the requirement to perform the ITP-20 and 2) the timing requirements related to the ITP-10 to permit SPP a) to advance the ITP-10 so that it could commence in January 2015 and b) to conduct the ITP over a 24-month period, concluding in 2017.¹⁶

The decision to utilize an ITP-10 instead of an ITP-20 to evaluate the impact of the Clean Power Plan is based upon the design of the individual studies. The ITP-20 evaluates the needs of the transmission system in a single year, 20 years out, while the ITP-10 evaluates the needs of the transmission system over a ten-year period of time. An ITP-20 assessment typically yields 300 kV and above transmission solutions that are not approved for construction but are used to inform subsequent ITP-10 assessments whereas

¹⁵ The scope of the new three year planning cycle has been discussed at the Economic Studies Working Group, Markets and Operations Policy Committee, Strategic Planning Committee and the SPP Board of Directors.

¹⁶ Board of Directors/Member Meeting Committee Meeting Minutes No. 160 at Agenda Item 8 posted at the following website link: http://www.spp.org/publications/BOD_MC%20102814%20Minutes.pdf.

an ITP-10 assessment typically yields 100 kV and above solutions that are approved for construction based on when they are needed within the studied 10-year period. Clearly, the ITP-10 will provide a more detailed look at the needs of the transmission system over the next 10 years. This information will be critical for SPP stakeholders evaluating options for compliance with the Clean Power Plan.

SPP proposes to conduct the ITP-10 over a 24-month time period¹⁷ with the study commencing in January 2015, prior to the issuance of the EPA's final rule expected in June 2015. During the first six months of the study process, SPP expects to begin a general scoping effort and upon issuance of the EPA's final rule, SPP will finalize its scoping and begin the ITP-10 assessment in earnest taking the final rule into consideration. Upon conclusion of the ITP-10 in 2017, SPP plans to commence the next three-year planning cycle in accordance with Attachment O of the Tariff. These proposed changes to the ITP process would allow SPP to fully evaluate impacts of the Clean Power Plan on transmission needs in the SPP region.

IV. Request for Waiver

In this filing, SPP requests waiver of Attachment O, Sections I, III.3(a) and III.4(a) for the planning cycle commencing in January 2015 in order to skip the ITP-20 and advance the ITP-10. "Where good cause for a waiver of limited scope exists, there are no undesirable consequences, and the resultant benefits to customers are evident, the

¹⁷ See Tariff at Attachment O, Sections I, III.3(a) and III.4(a) allow for 18 months for the completion of the ITP-20 and ITP-10.

Commission has found that a one-time waiver [of tariff provisions] is appropriate.”¹⁸
SPP’s waiver request meets this standard and is in the public interest.

First, the requested one-time waiver is of limited scope. SPP’s request is limited to the three-year planning cycle commencing in January 2015. SPP is requesting to waive the requirement to perform the ITP-20, as well as the timing requirements related to the ITP-10 to permit SPP to advance to the study to commence in 2015 and conduct the study over a 24-month period to conclude in 2017. SPP is not seeking a blanket authorization or tariff revision regarding the ITP-20 or the ITP-10. Upon conclusion of the ITP-10 that commences in 2015 and concludes in 2017, SPP plans to commence the next three-year planning cycle in accordance with Attachment O of the Tariff.

Second, the waiver will not have undesirable consequences or harm third parties. SPP will continue to perform transmission planning studies in accordance with the Tariff, including the ITP-NT which is performed annually to identify short-term reliability needs.

Third, the benefits of the waiver are evident. As noted above and in the SPP Comments, the uncertainty surrounding the Clean Power Plan is tremendous and, as proposed, the Clean Power Plan would dramatically change the use of the current transmission system. Without the waiver, SPP and its stakeholders will spend significant time and money on an ITP-20 that, given the uncertainty with the Clean Power Plan and the long range, single year design of the study, will provide questionable results and have

¹⁸ *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,031, at P 19 (2008); *see also Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator*, 118 FERC ¶ 61,226, at P 24, *order on clarification*, 120 (continued . . .)

little value. An ITP-10 will provide the granularity needed by SPP to fully evaluate the needs of the transmission system for the upcoming three-year planning cycle. In addition, the ITP-10 will be completed a year earlier than otherwise allowed by the Tariff, providing more information earlier to SPP stakeholders and state regulators as they consider their options for compliance with the Clean Power Plan.

