

## Conference Call Notes — Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

March 19, 2008

### 1. Administrative Items

#### a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at noon on Wednesday, March 19, 2008. Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Doug Hohlbaugh	Bob Jones
Tom Mielnik	Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair
Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas
Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters	Bob Williams
Tom Gentile, Observer	Daniela Hammons, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer
Kevin Thundiyil, FERC, Guest	Steve Rueckert, WECC, Guest	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC

#### b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

#### c. Conference Call Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

This conference call was mainly intended as a progress report to judge where the SDT is with regard to finishing the work for the second posting. Several new items were added to the agenda as Item #2.

### 2. Miscellaneous Topics — John Odom

#### a. Meeting with FERC Staff

John and Ed will meet with FERC staff in Washington, DC on Monday, April 14, 2008 just prior to the SDT meeting to discuss the revisions to the TPL standards.

#### b. NERC PC Workshop

The NERC PC has approved the concept of a ½ day workshop in conjunction with their next meeting in Toronto, Ontario, Canada in June. John Odom will

make the presentation. There will be no dial-in or WebEx facilities available. This will be an open meeting but it will not be advertised separately from the PC meeting. It will be coordinated with the SC. It is not intended to replace any industry wide workshop such as has been discussed within the SDT. That concept still needs to be brought before the SC for their approval.

**c. More Stringent Criteria Survey**

In FERC Order 693, NERC was asked to conduct a survey of planning practices in North America. The idea was to try to identify any criteria for planning that was more stringent than the current standards and then to incorporate those more stringent criteria into the revised planning standards through the approved standards process. The survey has been completed. John Odom and the FRCC staff are developing a matrix for use by the SDT in reviewing these criteria. He expects to have it distributed to the SDT no later than March 24<sup>th</sup>. The SDT will need to review the material for detailed discussion in Washington to see if the standard needs to raise the bar to any of these more stringent planning criteria.

**Action Item** — John Odom to distribute the more stringent planning criteria matrix to the SDT no later than March 24<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Item** — The SDT is to review the more stringent planning criteria for detailed discussions in Washington as to whether any of them need to be included in the revised planning standards.

**d. Additional Comment**

An additional set of comments on the first posting has been unearthed by NERC staff following a complaint from the commenter that he couldn't see his comments in the list on the web. These comments will need to be addressed as part of the normal process. Ed will distribute the raw comments to the mail server and the individual sub-teams will pull out their assigned pieces for action.

**Action Item** — Ed will distribute the found comment form for action by the sub-teams as part of their responses.

**e. Functional Model Changes**

The FMWG is proposing changes to the FM that would eliminate the PC and move those responsibilities to the TP. Ed will distribute the link for the revised FM to the SDT so that they can review it to decide if the SDT should submit official comments as a group. John will distribute draft comments for SDT consideration. The deadline for comments is April 4<sup>th</sup>. There will be a conference call and WebEx scheduled to discuss the matter (see Item #7a). R5 may need to change due to the changes in the FM.

**Action Item** — Ed will send the link to the revised FM to the SDT.

**Action Item** — John will distribute a draft set of comments on the FM to the SDT.

**Action Item** — The SDT should study the FM changes and the draft comments in preparation for a conference call on this topic (see Item #7a).

**f. Bifurcation Approach**

The bifurcation approach is not acceptable to NERC management for a continent wide standard. WECC has been notified that they will need to pursue a regional difference through their approved standards process. Bob Millard pointed out that page 27 of the Guidelines contains a reference to this type of action. The concept of grandfathering is not seen as a problem per se but there should be some reporting requirements relating to RAS/SPS. The SDT may want to re-think how R3.5 and R4.5 will be worded going forward due to this change. This will be discussed in detail in Washington. Tom Mielnik pointed out that he is authoring a SAR in MRO addressing this topic.

**g. Shelf Life**

Bob Millard sent out draft wording for a revised R2.6 on the topic of ‘shelf life’. The SDT decided to set shelf life at 5 years for all cases except plant stability that will be indefinite. Bob will re-write the requirement.

**Action Item** — Bob Millard will revise the R2.6 wording based on today’s conference call.

**3. Review Results of VRF Poll — John Odom**

The SDT reviewed the results of the VRF poll as distributed by Bob Pierce which discounted the ‘E’ ratings.

Chifong fixed a typo in her response — R2.1 should have been ‘M’ and R2.2 should have been ‘L’. This did not change the relative scoring.

The indication from the poll is that the requirements are grouped correctly for R1, R3, and R4. Only R2 shows any differences and they are relatively minor. That leads to the conclusion that the present groupings of requirements and sub-requirements can still be utilized for the second posting so as not to lead to any confusion. The actual assignment of VRF is still to be done and applying measures and/or VSL may still lead the SDT to pull out certain sub-requirements and make them full requirements. However, that can be done in the third posting.

The review pointed out that R3.5 and R4.5 are probably worded incorrectly as they were rated as 'E' by a majority of the SDT members. It seems incongruous that such an important detail with all of the resulting discussion could be an 'E' statement.

#### **4. Review Action Item Progress**

- a.** Inclusion of MOD and TPL tie statement in background information for second question set — Paul Rocha

This material was distributed by Daniela.

- b.** Revised R1 — Paul Rocha

This material was distributed by Daniela.

- c.** Revised question set for second posting — Paul Rocha

This material was distributed by Daniela.

- d.** Sensitivity and CAP wording changes — Bob Millard

This material was distributed by Bob Millard.

- e.** Rewording of R3.3.2.2, R3.5/3.6, and R4.5/4.6 — Bernie Pasternack

This material was distributed by Bernie.

R3.3.2.2 is still causing some confusion within the SDT. The second posting will go out with this wording but split into three separate requirements. The SDT may ask a question on this topic in an attempt to gain some clarity.

