

Screening Study SPP-DPT-2011-001

For OASIS Request #75134391

MAINTAINED BY
SPP Engineering, SPP Transmission Service Studies
April 13, 2011

Copyright © 2011 by Southwest Power Pool, Inc. All rights reserved.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction.....	3
Study Methodology	4
Description	4
Model Updates	5
Transmission Request Modeling.....	5
Transfer Sensitivity Analysis	6
Study Results.....	7
Study Analysis Results.....	7
Conclusion	8
Appendix A.....	9

Executive Summary

Westar Energy has requested a screening study to determine the impacts on SPP and first-tier third party facilities due to a Delivery Point Transfer of 2 MW. Third party includes both first-tier neighboring facilities outside SPP and Transmission Owner facilities within SPP that are not under the SPP OATT. The service type requested for this screening study is Delivery Point Transfer (DPT). The period of the service requested is from 11/1/2012 to 11/1/2032.

The principal objective of this study is to identify system problems and potential system modifications necessary to facilitate the DPT request while maintaining system reliability. The DPT request was studied using two system scenarios. A transfer sensitivity analysis of the service was performed on the limitations identified in the 2010-AGP1-AFS-4 study.. Two scenarios were studied to capture system limitations impacted by the requested service. An analysis was conducted on the planning horizon.

The requested service does not significantly impact facilities on the SPP system or first-tier third party systems. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the results of the screening study analysis for the new source location for the scenarios listed in the table. Table 1 lists SPP and first-tier third party thermal transfer limitations identified. Table 2 lists SPP and first-tier third party voltage transfer limitations identified. Table 3 lists the network upgrades required to mitigate the limitations impacted by this request. Table 4 lists the potential redispatch relief pairs to prevent deferral of service, if applicable.

Introduction

Westar Energy has requested a screening study to determine the impacts on SPP and first-tier third party facilities for a Delivery Point Transfer of 2 MW. The principal objective of this study is to identify the constraints on the SPP and first-tier third party transmission systems that may limit the requested service and to determine the potential least cost solutions required to alleviate the limiting facilities.

This study includes steady-state contingency analysis (PSS/E function ACCC). The steady-state analysis considers the impact of the request on transmission line and transformer loadings, and bus voltages for outages of single transmission lines, transformers, and generating units, and selected multiple transmission lines and transformers on the SPP and first-tier third party systems.

The DPT request was studied using two system scenarios. A transfer sensitivity analysis of the service was performed on the limitations identified in the 2010-AGP1-AFS-4 study.. Two scenarios were studied to capture the system limitations impacted by the requested service. Scenario 0 includes projected usage of transmission service included in the SPP 2010 Series Cases. Scenario 5 includes transmission service not already included in the SPP 2010 Series Cases.

Study Methodology

Description

The facility study analysis was conducted to determine the steady-state impact of the requested service on the SPP and first tier non-SPP control area systems. The steady-state analysis was performed to ensure current SPP Criteria and NERC Reliability Standards requirements are fulfilled. SPP conforms to NERC Reliability Standards, which provide strict requirements related to voltage violations and thermal overloads during normal conditions and during a contingency. NERC Standards require all facilities to be within normal operating ratings for normal system conditions and within emergency ratings after a contingency.

Normal operating ratings and emergency operating ratings monitored are Rate A and B in the SPP Model Development Working Group (MDWG) models, respectively. The upper bound and lower bound of the normal voltage range monitored is 105% and 95%. The upper bound and lower bound of the emergency voltage range monitored is 105% and 90%. Transmission Owner voltage monitoring criteria is used if more restrictive. The SPS Tuco 230 kV bus voltage is monitored at 92.5% due to pre-determined system stability limitations. The WERE Wolf Creek 345 kV bus voltage is monitored at 103.5% and 98.5% due to transmission operating procedure.

The contingency set includes all SPP control area branches and ties 69 kV and above; first tier non-SPP control area branches and ties 115 kV and above; any defined contingencies for these control areas; and generation unit outages for the control areas with SPP reserve share program redispatch. The monitor elements include all SPP control area branches, ties, and buses 69 kV and above, and all first tier non-SPP control area branches and ties 115 kV and above. Voltage monitoring was performed for SPP control area buses 69 kV and above.

A 3 % transfer distribution factor (TDF) cutoff was applied to all SPP control area facilities. For first tier non-SPP control area facilities, a 3 % TDF cutoff was applied to AEI, AMRN (Ameren), and ENTR (Entergy) control areas. A 2 % TDF cutoff was applied to WAPA. For voltage monitoring, a 0.02 per unit change in voltage must occur due to the transfer or modeling upgrades to be considered a valid limit to the transfer.