Thus, for the three-year planning cycle commencing in January 2015, SPP's request for a waiver of Attachment O, Sections I, III.3(a) and III.4(a) for 1) the requirement to perform the ITP-20 and 2) the timing requirements related to the ITP-10 to permit SPP a) to advance the ITP-10 so that it could commence in January 2015 and b) to conduct the ITP over a 24-month period, concluding in 2017 satisfies Commission precedent and, therefore, should be approved.

V. Communications

Correspondence and communications with respect to this filing should be sent to, and SPP requests the Secretary to include on the official service list, the following:

Tessie Kentner
 Attorney
 Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 201 Worthen Drive
 Little Rock, AR 72223
 Telephone: (501) 688-1782
tkentner@spp.org

Nicole Wagner
 Manager - Regulatory Policy
 Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
 201 Worthen Drive
 Little Rock, AR 72223
 Telephone: (501) 688-1642
jwagner@spp.org

(. . . continued)

FERC ¶ 61,180 (2007).

VI. Service

SPP has served a copy of this filing on all its Members, Customers, and Market Participants. A complete copy of this filing will be posted on the SPP website, www.spp.org, and is also being serviced on all affected state commissions.

VII. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, SPP respectfully requests that, for the three year planning cycle commencing in January 2015, the Commission waive the Attachment O requirement to perform the ITP-20 and the timing requirements for the ITP-10.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Tessie Kentner

Tessie Kentner
Southwest Power Pool, Inc

**Attorney for
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.**

ATTACHMENT 1



HELPING OUR MEMBERS WORK TOGETHER
TO KEEP THE LIGHTS ON... TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE

October 9, 2014

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Gina McCarthy, EPA Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602

Dear Administrator McCarthy:

This letter is submitted to the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") on behalf of Southwest Power Pool, Inc. ("SPP") in its capacity as a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") approved Regional Transmission Organization ("RTO") and a Regional Entity with delegated authorities to ensure the reliability of the bulk electric system within the SPP region¹.

The purpose of this letter is to convey SPP's comments on the "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" ("Clean Power Plan" or "CPP") proposed rule that was published in the Federal Register on June 18, 2014.

Specifically, SPP will address three primary areas of concern: 1) the CPP will impact reliability of the bulk electric system; 2) the timing proposed by EPA for compliance is infeasible; and 3) the proposed CPP will have material impacts on the market-based dispatch of electric generating units within the SPP region.

¹ SPP is an Arkansas non-profit corporation with its principal place of business in Little Rock, Arkansas. SPP has 78 members that include investor-owned electric utilities, municipals, electric cooperatives, state authorities, independent power producers and independent electric transmission companies. As an RTO, SPP administers open access Transmission Service over approximately 48,930 miles of transmission lines covering portions of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, across the facilities of SPP's Transmission Owners. SPP administers its centralized day-ahead and real-time energy and operating reserve markets ("Integrated Marketplace") with locational marginal pricing and market-based congestion management processes to deliver wholesale energy to its customers in the most economic and reliable fashion. As an RTO, SPP also plans for and functionally controls the transmission infrastructure committed to it. For purposes of these comments, SPP has included the Integrated Systems utilities, which are in the process of joining the organization.