R3.6 and R4.6 will be eliminated (see Item #2f). R3.5 and R4.5 will be written for North America as a whole. More discussion on this wording will take place in Washington.

- f.** WECC review of revised R3.6/4.6 — Brian Keel

This is now a moot point.

- g.** Performance tables — Doug Hohlbaugh

This material was distributed by Doug. The SDT should review it and distribute comments via the mail server so that it can be finalized in Washington.

**Action Item** — The SDT will review and comment on the revised performance tables via the mail server so that the tables can be finalized in Washington.

- h.** Bus-tie breaker definition — Doug Hohlbaugh

This material was distributed by Doug in Tampa.

**i.** Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack

A revised Implementation Plan was distributed by Bernie.

**j.** Aggregation of Q43 responses — Daniela Hammons

This can only be accomplished after item 4k is completed. In the meantime, Daniela will check to make sure that there are draft responses for all q43 items.

**Action Item** — Daniela will check to make sure that there are draft responses for all q43 items.

**k.** Review of comment responses — Sub-team leaders

This task can't be completed until after there is an agreed upon second posting text. It will be taken up post-Washington.

**5. Issues Matrix — John Odom**

The update provided by Bill Harm was used as the basis for this discussion. John pointed out 3 major areas of concern:

- Row #2 refers to the more stringent planning criteria (see Item #2c). As such, this cannot be marked as complete until after the review in Washington.
- Row #21 refers to NRC suggestions being incorporated (see also row #30): It is not clear that the SDT has this covered in the standard. More research is required. Bob Williams will look into this matter and provide suitable wording for inclusion in the matrix resolution column.
- Row #28 refers to proxies for defining the simulation of cascading outages: This is not currently covered in the standard. If R5 was adjusted to address peer review in a more complete manner (see row #12) then some of these problems might go away. However, the SDT felt that the proxy issue needs to be explicitly handled within the standard and that R5 needs to be tightened up. Bernie will provide draft wording on the proxy issue. Bob Pierce will re-draft R5.

In order to complete the work on the matrix which is needed before the meeting with FERC staff, a second posting document needs to be compiled. Ed will do this based on the submittals to date and supply it by the end of the week.

In general, each resolution must point to a specific requirement in the text. 'Complete' and 'Included' are not sufficient. Dana will look at all of the provided responses and check them for wording and accuracy.

The SDT is to review the issues matrix and distribute comments through the mail server such that this document can be finalized by April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Item** — Ed will supply a second posting document incorporating the distributed changes that have been made.

**Action Item** — Bob Williams will research the NRC issues in row #21 and row #30 of the issues matrix and provide draft responses. The deadline is March 31<sup>st</sup>.

**Action Item** — Dana will review the issues matrix for completeness and accuracy by March 31<sup>st</sup>.

**Action Item** — The SDT will review the issues matrix and provide comments such that the document can be finalized no later than April 8<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Item** — Bernie will provide draft wording for a requirement on defining how cascading outages, voltage instability, and uncontrolled islanding are to be handled in simulations.

**Action Item** — Bob Pierce will draft a revision of R5 emphasizing true peer review.

## **6. Conditional Firm Transfers — John Odom**

Due to time constraints, this topic was not discussed. It will be carried over to the Washington agenda.

## **7. Next Meetings**

- a.** Conference call and WebEx — Wednesday, March 26, 2008 from 11 a.m.–2 p.m. EDT. The call will be led by John. The topic is the FM comments. If SDT members can't make the call, they are encouraged to send in comments through the mail server. Details on the call will be supplied at a later date.
- b.** John and Ed will meet with FERC staff on Monday, April 14, 2008 from 1 p.m.–4 p.m. EDT at the FERC offices in Washington, DC.
- c.** Face-to-face meeting in Washington, DC on Tuesday, April 15, 2008 from 8 a.m. EDT through Thursday, April 17, 2008 at noon EDT. Please be prepared to attend the entire meeting.
- d.** Conference call and WebEx — Monday, April 28, 2008 from noon–4 p.m. EDT. Details will be supplied at a later date.
- e.** Conference call and WebEx — Monday, May 5, 2008 from noon–4 p.m. EDT. Details will be supplied at a later date.

## **8. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action items were developed during this conference call:

- John Odom to distribute the more stringent planning criteria matrix to the SDT no later than March 24<sup>th</sup>.
- The SDT is to review the more stringent planning criteria for detailed discussions in Washington as to whether any of them need to be included in the revised planning standards.
- Ed will distribute the found comment form for action by the sub-teams as part of their responses.
- Ed will send the link to the revised FM to the SDT.
- John will distribute a draft set of comments on the FM to the SDT.
- The SDT should study the FM changes and the draft comments in preparation for a conference call on this topic (see Item #7a).
- Ed will supply a second posting document incorporating the distributed changes that have been made.
- Bob Williams will research the NRC issues in row #21 and row #30 of the issues matrix and provide draft responses. The deadline is March 31<sup>st</sup>.
- Dana will review the issues matrix for completeness and accuracy by March 31<sup>st</sup>.
- The SDT will review the issues matrix and provide comments such that the document can be finalized no later than April 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Bernie will provide draft wording for a requirement on defining how cascading outages, voltage instability, and uncontrolled islanding are to be handled in simulations.
- Bob Pierce will draft a revision of R5 emphasizing true peer review.
- The SDT will review and comment on the revised performance tables via the mail server so that the tables can be finalized in Washington.
- Daniela will check to make sure that there are draft responses for all q43 items.
- Bob Millard will revise the R2.6 wording based on today's conference call.

This project continues to lag the schedule by several months.

## **9. Adjourn**

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