

# Meeting Notes

## Project 2012-INT-02 Interpretation of TPL-003-0a and TPL-004-0 for SPCS

June 13, 2012  
Conference Call and ReadyTalk Webinar

### Administrative

#### 1. Introductions

Scott Barfield-McGinnis (advisor) took attendance and the list is provided below. A quorum was not met.

Name	Entity	
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
Tom Bradish	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Doug Hohlbaugh (chair)	FirstEnergy Corp.	Member
Bill Middaugh	Tri-State Generation and Transmission	Member
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy	Member
John Zipp	ITC Holdings	Member

#### 2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

The advisor read the NERC Antitrust Guidelines and disclaimer to the team, there were no questions.

#### 3. Review Current Team Roster

The advisor presented the team roster and noted no members were added or removed.

#### 4. Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives

The advisor reviewed the agenda and objectives. There were no changes or additions.

## **Agenda**

### **1. Review of Action Items from Last Meeting – Complete**

The advisor reviewed the action items from the May 9, 2012 meeting.

### **2. Respond to Quality Review Feedback – Complete**

The quality review feedback was provided to the team several days prior to the meeting. The team addressed the reviewer comments for each of the two responses. Overall, the feedback was straightforward and did not reveal any significant issues.

### **3. Discuss Interpretation Response – Complete**

For response one, the quality review team suggested changing “their” to “its.” The team agreed, as it was not a substantive change. Regarding response two, the quality review team suggested a change in the first sentence. The interpretation team disagreed with the proposed change and believed that is important to include the concept of the word “normal” with clearing time not being achieved in the study. The team’s perception was that the quality review team had a concern about the normal clearing time referring to a quicker response time. The team could not think of a situation that would meet this condition. For example, a delayed clearing time implies it takes longer. The team did not make a change. The quality review team made a couple of minor readability changes. The team agreed with the addition of “Any” in the second sentence, the replacement of “affects” with “increase,” and the addition of “Transmission Planner and Planning Authority” listing of entities. These revisions were not substantive. Lastly, the team disagreed with the removal of “full” from the last sentence. The team believed the term “full” emphasizes the need to have a complete and thorough simulation.

### **4. Review of Schedule – Complete**

The advisor reviewed the schedule noting the team was approximately three weeks ahead of schedule. Using the NERC application, AtTask, the advisor demonstrated where the team was in the schedule and provided an outlook on the next meeting opportunities. Assuming a posting the week of June 18, 2012, the team should consider having a conference call August 14 or 15, 2012.

### **5. Next Steps – None at this time**

### **6. Action Items or Assignments**

- a. Send out availability request to determine August 2012 conference call dates – Advisor
- b. Send out a summary of the meeting dates to the team – Advisor

### **7. Future Meeting(s)**

The team is considering a conference call for August 14 or 15, 2012, depending on availability. If needed, the team may elect to meet in-person Labor Day week to address comments.

### **8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at Noon ET June 13, 2012.