Meeting Notes
Backup Facilities SDT — Project 2006-04

1. **Administrative Items**

   a. Introductions and Quorum

   The Chair called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. PDT in Scottsdale, AZ on Wednesday, April 2, 2008. Meeting participants were:

Tom Bowe	Sam Brattini, Chair	Blaine Dinwiddie
Charles Jenkins	Barry Lawson	Sara McCoy
Melinda Montgomery	Keith Porterfield	John Procyk
Mike Schiavone, Vice Chair	James Vermillion	Ed, Dobrowolski, NERC

   b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

   There were no questions raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

   c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — Sam Brattini

   The objective of this meeting was to attempt to finalize the response to comments and the revisions to the standards text. An item was added to the agenda to allow for the reporting of conference calls with FERC staff and NERC staff.

2. **Reports on Conference Calls — Sam Brattini**

   Prior to the posting, Sam, Tom, and Ed participated in a conference call with FERC staff to discuss the issue of GOP applicability. The positions outlined in the SDT memo on this topic were reviewed with staff. While the memo was not accepted as proof positive that the GOP should not be an applicable entity here, FERC staff expressed a willingness to listen to arguments in that direction. When the SDT files this standard with FERC for commission approval, it will need to be accompanied by a strong white paper completely describing the reasoning for such exclusion.

   Also prior to posting there was a conference call with NERC staff that Sam and Mike participated in. The purpose of this call was to ensure consistency with standard format and terminology. Compliance staff also took part in this call and they stated that the waiver that was contained in the draft standard was not within the scope of

the SDT to grant and they insisted that it be removed prior to posting. No other content was changed.

Several members of the SDT expressed their displeasure with the role of the Compliance staff in removing a requirement that had been drafted by the SDT and with what they felt was a violation of process in so doing.

3. **Review Comment Responses**

There were several key concerns expressed in the comments that were discussed in detail as the individual draft question responses were reviewed.

a. Question 1 — Charles and Barry

Several commenters misunderstood the intent of the partial TOP exclusion. Regardless, it seems as if the exclusion utilizing the definitions of Critical Assets and IROL isn't the way to try to help smaller TOPs. For example, what happens if a new IROL arises? Do you need to immediately have a backup when you didn't have one before? This type of exclusion might also cause entities to re-define their Critical Assets which could lead to a decrease in reliability.

If the SDT wants to continue with this line of thought, a new type of exclusion is needed and it must be justified. Along those lines, an exclusion of less than 200 KV was set up unless the RE states otherwise. A question will be raised in the next posting to cover this change.

b. Question 2 — Tom

The comments were evenly split on this topic. However, no one supplied the requested information on alternatives or how it is currently dealt with. One option may be to point to COM-002-2, R1. This covers the GOP in real-time emergency conditions.

The SDT contacted the RC Project which is handling any changes in COM-002. That project is currently planning on retiring COM-002. The RCSDT has set up a conference call for April 18th at 9 a.m. EDT to discuss this matter. Details on the call will be sent out. If the GOP is not covered in COM-002, then the SDT will need to handle this problem in a different manner.

c. Question 3 — Blaine and James

There were many questions on the 2 hour time period and the apparent decrease in the requirement from what it currently is. The 2 hours are based on realistic travel times due to appropriate geographic separation of the two centers for reliability purposes. To do anything quicker than that may be construed as dictating manned, hot standby centers that is not the intent of the SDT. It was also pointed

out that the revised standard now requires specific functionality so that the true requirement has been strengthened.

The SDT decided to stay with the 2 hour requirement while placing a bulleted list of reasons in the response. However, the SDT may need to tighten up what actually happens in those first two hours.

d. Question 4 — Blaine and James

After some debate, the time requirement has been set to 2 hours for all entities to provide a consistent approach. Therefore, R8.1 and R8.2 will be deleted and R8 will be moved up to become a sub-requirement of R1.

In the first 2 hours, an entity must notify their neighbors.

e. Question 5 — Sara and Mike

Two hours allows an entity to cross an hour boundary and to check schedules and ramps. However, the SDT will clarify that 2 consecutive hours is required.

f. Question 6 — Melinda and Glenn

Most commenters thought that six months was too long but there seemed to be some confusion as to whether they were commenting on the plan or the implementation. The SDT believes that 6 months is a reasonable time frame.

g. Question 7 — Sam

There are no actions required due to the comments on question 7.

h. Question 8 — John, Keith, and Sam

As a result of the comments in question 8, the requirement for a manager's signature was removed.

The concept of how to handle outages was raised and a proposal to include this in the new Section 4.2 (where issues such as transition time are mentioned) was developed.

Some other minor wording changes were made on the fly to the roadmap document.

4. **Revise Standards Text (as required)**

The text was revised based on the decisions made in reviewing the industry comments. The red-lined document was distributed via the mail server.

5. **Next Steps — Sam Brattini**

Those SDT members assigned to respond to questions were requested to go back over their responses based on the changes made to the roadmap document during the meeting. The revised responses should make specific references to the changes made.

Sam, Tom, and Ed will work on developing Measures. This will be completed no later than May 2nd.

Comment responses are due back to Ed no later than April 18th. He will collate the responses.

Charles will work on the Implementation Plan. This is due no later than May 15th.

6. **Schedule Next Meetings — Sam Brattini**

There will be a conference call with the RCSDT on Friday, April 18, 2008 at 9 a.m. EDT to discuss COM-002. Details will be forwarded.

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Friday, May 16, 2008 from 11 a.m.–3 p.m. EDT. Details will be forwarded.

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Wednesday, May 28, 2008 from 11 a.m.–3 p.m. Details will be forwarded. This is the last scheduled activity prior to the next posting.

7. **Review Action Items and Project Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action items were developed at this meeting:

- Sam, Tom, and Ed will work on developing Measures. This will be completed no later than May 2nd.
- Comment responses are due back to Ed no later than April 18th. He will collate the responses.
- Charles will work on the Implementation Plan. This is due no later than May 15th.

The next scheduled deadline for this project is to submit the documents for the second posting by May 30, 2008. The current schedule is tight but if the SDT can finish work on the May 28th conference call, the schedule can be maintained.

8. **Adjourn**

The Chair thanked SRP for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 3, 2008.