SPP Southwest Power Pool

System Impact Study
SPP-2005-046
For Transmission Service
Requested By:
Western Resources

From OKGE to WR

For a Reserved Amount Of
250 MW
From 07/01/05
To 09/01/05

SPP Transmission Planning

1. Executive Summary

Western Resources has requested a system impact study for monthly firm transmission service from OKGE to WR. The period of the transaction is from 07/01/05 to 09/01/05. The request is for reservation 875674 for the amount of 250 MW.

The 250 MW transaction from OKGE to WR has an impact on the following flowgates with no ATC: BVSNBVNESDEL, KILCREWOOWIC, SCODEADELNEO. To provide the ATC necessary for this transfer, the impact on these flowgates must be relieved.

After studying many scenarios using curtailment of reservations and generation redispatch, there are several feasible scenarios that will relieve the flowgate(s) in question.

2. Introduction

Western Resources has requested a system impact study for transmission service from OKGE to WR.

There are three constrained flowgates that require relief in order for this reservation to be accepted. The flowgates and the explanations are as follows:

- BVSNBVNESDEL: Bartlesville SE to N. Bartlesville 138 kV line for the loss of Northeastern to Delaware 345 KV line

- KILCREWOOWIC: Kildare to Creswell 138 kV line for the loss of Woodring to Wichita 345 KV line

- SCODEADELNEO: South Coffeyville to Dearing 138 kV line for the loss of Delaware to Neosho 345 KV line

3. Study Methodology

A. Description

Southwest Power Pool used Managing and Utilizing System Transmission (MUST) to obtain possible unit pairings that would relieve the constraint. MUST calculates impacts on monitored facilities for all units within the Southwest Power Pool Footprint. The SPP ATC Calculator is used to determine response factors for the time period of the reservation.

B. Model Updates

The 2005 Southwest Power Pool model was used for the study. This model was updated to reflect the most current information available.

C. Transfer Analysis

Using the short-term calculator, the limiting constraints for the transfer are identified. The response factor of the transfer on each constraint is also determined.

The product of the transfer amount and the response factor is the impact of a transfer on a limiting flowgate that must be relieved. With multiple flowgates affected by a transfer, relief of the largest impact may also provide relief of smaller impacts.

Using Managing and Utilizing System Transmission (MUST), specific generator pairs are chosen to reflect the units available for redispatch. The quotient of the amount of impact that must be relieved and the generation sensitivity factor calculated by MUST is the amount of redispatch necessary to relieve the impact on the affected flowgate.

4. Study Results

After studying the impacts of request 875674, three flowgates require relief. The flowgates and associated amount of relief is as follows:

Table 1

Flowgates	Sensitivity Original (%)	Duration	Required Relief (MW)
BVSNBVNESDEL	6.8	July - August	12
KILCREWOOWIC	11.3	July - August	29
SCODEADELNEO	7.4	July - August	19

Table 2 displays a list of reservation paths that offer relief for the flowgates in question.

Table 2

Transactions Path	BVSNNBVNESDEL Sensitivity (%)	KILCREWOOWIC Sensitivity (%)	SCODEANESDEL Sensitivity (%)
WR - EES	-	-	-

Table 3 displays the amount of capacity required for each reservation path to relieve the flowgates in question.

Table 3

Transactions Path	BVSNNBVNESDEL Sensitivity (MW)	KILCREWOOWIC Sensitivity (MW)	SCODEANESDEL Sensitivity (MW)
WR - EES	-	-	-

Table 4 displays a list of generator pairs that are possible relief options for the flowgates in question.

Table 4

Source	Sink	BVSNBVNESDEL Sensitivity (%)	KILCREWOOWIC Sensitivity (%)	SCODEANESDEL Sensitivity (%)
GEC (WR)	JEC (WR)	-	8.6	-
GEC (WR)	HEC (WR)	-	7.4	-
EEC (WR)	JEC (WR)	-	5.9	-
EEC (WR)	Stateline (WR)	-	10.8	-
GEC (WR)	Stateline (WR)	-	12.8	-
Iola (WR)	Stateline (WR)	10.4	-	14.2
Neosho (WR)	Stateline (WR)	22	-	34
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	GEC (WR)	13.3	-	19.7
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	EEC (WR)	13.3	-	19.7
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	Stateline (WR)	14.3	-	20.6
Welsh (AEPW)	NES (AEPW)	9.8	-	7.32
Wilkes (AEPW)	NES (AEPW)	9.8	-	7.4

Table 5 displays the amount of redispatch capacity necessary for each generator pair.

Table 5

Source	Sink	BVSNBVNESDEL Sensitivity (MW)	KILCREWOOWIC Sensitivity (MW)	SCODEANESDEL Sensitivity (MW)
GEC (WR)	JEC (WR)	-	329	-
GEC (WR)	HEC (WR)	-	382	-
EEC (WR)	JEC (WR)	-	479	-
EEC (WR)	Stateline (WR)	-	262	-
GEC (WR)	Stateline (WR)	-	221	-
Iola (WR)	Stateline (WR)	97	-	130
Neosho (WR)	Stateline (WR)	55	-	54
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	GEC (WR)	90	-	93
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	EEC (WR)	90	-	93
CgenSub2/Erie (WR)	Stateline (WR)	84	-	89
Welsh (AEPW)	NES (AEPW)	123	-	250
Wilkes (AEPW)	NES (AEPW)	123	-	250

5. Conclusion

Reservation curtailment and generation redispatch options were studied in order to relieve the necessary constraint. The results of this study shows that the constraints on the flowgates in question could be relieved by executing one or more of the options described in the Study Results section of this document. Before the Transmission Provider accepts the reservations, proof of one of these relief options must be presented to Southwest Power Pool. Noncompliance with this guideline will result in the refusal of the reservation.