

Conference Call Agenda for Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

April 7, 2009

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at 1 p.m. EDT on Tuesday, April 7, 2009.

Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Bob Jones
Ron Mazur	Tom Mielnik	Bob Millard, Vice Chair
John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce
Chifong Thomas	Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters
Ray Kershaw, Observer	Chuck Lawrence, Observer	Curt Stepanek, Observer
Tom Gentile, Observer	Chris Mak, FERC, Guest	Stuart Hansen, FERC, Guest
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

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

c. Conference Call Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The object of the call was to review items brought up by FERC staff in the recent meeting and where possible to come to a quick agreement, include those changes in the third posting. Those items where quick agreement can not be reached will be postponed until the fourth posting.

2. Report on Discussions with FERC Staff — John Odom

John provided a brief overview of the March 24th meeting. Notes of the meeting were distributed via the mail server and have been posted to the Website.

A question was raised as to why the SDT needed to consider the comments of FERC staff as the official comment period has ended. As per the newly approved Roles and Responsibilities document, FERC staff will meet with an SDT from time to time to discuss progress on a project. There will be notes taken, distributed, and posted for these meetings and the SDT is expected to respond to comments and questions raised by staff.

3. Finalize Roadmap Changes from April 1, 2009 E-Mail

John and Ed made a number of changes to the roadmap document that were the basis for the April 1, 2009 e-mail and which were the reference for this item.

a. R1.1

Staff asked about considering sensitivity conditions that showed potential problems in a study being included as base conditions in the next year's studies. The SDT questioned why only sensitivities were being spelled out as there are other items that probably should be included as well. The use of the term 'consider' was also brought up as it was felt that more than consideration was required. One member brought up the concept of peer reviews catching these things but it was pointed out the peer reviews are not requirements. There was no general objection to the concept being discussed but no consensus was obtained on the wording or the actual location of the wording. Therefore this issue was tabled.

b. R1.1.1

The basic premise being pursued is that one must plan for maintenance. This is included in the existing standards in TPL-002-0, R1.3.12. Chifong added the term 'effects of' to the proposed wording but after considerable discussion, this terminology was deleted. Again there was no real objection to the concept but wording and location were debated. Therefore this issue was tabled.

c. R2.1.3.6

The proposed wording replaced 'effectiveness' with 'range'. After some discussion it was decided to delete both words in order to be consistent with the other items in the list.

d. R2.1.4

The SDT made some slight changes to the suggested wording but accepted the modified requirement.

e. R2.5.2

There was considerable discussion on this item and it was clear that no easy resolution was possible. Therefore, this issue was tabled.

f. R2.5.2.1

There was considerable discussion on this item and it was clear that no easy resolution was possible. Therefore, this issue was tabled.

g. Header note 'b'

The original distinction between steady state and Stability was intentional. In the Stability case, the Load could come back and the situation may get better but it might get worse. Therefore, the original intent was to delete Stability from the sentence. However, the desire is to accurately model what is actually happening so more discussion is needed. Therefore this issue was tabled.

h. P3

The existing standards allow the planner to select the worst case, SLG or 3-phase. Footnote 3 was supplied to provide clarity on the selection criteria. It was feared that going to 3-phase in the table might be inadvertently raising the bar but after discussion it was decided to leave it as is and see if the industry comments. The DC line element will need to be split out separately however to show SLG. The suggested change was accepted so that the SDT can solicit industry feedback on the issue.

i. P6

See item h.

j. Footnote 6

The suggested wording was accepted as is.

k. Bulleted lists

The SDT agreed to utilize bulleted lists where the items are an actual list of items.

4. Discuss Further Changes as per FERC Staff Meeting Notes

John provided a short overview on each topic but time prevented detailed discussions. These items were tabled until the next meeting.

- a. R1.1.6 — Generation tripping
- b. R2.1.3 — Sensitivities
- c. R2.1.5 — Spare strategy
- d. R2.2 — Worst year scenario
- e. R2.3 — Short circuit studies
- f. R2.4 — Long-term Stability
- g. R3.3.3 — Correspondence to Stability
- h. Header note 'c' — High speed reclosing

5. Discuss Need for Any Changes to Second Posting Comment Report Responses and Implementation Plan Necessitated by Recent Adjustments

It does not appear that any of the accepted changes will affect the text of the comment responses.

6. Next Steps — John Odom

While it is possible that industry comments to the third posting may provide insight on how to proceed with these items, it was decided that a face-to-face meeting to resolve the issues was necessary.

The third posting will proceed with only those changes agreed upon during this conference call. All other items will be considered for the fourth posting.

Since the SDT added VRF, Time Horizon, Measures, data retention, and VSL for this posting, it should be a 45 day listing.

There should be another webinar about midway through the posting.

7. Next Meetings

The SDT will be polled on possible dates for a special meeting to discuss the FERC staff issues that haven't been resolved to date.

The webinar may be held as a separate event or combined with a face-to-face meeting. If it is combined, it would be held on the afternoon of the day prior to the regular meeting and SDT members could then decide whether they will travel for the webinar or the meeting.

8. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

Ed will revise the roadmap with the changes agreed upon today and submit the documents to NERC staff for review prior to posting.

9. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 3:15 p.m. EDT.