

Notes

Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission and Future Needs

Wednesday, July 6, 2011 | 1:00 - 4:00 p.m. ET

Meeting Location: Teleconference

Administration

1. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at 1:00 p.m. ET on Wednesday, July 6, 2011. Call participants were:

Members		
Darrin Church, TVA	Bill Harm, PJM	Doug Hohlbaugh, First Energy, Vice Chair
Julius Horvath, Lone Star	Bob Jones, Southern	Brian Keel, SRP
Tom Mielnik, Mid-American	John Odom, FRCC, Chair	Bernie Pasternack, Transmission Strategies
Bob Pierce, Duke	Dana Walters, NYISO	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC
Observers		
Eugene Blick, FERC	Andy Dressel, NERC	Ray Kershaw, ITC
Ruth Kloecker, ITC	Chuck Lawrence, ATC	Charles Long, Entergy
Gordon Dobson-Mack, Powerex	Leslie Saponaro, FERC	

2. NERC Anti-trust Guidelines and Conference Call Warning – Ed Dobrowolski

The NERC Anti-trust Guidelines were presented and the conference call warning was delivered. No questions were raised.

3. Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives – John Odom

The goal of the meeting was to finalize the comment responses so that the project can move to the recirculation ballot. This will facilitate placing the project on the next NERC Board of Trustees meeting on August 4, 2011.

Agenda

1. Overview of Meeting with FERC Staff – John Odom

John presented highlights of the meeting with FERC staff on June 20, 2011. Notes from the meeting have been distributed.

FERC staff understands the Standards Drafting Team (SDT) plans to go to recirculation ballot (final ballot) with no significant changes being made to the standard. However, FERC staff took the opportunity to point out concerns with the proposed standards where SDT positions should be fully explained in the filing to avoid delays in the process. FERC staff concerns included:

- The translation of Requirement R1.3.10 (P5) – FERC staff felt that this lowered the bar as it moved the performance from a categorized event to an extreme event.
- The 6 month duration of known outages before they are included for evaluation was viewed as lowering the bar compared to what is currently required in Requirement R1.3.12 of the existing TPL standards.
- Coordination with the on-going revision of the BES definition.
- Spare equipment strategy being restricted to steady state.

In addition, FERC staff expressed a desire to see examples of the types of sensitivities to be studied.

2. Finalize Comment Responses

a. Implementation Plan

The changes made were strictly a matter of consistency in language between the Implementation Plan section on Effective Date and the Reliability Standard section on Effective Date.

The SDT was concerned that the amount of redline shown would cause confusion with the industry and a note will be placed in the redline version of the Implementation Plan to indicate that no content or context has been changed.

b. Question 1

John Odom reviewed the summary statements and then led the SDT through the individual responses.

The SDT made several grammatical changes to the draft responses. The SDT also revised the proposed response on the use of 'System' to provide additional clarification.

Two bullets in the Data Retention section were changed to provide consistency between the language in that section and that of the matching requirements. No change was made to the timeframes shown however.

The SDT agreed that no change to the requirements language was necessary due to industry comments.

c. Question 2

Ed Dobrowolski reviewed the summary statement and then led the SDT through the individual responses.

The SDT agreed to the changes to the VSL language brought about by industry comments pointing out inconsistencies in language between the VSLs and the requirements. No changes were made to the actual violations however.

d. Question 3

Doug Hohlbaugh reviewed the summary statements and then led the SDT through the individual responses.

The main points of discussion were to ensure consistency between the responses to question 1 and question 3. Several changes were made to achieve this goal. However, these changes did not result in a change to the context of the responses.

The SDT agreed that no change to the requirements language was necessary due to industry comments.

3. Next Steps – John Odom

Ed Dobrowolski will clean up the documents and submit them to NERC staff as quickly as possible with a request to move the project to the recirculation ballot stage.

4. Future Meetings

The scheduled teleconference for Thursday, July 7, 2011 was cancelled as the SDT completed the agenda during this call.

5. Action Items & Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The only action item was for Ed Dobrowolski to submit the documents needed to advance to recirculation ballot as soon as possible.

The project is on schedule at this time.

6. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 3:45 p.m. ET.