Administrator McCarthy
October 9, 2014
Page 2

Nicholas A. Brown

To address these areas of concern, SPP is providing four recommendations: 1) a series of technical conferences jointly sponsored by the EPA and FERC; 2) completion of a detailed, comprehensive and independent analysis of the impacts the proposed CPP will have on the reliability of the nation's bulk electric system; 3) extension of the proposed schedule for compliance in order for the necessary electric and gas infrastructure to be identified and constructed; and 4) adoption of a "reliability safety valve". SPP appreciates the opportunity to submit comments and provides the following explanation of its concerns and recommendations.

Pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 2005, FERC has approved mandatory and enforceable reliability standards promulgated by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation ("NERC") with which the electric industry must comply. Contained in these standards are key requirements necessary to ensure the bulk electric system meets an adequate level of reliability. Failure to comply with these standards affects the ability of the power grid to operate reliably and subjects registered entities such as SPP and its member utilities to civil monetary penalties².

These reliability standards require SPP to ensure electric transmission lines are not overloaded and voltage is maintained within certain prescribed limits in the event of the failure of a single element in the monitored system. Additionally, the reliability standards require SPP to maintain the region's bulk electric system within certain reliable operating limits. If the proposed CPP remains as is, the bulk electric system will be at serious risk of violating these limits. The likelihood that this outcome occurs dramatically increases if the timing of the issuance of the final rule effectively prevents the construction of electric system infrastructure necessary to facilitate compliance with the state goals being contemplated under the proposed CPP.

Because maintaining reliability is SPP's most important function, it has completed an assessment of the impacts that the proposed CPP will have on reliability in the SPP region. This assessment includes an evaluation of transmission system impacts and an evaluation of impacts to reserve margin. In both evaluations, SPP modeled EPA's projected Electric Utility Generating Unit ("EGU") retirements within the SPP region and surrounding areas (see Figure 1 below).

² Up to \$1 million per day, per violation.




Figure 1: EPA's Projected EGU Retirements by 2020 in the SPP Region and Adjacent Systems

The transmission system impact evaluation was completed in two parts. In the first part, SPP assumed available unused electric generation capacity that currently exists within the SPP region and surrounding areas would be used to replace the projected retired capacity. This scenario is a reflection of what will occur early in the EPA's proposed compliance period where carbon emissions are expected to be drastically reduced but there is insufficient time to make changes to generation and transmission infrastructure or develop other alternatives.

The second part of the transmission system impact evaluation assumed that the projected EGU retirements would be replaced by increased output of existing generation, including wind resources, and new generation capacity modeled according to resource planning information being utilized in SPP's 10-year transmission planning assessment that is currently in progress (see Figure 2 below).




Figure 2: New Generation Capacity Assumed in Part 2 of System Impact Evaluation

This part of the evaluation is not intended to address whether it is possible to install replacement generation capacity in a timely fashion under the proposed CPP compliance timeframe, nor is it intended to suggest locations where replacement generation should be located.

The SPP region will experience numerous thermal overloads and low voltage occurrences under both scenarios studied. Results of the first part of the transmission system impact evaluation indicate that if the assumed EGU retirements were to occur absent requisite transmission and generation infrastructure improvements, the power grid would suffer extreme reactive deficiencies (see Figure 3) that would expose it to widespread reliability risks resulting in significant loss of load and violations of NERC reliability standards.




Figure 3: Transmission System Impact Analysis Part 1 - Reactive Deficiencies (MVAR)

Results of the second part of the evaluation indicate that even with generation capacity added to replace the assumed EGU retirements, additional transmission infrastructure will be needed to maintain reliable operation of the grid. This assessment revealed 38 overloaded elements that SPP would be required to mitigate with transmission planning solutions. These overloaded elements were identified in the portions of six states – Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas – that operate within the SPP region. Portions of the system in the Texas panhandle, western Kansas, and northern Arkansas were so severely

Administrator McCarthy

Nicholas A. Brown

October 9, 2014

Page 6

overloaded that cascading outages and voltage collapse would occur and would result in violations of NERC reliability standards. The following graph shows the number of overloaded elements and significance of loading expected under the conditions studied in this assessment (see Figure 4 below).