Model Updates

SPP used four seasonal models from the 2010-AGP1-AFS-4 study to represent the WERE to WERE 2 MW request for the requested service period. The following SPP Transmission Expansion Plan 2010 Build 2 cases were used to study the impact of the requested service on the transmission system:

- 2012/13 Winter Peak (12WP)
- 2016 Summer Peak (16SP)
- 2016/17 Winter Peak (16WP)
- 2021 Summer Peak (21SP)

The Spring Peak models apply to April and May, the Summer Peak models apply to June through September, the Fall Peak models apply to October and November, and the Winter Peak models apply to December through March.

The chosen base case models were modified to reflect the current modeling information. From the four seasonal models, two system scenarios were developed. Scenario 0 includes projected usage of transmission included in the SPP 2010 Series Cases. Scenario 5 includes transmission not already included in the SPP 2010 Series Cases.

Transmission Request Modeling

Network Integration Transmission Service requests are modeled as Generation to Load transfers in addition to Generation to Generation because the requested Network Integration Transmission Service is a request to serve network load with the new designated network resource, and the impacts on the Transmission System are determined accordingly. Generation to Generation transfers are accomplished by developing a post-transfer case for comparison by dispatching the request source and redispatching the request sink.

Transfer Sensitivity Analysis

PTI's MUST sensitivity analysis function was used to determine whether the requested service impacted the limitations identified in the 2010-AGP1-AFS-4 study by greater than or equal to a 3% TDF. The MUST options chosen to conduct the analysis can be found in Appendix A.

Study Results

Study Analysis Results

Tables 1 and 2 contain the initial steady-state analysis results of the DPT. The tables are attached to the end of this report, if applicable. The tables identify the scenario and season in which the event occurred, the facility control area location, applicable ratings of the thermal transfer limitations and voltage transfer limitations, and the loading percentage and voltage per unit (pu).

Table 1 lists the SPP and first-tier third party thermal transfer limitations caused or impacted by the 1 MW transfer for applicable scenarios. Solutions are identified for the limitations in this table.

Table 2 lists the SPP and first-tier third party voltage transfer limitations caused or impacted by the 1 MW transfer for applicable scenarios. Solutions are identified for the violations in this table.

Table 3 lists the network upgrades required to mitigate the limitations caused or impacted by this request. Engineering and construction costs are provided for assigned upgrades in this table.

Table 4 lists the potential redispatch relief pairs to prevent deferral of service.

Conclusion

The results of the screening study show that limiting constraints do not exist on the SPP system for the 2 MW transfer from WERE to WERE. No significant impacts were identified for the requested term of this DPT. Since no additional limitations were identified, the request will be accepted. Once the request has been confirmed, SPP will issue a revised service agreement.

Appendix A

MUST CHOICES IN RUNNING THE SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS FUNCTION

CONSTRAINTS/CONTINGENCY INPUT OPTIONS

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. AC Mismatch Tolerance: | 50 MW |
| 2. Base Case Rating: | Rate A |
| 3. Base Case % of Rating: | 100% |
| 4. Contingency Case Rating: | Rate B |
| 5. Contingency Case % of Rating: | 100% |
| 6. Base Case Load Flow: | Do not solve AC |
| 7. Convert branch ratings to estimated MW ratings: | No |
| 8. Contingency ID Reporting: | Labels and Events |
| 9. Maximum number of contingencies to process: | 5000 |

MUST CALCULATION OPTIONS

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Phase Shifters Code: | Constant flow for Base Case
and Contingencies |
| 2. Report Base Case Violations with FCITC: | Yes |
| 3. Max. number of violations to report in FCITC table: | 150 |
| 4. Distribution Factor (OTDF and PTDF) Cutoff: | 0.0001 |
| 5. Max. times to report the same elements: | 3 |
| 6. Apply Distribution Factor to Contingency Analysis: | Yes |
| 7. Apply Distribution Factor to FCITC Reports: | Yes |
| 8. Min. Contingency Case flow change: | 0.0 MW |
| 9. Min. Contingency Case Distribution Factor change: | 0.0 |
| 10. Min. Distr. Factor for Transfer Sensitivity Analysis: | 0.0 |

Table 1- SPP Facility Thermal Transfer Limitations

Scenario	Season	From Area	To Area	Monitored Branch Over 100% Rate B	Base Case Loading (%)	Transfer Case Loading (%)	TDF (%)	Outaged Branch Causing Overload	Upgrade Name	Solution
				None						

Table 2- SPP Facility Voltage Transfer Limitations

Scenario	Season	Area	Monitored Bus with Violation	Post-transfer Voltage (PU)	Outaged Branch Causing Overload	Upgrade Name	Solution
			None				

Transmission Owner	Upgrade	Solution	Earliest Date Upgrade Required (DUN)	Estimated Date of Upgrade Completion (EOC)	NTC
	None				

Limitations were not identified; therefore, redispatch was not calculated.