

Meeting Notes

Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT — Project 2006-02

Tuesday, June 24, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. PDT

Wednesday, June 25, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. PDT

SRP PERA Club
1 E. Continental Drive
Tempe, AZ 85281

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. PDT on Tuesday, June 24, 2008 at SRP Offices in Tempe, AZ. Meeting participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Jones	Brian Keel	Tom Mielnik
Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Paul Rocha	Chifong Thomas
Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters	Tom Gentile, Observer
Ray Kershaw, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer	Julius Horvath, LCRA, Guest
Charles Long, Entergy, Guest	Tim Ponseti, TVA, Guest	Mark Ringhuasen, Old Dominion, Guest
Steve Rueckert, WECC, Guest	Joe Seabrook, Puget, Guest	Jonathon Sykes, SRP, Guest
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

Yury Tsimberg has received permission from his new employer to remain active with the SDT as an observer.

Charles Lawrence, ATC, is a new observer, taking the place of Hari Singh who left ATC. Hari is now with Georgia Transmission and has received permission to remain as an observer.

Julius Horvath, LCRA, will become an observer following the meeting.

Paul Rocha will be leaving the group shortly due to the press of his duties at CenterPoint. Julius has petitioned the SC to take Paul's place on the SC.

Chavdar Ivanov of UCTE in Brussels, Belgium has joined the group as an observer.

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

No requirements are to be written or revised at this meeting. The roadmap document has been submitted to NERC staff but it will not be reviewed until they receive the comment response form. That is being held up due to problems with the SDT responses to question 43 comments.

2. Report on PC Workshop — John Odom

There were 60 people in attendance at the workshop in Toronto. John gave a PowerPoint presentation to the group and answered questions afterward. The workshop lasted about 3 hours. Doug, Dana, Ray, and Yury were in attendance. The PowerPoint was previously sent out to the SDT via the mail server.

John raised seven issues to the workshop attendees where the SDT is seeking guidance from industry. All seven will be represented in the next question set but John was trying to raise awareness of the main issues and prepare people to look for the questions.

Questions were raised by the audience. Answers were provided but the audience was reminded that all comments must be submitted through the official response process for the SDT to take any possible actions on them.

The file 'tpl_workshop_issues_20080603' contains the questions and issues and was mailed to the plus list during the meeting.

The need for a high level white paper was brought up in the workshop.

John received positive feedback from the attendees and encourages all SDT members to try to have small workshops in their respective regions.

3. Review 693 Issues Matrix

The issues matrix, with the comments from the meeting with FERC staff, was reviewed:

- Item 2 — SDT still needs to review the more stringent criteria survey and make changes to the requirements as appropriate.
- Item 20 — This is seen as a timing issue with the Generator Verification Project where this item really should be handled. However, the SDT may need to fill the gap until PRC-024 is revised by that group. The TP should

only be relying on generators that can realistically be expected to ride through the events.

- Changes to R3.5 were made after the staff review and could raise concerns, specifically with regard to footnote 'c' in TPL-002-0.
- FERC staff would like to see this matrix included in the eventual TPL filing.
- Treatment of conditional firm transfers is still seen as an issue that needs to be addressed in this standard.

4. Assign VRF and Time Horizon

Bob Millard provided an overview of VRFs, Time Horizons, and VSLs. The definitions were included in the supplemental SAR. However, a discrepancy was discovered in the Lower VRF definition. The supplemental SAR contained the following definition of Lower Risk Requirement:

“A requirement that, if violated, would not be expected to adversely affect the electrical state or capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the bulk electric system. A requirement that is administrative in nature; or a requirement in a planning time frame that, if violated, would not, under the emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, be expected to adversely affect the electrical state or capability of the bulk electric system, or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the bulk electric system. A planning requirement that is administrative in nature.”

Bob Snow pointed out that this definition does not agree with what NERC filed with FERC in March 2007 or that was agreed to by FERC in their May ruling where the definition was:

“**Lower Risk Requirement:** is administrative in nature and (a) is a requirement that, if violated, would not be expected to affect the electrical state or capability of the Bulk-Power System, or the ability to effectively monitor and control the Bulk-Power System; or (b) is a requirement in a planning time frame that, if violated, would not, under the emergency, abnormal, or restorative conditions anticipated by the preparations, be expected to affect the electrical state or capability of the Bulk-Power System, or the ability to effectively monitor, control, or restore the Bulk-Power System.”

The definition used in the filing is the one that should be utilized in determining the risk factor.

The SDT assigned initial risk factors to all of the requirements. They also assigned initial risk factors to each of the sub-requirements as an exercise to see if all of the sub-requirements could realistically take on the same risk factor as the main requirement. This exercise pointed out that there may be a need to re-format the requirements.

The SDT decided to post the current wording and format without VRFs or Time Horizons at this time so as not to delay the second posting any further. The issue of re-formatting will be taken up for the third posting. At that time the SDT must decide on one of three possible options:

1. Leave the format as it currently is
2. Re-format by promoting existing sub-requirements to main requirements.
3. Re-format in a different logical order.

