



***System Impact Study SPP-2001-048
For Transmission Service
Requested By
Aquila Energy Marketing Corp.***

From CLEC To ERCOTE

***For a Reserved Amount Of 100MW
From 1/20/02
To 1/20/03***

SPP Transmission Planning

Table of Contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2. INTRODUCTION	4
3. STUDY METHODOLOGY.....	5
A. DESCRIPTION	5
B. MODEL UPDATES	5
C. TRANSFER ANALYSIS.....	5
4. STUDY RESULTS	6
A. STUDY ANALYSIS RESULTS.....	6
TABLE 1 – SPP FACILITY OVERLOADS CAUSED BY THE CLEC TO ERCOTE 100MW TRANSFER.....	7
TABLE 2 – NON - SPP FACILITY OVERLOADS CAUSED BY THE CLEC TO ERCOTE 100MW TRANSFER ..	7
TABLE 3 – PREVIOUSLY ASSIGNED AND IDENTIFIED SPP FACILITIES IMPACTED BY THE CLEC TO ERCOTE 100MW TRANSFER.	8
5. CONCLUSION.....	9
APPENDIX A	10

1. Executive Summary

Aquila Energy Marketing Corp. has requested a system impact study for long-term Firm Point-to-Point transmission service from CLEC to ERCOTE. The period of the transaction is from 1/20/02 to 1/20/03. The request is for OASIS reservations 239061 and 239062, which are the renewals of OASIS reservations 210531 and 210532, for 100MW.

The principal objective of this study is to identify system problems and potential system modifications necessary to facilitate the additional 100MW transfer while maintaining system reliability.

There were no limiting constraints found for the 100MW CLEC to ERCOTE transfer.

2. Introduction

Aquila Energy Marketing Corp. has requested an impact study for transmission service from CLEC control area with a sink of ERCOTE.

The principal objective of this study is to identify the restraints on the SPP Regional Tariff System that may limit the transfer to less than 100MW. This study includes steady-state contingency analyses (PSS/E function ACCC) and Available Transfer Capability (ATC) analyses.

The steady-state analyses consider the impact of the 100MW transfer on transmission line loading and transmission bus voltages for outages of single and selected multiple transmission lines and transformers on the SPP system.

ATC analyses shows the amount of First Contingency Incremental Transfer Capabilities (FCITC) between the given study systems and what the limitations are, if any, for transferring up to 100MW.

3. Study Methodology

A. Description

Two analyses were conducted to determine the impact of the 100MW transfer on the system. The first analysis was conducted to identify any new overloads caused by the 100MW transfer. The second analysis was done to ensure that available capacity exists on previously identified circuits.

The first analysis was to study the steady-state analysis impact of the 100MW transfer on the SPP system. The second step was to study Available Transfer Capability (ATC) of the facilities identified in the steady-state analysis impact. The steady-state analysis was done to ensure current SPP Criteria and NERC Planning Standards requirements are fulfilled. The Southwest Power Pool (SPP) conforms to the NERC Planning Standards, which provide the strictest requirements, related to thermal overloads with a contingency. It requires that all facilities be within emergency ratings after a contingency.

The second analysis was done to determine the impact of the transfer on previously assigned and identified facilities.

B. Model Updates

SPP used three seasonal models to study the 100MW request. The SPP 2001 Series Cases 2001/02 Winter Peak, 2002 Summer Peak, and 2002/03 Winter Peak were used to study the impact of the 100MW transfer on the SPP system during the transaction period of 1/20/02 to 1/20/03.

The chosen base case models were modified to reflect the most current modeling information. The cases were modified to reflect future firm transfers during the request period that were not already included in the January 2001 base case series models.

C. Transfer Analysis

Using the created models and the ACCC function of PSS/E, single and select double contingency outages were analyzed. Then full AC solution was used to obtain the most accurate results possible. Any facility overloaded, using MVA ratings, in the transfer case and not overloaded in the base case was flagged. The PSS/E options chosen to conduct the Impact Study analysis can be found in Appendix A.

4. Study Results

A. Study Analysis Results

Tables 1, 2, and 3 contain the analysis results of the System Impact Study. The tables identify the seasonal case in which the event occurred; the emergency rating of the overloaded circuit (Rate B), the contingent loading percentage of circuit with and without the studied transfer, the estimated ATC value using interpolation if calculated, any SPP identification or assignment of the event, and any solutions received from the transmission owners.

Table 1 shows the new facility overloads caused by the 100MW transfer.

Table 2 documents overloads on Non SPP Regional Tariff participants' transmission systems caused by the 100MW transfer.

Table 3 documents the 100MW transfer impact on previously assigned and identified facilities.

Table 1 – SPP Facility Overloads caused by the CLEC to ERCOTE 100MW Transfer

Study Year	From Area - To Area	Branch Over 100% RateB	Rate B	BC % I Loading	TC % I Loading	Outaged Branch That Caused Overload	ATC (MW)
01WP		NONE				NONE	100
01SP		NONE				NONE	100
02WP		NONE				NONE	100

Table 2 – Non - SPP Facility Overloads caused by the CLEC to ERCOTE 100MW Transfer

Study Year	From Area - To Area	Branch Over 100% RateB	Rate B	BC % Loading	TC % Loading	Outaged Branch That Caused Overload	ATC (MW)
01WP		NONE				NONE	
02SP		NONE				NONE	
02WP		NONE				NONE	

Table 3 – Previously Assigned and Identified SPP Facilities Impacted by the CLEC to ERCOTE 100MW Transfer.

Study Year	From Area - To Area	Branch Over 100% RateB	RATEB	BC % I Loading	TC % I Loading	Outaged Branch That Caused Overload	ATC (MW)
01WP		NONE					100
01SP		NONE					100
02WP		NONE					100

5. Conclusion

SPP found no facilities to restrict the requested 100MW reservation; therefore, it will be accepted.

Appendix A

PSS/E CHOICES IN RUNNING LOAD FLOW PROGRAM AND ACCC

BASE CASES:

Solutions - Fixed slope decoupled Newton-Raphson solution (FDNS)

1. Tap adjustment – Stepping
2. Area interchange control – Tie lines only
3. Var limits – Apply automatically
4. Solution options - Phase shift adjustment
 - Flat start
 - Lock DC taps
 - Lock switched shunts

ACCC CASES:

Solutions – AC contingency checking (ACCC)

1. MW mismatch tolerance –1.0
2. Contingency case rating – Rate B
3. Percent of rating – 100
4. Output code – Summary
5. Min flow change in overload report – 1mw
6. Excl'd cases w/ no overloads form report – YES
7. Exclude interfaces from report – NO
8. Perform voltage limit check – YES
9. Elements in available capacity table – 60000
10. Cutoff threshold for available capacity table – 99999.0
11. Min. contng. case Vltg chng for report – 0.02
12. Sorted output – None

Newton Solution:

1. Tap adjustment – Stepping
2. Area interchange control – Tie lines only
3. Var limits - Apply automatically
4. Solution options - Phase shift adjustment
 - Flat start
 - Lock DC taps
 - Lock switched shunts