Figure 4: Number of Facilities Overloaded in Part 2 of System Impact Evaluation

Both parts of the assessment assumed that electric transmission expansion currently planned to meet previously identified needs would be available. It is important to note that the transmission expansion currently planned in SPP does not consider EGU retirements expected as a result of the CPP. EPA's projected EGU retirements represent approximately 6,000 MW of additional capacity being retired in the SPP region beyond that currently expected by 2020. This represents approximately a 200% increase in retired generating capacity compared to SPP's current expectations. Unless the proposed CPP is modified significantly, SPP's transmission system impact evaluation indicates serious, detrimental impacts on the reliable operation of the bulk electric system in the SPP region, introducing the very real possibility of rolling blackouts or cascading outages that will have significant impacts on human health, public safety and economic activity within the region.

Administrator McCarthy

Nicholas A. Brown

October 9, 2014

Page 7

SPP also performed an evaluation of the impacts of the projected EGU retirements on SPP's reserve margin. Reserve margin is the amount of generation capacity an entity maintains in excess of its peak load-serving obligation. SPP's minimum required reserve margin is 13.6% per load-serving entity. In this evaluation, SPP utilized current load forecasts, firm capacity purchases and sales, currently planned generator retirements and additions, as well as the additional generator retirements projected by the proposed CPP. This evaluation concluded that by 2020, SPP's reserve margin would fall to 4.7%, which is 8.9% below SPP's minimum reserve margin requirement and would result in a violation of SPP's reliability criteria and NERC reliability standards. Out of the fourteen load-serving members impacted by the EPA's projected EGU retirements, nine would be deficient in 2020. Furthermore, SPP found that its anticipated reserve margin would fall to -4.0% by 2024, causing ten of SPP's load-serving members to be deficient (see Figure 5 below).




Figure 5: Reserve Margin Percentage by Area

These anticipated reserve margins represent a total generation capacity deficiency in the SPP region of approximately 4,600 MW in 2020 and 10,100 MW in 2024.

Based on SPP's reliability impact assessment, it is clear that the proposed CPP will impede reliable operation of the electric transmission grid in the SPP region, resulting in violations of NERC's mandatory reliability standards and exposing the power grid to significant interruption or loss of load.

Administrator McCarthy
October 9, 2014
Page 8

Nicholas A. Brown

SPP has only been able to perform an initial reliability evaluation of steady-state system response during a “normal” future summer peak condition. SPP has not evaluated the impact of the proposed EGU retirements during other potentially critical scenarios, such as drought and polar vortex conditions or times of limited wind resource availability, which have been experienced numerous times within SPP’s region in recent history.

Furthermore, there has been inadequate time to perform analysis of the technical feasibility of each of the four building blocks proposed within the CPP. To be clear, if any or all of the four building blocks are not feasible, application of a goal that assumes they are will have untold consequences on the reliability of the bulk electric system. For example, if the projected EGU retirements occur and a 70% capacity factor from natural gas combined cycle generating units, as assumed in CPP building block 2, is not feasible, the reliability implications of this improper assumption will be very significant and serious. Additional time to evaluate the impact of these and other potential concerns on reliability of the bulk electric system is warranted before imposing a final rule that is not properly considerate of potential threats to the reliability of the bulk electric system.

SPP is also concerned with the timing proposed for compliance with the CPP. Within the SPP region, the timing associated with CPP compliance is problematic at best. Based on SPP’s review of the proposed CPP, EPA has considered neither the cost nor the time required to plan and construct electric transmission facilities. In the SPP region, as much as eight and a half years to study, plan for and construct new transmission facilities has been required. Compliance with the proposed CPP is impossible due to the transmission expansion that will be required and the time it takes to complete the required transmission expansion. In addition to more time being needed to develop plans for and construction of necessary infrastructure, a “reliability safety valve”, as suggested by the ISO/RTO Council prior to release of the proposed CPP, should be incorporated into the final rule. Such an approach would require that state plans include a process to evaluate electric system reliability issues resulting from implementation of the state plan and require mitigation when needed.³

