

DRAFT
Summary of the March 29, 2010 GUWG Meeting

The following members participated in the March 29, 2010 Grid Utilization Work Group conference call.

Prem Bahl, ACC	David Meyer, DOE
Duane Braunagel, CO PUC	Mason Emmett, FERC
Wayne Hart, ID PUC	Kevin Kelly, FERC
Gene Fadness, ID PUC	Michael Milligan, NREL
Brian Dekiep, MT PSC	Ron Lehr, AWEA
Jason Marks, NM PRC	Ed Higginbottom, BCTC
Matt Muldoon, OR PUC	Charles Reinhold, Electric Resources Strategies
John Savage, OR PUC	Gerald Brooks, Grid Power
Ric Campbell, UT PSC	Rajan Kaul, ITRON
Phil Jones, WA UTC	John Cupparo, Pacificorp
Marci Norby, WY PSC	Ron Steinbach, Tri-State
Steve Oxley, WY PSC	Steve Beuning, Xcel
Dave Walker, WY PSC	Doug Larson, SPSC Staff
Tom Darin, DOE	Victoria Ravenscroft, SPSC Staff
Lawrence Mansueti, DOE	Tom Carr, SPSC Staff

Action Items and Next Steps:

- Draft a proposed recommendation to State-Provincial Steering Committee that the SPSC commit \$25,000 to the benefit/cost study of the SIS proposed Energy Imbalance Service and Seams Coordination Tool. Make funding contingent upon WECC's creation of a high-level oversight committee. Recommend that the state and provincial members of the oversight committee, to the extent possible, should be drawn from the state/provincial members of the GUWG.
- Draft more detailed definitions/descriptions of GUWG subgroups and disseminate to the full Work Group.
- Organize subgroups.
- Draft subgroup work plans and submit to staff to compile into one master workplan for the GUWG.
- Monitor the activities of the WECC Variable Generation Subcommittee.
- Schedule SIS proposal webinar for the week of April 12.
- Schedule a HAWG webinar for some time following the WECC Board meeting.

Background

There were no objections to the agenda and the meeting proceeded with the agenda as planned.

MIC/SIS proposed EIS and Seams Coordination Tool

Doug Larson and Steve Beuning described the SIS proposal in more detail. In response to questions, Steve Beuning described the structure of the benefit/cost study and the study budget (\$450,000 in addition to any money contributed by the Western Interconnection Regional Advisory Body and potentially the SPSC) and the difference between the SIS proposal and true

BA consolidation. Doug relayed FERC's position that the benefit/cost study, *not the implementation of the tools*, could be funded using Section 215 funds. Doug discussed WIRAB's decision to conditionally commit \$25,000 to the study and submit advice to the WECC Board in support of WECC funding.

Steve Oxley suggested that the group move directly to discussion of making a funding proposal from the GUWG to the SPSC recommending that the SPSC commit funds to the study. John Savage suggested that the GUWG draft a recommendation to the SPSC proposing that it commit \$25,000 to the study, contingent upon the creation of a high-level oversight committee, discussed above. It was suggested that the recommendation encourage WECC to draw the regulatory oversight group in the high-level oversight committee from state/provincial members who are serving on the GUWG. Staff was asked to draft the recommendation and circulate it to the group for comment and approval. No objections were made and the drafting of the recommendation was approved.

Gerald Brooks asked if there was a way to study a prototype of a few BAs to demonstrate the effects on a smaller scale without widespread buy-in. Steve Beuning responded that thus far WECC's focus has been on full development and that spreading development costs over a few BAs may make the proposal uneconomic. Doug described the "middle ground," which would be to study the entire interconnection, less a few BAs in order to determine a critical mass.

Update on VGS work

Victoria Ravenscroft gave an update on the WECC Variable Generation Subcommittee work including the [white paper on markets and IVG](#), [white paper on wind capacity](#), and BA coordination study.¹ In answer to questions about the specifics of the white papers, including completion dates, Victoria informed the group that she and Tom Carr would be attending the VGS meeting on March 31 and would update the group following that meeting.

Communications

Victoria discussed the communication structure for the GUWG and asked all members to send her any corrections and additions to the contact information. Per request by Steve Oxley, Victoria will be the central communication point for the GUWG.

Subgroups

- After a basic description by Steve Oxley, the group discussed the creation of three subgroups:
- Existing Grid Utilization Subgroup (EGUS)
 - New Technology Subgroup (NTS)
 - Variable Generation Integration Subgroup (VGIS)

Members asked that the responsibilities of each of the subgroups be described in detail so that they could get a better understanding of what each subgroup would do. Staff will work with members to better define the subgroups and disseminate the information to the GUWG. Members interested in volunteering should contact Victoria and the subgroup chair. Steve noted

¹ For information and the most recent version of the study plan, please contact Victoria.

these details should form the basis of subgroup work plans which would be reviewed by the GUWG as a whole and forwarded to the SPSC.

EGUS: Questions about the nature of the EGUS. Victoria clarified that this subgroup would cover current use of the grid and current market/scheduling practices in an effort to gain a better understanding of possible inefficiencies on the grid. It was pointed out that the impetus for this subgroup was the work done by the WECC Historical Analysis Work Group (HAWG). Matt Muldoon suggested that this subgroup create a benchmark against which potential changes can be measured. Matt Muldoon agreed to help put together a task list/work plan for the EGUS but was not interested in leading the effort of the subgroup.

NTS: Steve Oxley explained the NTS. Ron Lehr suggested that it might be useful to have a list of all the ideas of new technologies with definitions for each, an estimation of whether or not it will be a “big deal,” and a prospectus on possible impacts. Ron agreed to help with putting such a list together. Duane Braunagel volunteered to assist and work on the subgroup. Gerald Brooks expanded on Ron’s suggestion and suggested that we identify categories of problems on the grid and potential solutions. Gerald volunteered to work on this subgroup.

Larry Mansueti asked whether generation technology would be looked at by this subgroup. Doug clarified that the Scenarios Work Group of the SPSC has a breakthrough technology scenario that would examine those types of new generation technologies. Generation technology would be relevant to the NTS group to the extent it facilitated deployment of new transmission technology.

VGIS: John Savage volunteered to chair this subgroup.

Webinars

Victoria described the two tentatively planned webinars. The tentative date for the SIS proposal webinar is April 15. It was decided that holding the SIS proposal webinar before the April SPSC meeting would give members a chance to learn more about the subject. Members had no objection to a May webinar on the HAWG work. Staff will circulate a Doodle for each to determine the best time.

Work Product of the GUWG

John Savage suggested that each subgroup put together a work plan and submit it to staff to compile into a master workplan. Staff will circulate the draft workplan to the GUWG for comment and approval. The GUWG workplan would be offered as an amendment to the SPSC workplan.

Next Meeting

It was decided that the GUWG would not hold regular meetings but would hold them on an as-needed basis. If necessary, the group would have a conference call prior to the SPSC meeting to discuss/approve the draft funding proposal and the workplan development. If possible the group will address these issues via e-mail.