As the SDT did not have examples of possible new formats, no question will be asked of industry on this matter.

5. Assign Measures

This item was postponed until the re-formatting issue is resolved.

6. Review Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack

Bernie reviewed the draft implementation plan that was mailed out to the SDT prior to the meeting. There is a fundamental question that must be resolved with regard to the plan: How far does the SDT have to go with transition? Does the responsibility end with the issuance of a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that is compliant with the new requirements or does the SDT need to go further and handle transition through the construction of any new facilities required to meet performance issues raised in the revised standard? Another key point is who will be found to be non-compliant if a CAP has been issued and another party (not the TP) backs out of an approved plan and the TP can no longer do anything to assure compliance with performance?

The sub-team's draft proposal had a general 18 month transition to complete the new study requirements but the SDT determined that 24 months may be needed in areas that require regulatory approval before changes can be made.

The plan needs more detail as to what was changed in P2 through P5 and then it may be better to tie the timeframes to the individual Px item.

One possible option to look at would be to tie transition to a modified peer review process where transition times would be mutually agreed upon with the maximum capped at 10 years. This would have the effect of placing a cap on construction timeframes that could then be used for future compliance determinations.

This sub-team was asked to revise the plan based on today's discussion and to mail the revision out prior to the Boston meeting.

Action Item — Bernie's sub-team will revise the implementation plan for the Boston meeting based on the Tempe meeting discussions.

7. Discuss Requirements for System Protection

Jonathon Sykes, SRP, and Chair of the SPCTF led this discussion:

- The use of the term ‘single component’ in P5 of the Steady State table may be a problem. There is a specific list of components provided in the PRC standards. However, the use of the capitalized glossary term ‘Protection Systems’ automatically brings that list into play as they are all listed in the glossary definition.
- There is a feeling that the current TPL-001-1 is less stringent than TPL-002-0 for Requirements R1.3.10 through R1.3.12.
 - R1.3.10: Does this include mis-operation? FERC staff believes that this is category ‘b’ while industry has been interpreting it as category ‘c’. Performance is the key. P5 covers category ‘c’ but the SDT believes that P2 covers this item.
 - R1.3.11: The SDT may not have covered all of the devices needed in TPL-001-1. It appears that this could be easily solved by adding to header statement 5.
 - R1.3.12: This is not covered in TPL-001-1. It needs to be included but only for those demand levels where the planned outages are in effect. This should include the entire BES.

A sub-team was formed to provide strawman solutions to these issues for review at the Boston meeting. The team is: Brian (lead), Tom Mielnik, Doug, and Charles.

Action Item — A sub-team of Brian (lead), Tom Mielnik, Doug, and Charles will provide strawman solutions to the system protection issues prior to the Boston meeting.

8. Define Planning Coordinator for Glossary

The Functional Model Working Group (FMWG) has decided to replace Planning Authority with Planning Coordinator. This is a simple name change only to correspond with the Reliability Coordinator title and will involve no new responsibilities or tasks. In order to keep the records straight, the SDT was requested to document this change in the TPL-001-1 roadmap so that the NERC Glossary can be revised following the approval of the standard. This change will be noted in the definitions section of the roadmap.

9. Next Meetings

- a. Conference call and WebEx on Thursday, July 17, 2008 from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. EDT. Details to follow. This call should be retained on the schedule for possible use to resolve any issues with question 43 responses and/or the second question set. Sub-teams have been formed to resolve those problems:

- 1) Bill, Tom Gentile, and Ed will work on question 43.
 - 2) Doug and Darrin will work on the 'preamble' to the question set.
- b. Face-to-face meeting on Tuesday, July 29, 2008 and Wednesday, July 30, 2008 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. EDT (both days) in Westborough, MA. Announcement has been sent out.
- c. Face-to-face meeting in Chattanooga, TN on Tuesday, August 26, 2008 and Wednesday, August 27, 2008 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. EDT (both days). Announcement will be sent out shortly.

Action Item — Bill, Tom Gentile, and Ed will work on resolving the problems with question 43. The due date is July 3, 2008.

Action Item — Doug and Darrin will create a 'preamble' for the second question set. The due date is July 3, 2008.

10. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this meeting:

- Bernie's sub-team will revise the implementation plan for the Boston meeting based on the Tempe meeting discussions.
- A sub-team of Brian (lead), Tom Mielnik, Doug, and Charles will provide strawman solutions to the system protection issues prior to the Boston meeting.
- Bill, Tom Gentile, and Ed will work on resolving the problems with the SDT responses to question 43 comments. The due date is July 3, 2008.
- Doug and Darrin will create a 'preamble' for the second question set. The due date is July 3, 2008.

The project is now approximately two months behind schedule.

11. Adjourn

The Chair thanked SRP for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m. PDT on Wednesday, June 25, 2008.