Furthermore, while the proposed CPP provides states with significant flexibility for compliance, EPA has not provided state air quality and economic regulators with sufficient time to take advantage of this flexibility. As a consequence, SPP anticipates there will be few, if any, submitted compliance plans that reflect the regional nature of transmission planning, wholesale energy markets or, in the SPP

³ EPA CO2 Rule—ISO/RTO Council Reliability Safety Valve and Regional Compliance Measurement and Proposals; ISO/RTO Council at http://www.isorto.org/Documents/Report/20140128_IRCProposal-ReliabilitySafetyValve-RegionalComplianceMeasurement_EPA-CO2Rule.pdf; January 28, 2014.

Administrator McCarthy

Nicholas A. Brown

October 9, 2014

Page 9

region, transmission cost allocation. None of these issues are currently addressed on a state-specific basis within SPP, but rather are addressed regionally in a transparent environment where state boundaries are not acknowledged since the grid crosses city, county and state boundaries.

The proposed CPP will change the market dispatch of generating units by reducing the availability of the most economic generating resources. Such a shift will cause higher market clearing prices in the SPP region resulting in material adverse economic impacts on SPP customers. The proposed CPP will increase reliance on renewables and generators fueled by natural gas, yet there has been no evaluation of additional operating and planning measures needed to support integration of significant additional renewables and of natural gas availability required to fuel the increased number of gas burning units in the SPP region. While SPP's members will likely dramatically increase their reliance on wind generation within the SPP region to meet carbon emission goals under the proposed CPP, a proportional increase in gas burning generators will be necessary during times when wind resources are not available to maintain reliable energy supplies and minimum required planning reserves.

The current electric power grid has evolved incrementally over the last 40-plus years to provide a reliable supply of power in support of the current mix of generation assets. The changes being proposed by the EPA in the proposed timeframe will dramatically change use of the current system and will need to be thoroughly evaluated, modified as necessary, and implemented in a timely and responsible manner to avoid imposition of unnecessarily high costs and reliability risks to customers. The EPA should work closely with the regions, the states and all interested parties to ensure that any final CO₂ rule maintains bulk electric system reliability compatible with a reliable, efficient market dispatch of available generation.

As a result of its concerns, SPP recommends the following:

- (1) A series of technical conferences jointly sponsored by FERC and the EPA. The topics that should be discussed at these conferences include impacts of the proposed CPP on power system reliability, impacts on regional markets, and how to move forward in a coordinated fashion that best facilitates accomplishment of both EPA and FERC objectives.
- (2) Completion of a detailed, comprehensive and independent analysis of the impacts the proposed CPP will have on the reliability of the nation's bulk electric system. This analysis should take place in an open and transparent manner and should be completed before final rules are adopted by the EPA.

Administrator McCarthy
October 9, 2014
Page 10

Nicholas A. Brown

- (3) Extension of the proposed schedule for compliance in order for the necessary electric transmission, electric generation, and gas pipeline infrastructure to be identified and constructed within and across the appropriate planning areas. At a minimum, the imposition of the proposed interim goals beginning in 2020 should be extended at least five years. Extending the schedule for compliance will help states develop plans that are achievable and acceptable to the EPA, reduce risks of reliability impacts and violations of reliability standards, and increase the possibility that states will be able to take a regional approach that reflects market realities, and how transmission is planned and paid for.
- (4) Adoption of the “reliability safety valve” as proposed by the ISO/RTO Council.

I appreciate your prompt attention to these concerns. Please contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss this matter further.

Respectfully submitted,



Nicholas A. Brown
President & CEO
Southwest Power Pool, Inc.
(501) 614-3213 · nbrown@spp.org

cc: SPP Board of Directors
SPP Regional State Committee
SPP Strategic Planning Committee
SPP Regional Entity Trustees

Document Content(s)

ITP Waiver_Final.PDF.....1-19