

Conference Call Notes Project 2010-02 – Connecting New Facilities to the Grid

March 25, 2014 | 1-3 p.m. Eastern

Administrative

1. Introductions

Standards Developer Mallory Huggins initiated the meeting. She thanked all members for participating in the call and led group introductions. The following members and observers were in attendance:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Mike Steckelberg (Chair)	Great River Energy	M
Jeff Gindling (Vice Chair)	Duke Energy	M
Kumar Agarwal	FERC	O
Zakia El Omari	Georgia Transmission Corporation	M
Dennis Fuentes-Pedrosa	FERC	O
Brett Furuness	MISO	O
Kenneth Goldsmith	Alliant Energy	O
John Hagen	Pacific Gas & Electric	M
Joseph Hay	PJM	M
Alshare Hughes	Luminant	O
Ruth Kloecker	ITC Holdings	M
Selene Sanchez	Southern California Edison	O
Zelalem Tekle	Baltimore Gas and Electric, An Exelon Company	M
Ganesh Velumyylum	NIPSCO	M
Mallory Huggins	NERC	M

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Erika Chanzas	NERC	M

2. Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives

- a. Mallory explained that the goal of the call was to finalize FAC-001-2 and FAC-002-2 for posting and discuss next steps.

Agenda Items

1. Finalize Document for Posting

a. FAC-001-2:

- i. Mallory noted that she changed “connection” requirements to “interconnection” requirements in all references and modified the Purpose statement in line with a suggestion from NERC Counsel Stacey Tyrewala. The SDT supported both changes.
- ii. Chair Mike Steckelberg questioned the phrase “Facilities seeking interconnection” in the Background of FAC-001-2. Mallory explained that “Facilities” was used intentionally. The NERC Glossary term “Facilities” was used instead of “entities” in order to refer to both NERC Registered Entities that own Facilities seeking interconnection *and* third parties that may not yet be NERC Registered entities that own Facilities seeking interconnection. Mike was satisfied with this explanation.
- iii. Mallory clarified the use of Time Horizons: they are used by compliance staff in the assessment of a violation, with respect to how long an entity has to mitigate a violation.
- iv. The SDT reviewed and finalized the Measures that were proposed by SDT members via email.
- v. The SDT reviewed the VSLs that Mallory added and offered corrections for clarity and better conformance to the language of the requirements.
- vi. Mike proposed adding two new bullet points to the list of items to be considered in developing Facility interconnection requirements (now in the Guideline and Technical Basis section): procedures for requesting a new interconnection and data required to properly study an interconnection. The team supported this addition.

b. FAC-002-2:

- i. Mallory noted that she changed “connection” requirements to “interconnection” requirements in all references and modified the Purpose statement in line with a suggestion from NERC Counsel Stacey Tyrewala. The SDT supported both changes.

- ii. Mike questioned the order of the entities listed in the Applicability section. Mallory reviewed the guidelines for ordering entities in that section, and because there is no set rule for the order, she recommended ordering the entities by the order in which they appear in the Functional Model.
 - iii. Mallory proposed deleting “jointly” in R1.4 and the team agreed.
 - iv. The SDT reviewed and finalized the Measures that were proposed by SDT members via email.
 - v. Mallory noticed that Stacey flagged the reference to “applicable Generator Owners (under FAC-001-2)” in R4 as inappropriate. After discussion, the team determined that it had three options: include no special reference to FAC-001-2 because a Generator Owner wouldn’t be involved in the situation in R4 if there had not been an interconnection request in FAC-001-2; take out the standards reference and simply say “applicable Generator Owners”; or further specify “Applicable Generator Owners” in the Functional Entity, as done in FAC-001-2. Mallory reviewed the options with Stacey and determined that the third option was best; the SDT was satisfied with this.
 - vi. The SDT reviewed the VSLs that Mallory added and offered corrections for clarity and better conformance to the language of the related requirements.
- c. *Standard Authorization Request*: Mallory noted that the SAR did not require changes, as the SDT is still working within the scope of the original SAR.
- d. *Supporting Documents: Implementation Plan, VRF/VSL Justification, Mapping Document, Consideration of Issues and Directives, Consideration of Comments Form, New Comment Form*: Mallory explained that she would finalize each of these and share them with the team by March 26.
- e. *Next Steps*: Mallory explained that the standards and the SAR would be presented to the Standards Committee Executive Committee for approval for posting for a 45-day comment and ballot period on March 31.

2. Adjourn

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. Eastern on March 25, 2014.