

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

March 27, 2007

Conference Call Notes

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

John Odom, Chair, called the session to order at 1300. Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Tom Gentile	Bob Jones
John Odom, Chair	Bob Millard, Vice Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Bob Snow	Chifong Thomas
Yuri Tsimberg	Jim Useldinger	Bob Williams
Bill Harm (observer)	Doug Powell (observer)	Hari Singh (observer)
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

There were no questions on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — John Odom

The primary objective of this call was to finalize the responses to the Supplemental SAR comments and any subsequent required to the SAR itself as a result of those comments and responses.

2. Review Draft Responses to Supplemental SAR Comments — John Odom

The team reviewed the draft responses and made changes through the WebEx capability. The red-lined version of the comment response form is included with these call notes as **Attachment A**.

Several errors were pointed out in the basic form itself that need to be corrected prior to posting:

- The count of individual respondents needs to be checked.
- It was pointed out that an individuals name can appear twice if they submitted comments as both an individual and as part of a larger group.
- The group footnote at the end of the table of respondents should be corrected.

- The actual questions in the index are incorrect.

There was considerable discussion as to how to include directives handed down in the FERC Final Order in the SAR and whether the existing words included enough flexibility to include the Order as they stood. This issue is common to all drafting teams and was not resolved during the call. John Odom will address this issue off-line with Linda Campbell, chair of the Standards Committee, and Maureen Long, NERC Standards Process Manager. Their opinions will be forwarded to the team for discussion in Houston.

AI – John Odom to develop a proposed resolution with input from Linda Campbell and Maureen Long to address the inclusion of directions from the FERC Final Order in the SAR prior to the Houston meeting.

Based on a review of the comments and the proposed responses, the team determined that no changes were necessary to the Supplemental SAR except a potential change to incorporate the FERC directives that have been issued subsequent to the first draft of the SAR and any others that may come. There was also a great deal of discussion as to the need for re-posting the Supplemental SAR if new wording addressing the FERC Final Order is included. Did this represent a scope change that would necessitate a reposting according to the Standards Development Procedure? In general, the feeling was that the directives from FERC were covered in the existing SARs and a reposting should not be required although the final determination on this matter will await the answer on the wording issue above.

3. Review Sub-team Progress on Assignments for the Houston Meeting — Sub-team Chairs

Several of the teams have not been able to set up conference calls and are now working through e-mail to complete their assignments. John Odom reminded all of the teams that they must have a report for the group in Houston.

4. Review Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

We are maintaining our estimated schedule to date but a major push will be needed to keep on schedule for the initial posting in May.

The following action items were generated at this meeting:

- John to develop a proposed resolution with input from Linda and Maureen to address the inclusion of directions from the FERC Final Order in the SAR prior to the Houston meeting.
- TIS members are to send in their availability for the 4/16 conference call.

5. Schedule Next Meetings

- a. Wednesday, April 4, 2007 starting at 0800 CDT through Thursday, April 5, 2007 at 1700 CDT at CenterPoint Energy in Houston, Texas: CenterPoint will provide a continental breakfast both days and NERC will provide lunch for attendees. The focus of this meeting will be to clean up the requirements wording and Table 1. To ease the check-in burden for our hosts, the group should assemble in the lobby of the Courtyard at 0745 CDT and walk over together.

- b.** Monday, April 16, 2007 — Conference Call and WebEx from 1300 to 1600 EDT: call-in information will be provided. There is a problem with travel of several team members to a TIS Meeting in San Antonio the following day. We may have to reschedule this call for a different time on the same date.
- c.** Wednesday, April 25, 2007 starting at 1300 CDT and running through Friday, April 27, 2007 ending at noon CDT: Chicago O'Hare Hilton following the TADS Meeting
- d.** Wednesday, May 2, 2007 — Conference Call from 1100 to 1400 EDT: call-in information will be provided (tentative – if required)
- e.** July 18th and 19th in San Francisco, California, hosted by PG&E. Hotel information will be forwarded. There is no block of rooms set aside at any of the cited hotels. You should make your reservations as early as possible remembering to ask for the PG&E rate.

6. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 1530.

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

The Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR Drafting Team thanks all commenters who submitted comments on the Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR. This SAR was posted for a 30-day public comment period from February 15 through March 16, 2007. The requesters asked stakeholders to provide feedback on the standard through a special standard Comment Form. There were 6 sets of comments, including comments from 43 different people from more than 18 companies or organizations representing 8 of the 10 Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

Deleted: more than

Deleted: 8

Based on the comments received, the drafting team is recommending that the Standards Committee approve the Supplemental SAR to be moved forward to the standards drafting stage of the process.

In this "Consideration of Comments" document stakeholder comments have been organized so that it is easier to see the responses associated with each question. All comments received on the standards can be viewed in their original format at:

<http://www.nerc.com/~filez/standards/Assess-Transmission-Future-Needs.html>

If you feel that your comment has been overlooked, please let us know immediately. Our goal is to give every comment serious consideration in this process! If you feel there has been an error or omission, you can contact the Director of Standards, Gerry Adamski, at 609-452-8060 or at gerry.adamski@nerc.net. In addition, there is a NERC Reliability Standards Appeals Process.¹

¹ The appeals process is in the Reliability Standards Development Procedures: <http://www.nerc.com/standards/newstandardsprocess.html>.

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

The Industry Segments are:

- 1 — Transmission Owners
- 2 — RTOs, ISOs
- 3 — Load-serving Entities
- 4 — Transmission-dependent Utilities
- 5 — Electric Generators
- 6 — Electricity Brokers, Aggregators, and Marketers
- 7 — Large Electricity End Users
- 8 — Small Electricity End Users
- 9 — Federal, State, Provincial Regulatory or other Government Entities
- 10 — Regional Reliability Organizations, Regional Entities

	Commenter	Organization	Industry Segment											
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1.	Eric Mortenson	Exelon												
2.	Mark Ringhausen	Old Dominion Electric Coop.				✓								
3.	James H. Sorrels, Jr.	AEP	✓				✓	✓						
4.	Steve Myers	ERCOT		✓										
5.	Roger Champagne	HQT	✓											
6.	Ron Falsetti	IESO		✓										
7.	Kathleen Goodman	ISO New England		✓										
8.	Brian Thumm	ITC Transmission	✓											
9.	Michael Gammon	KCPL	✓											
10.	Ron Mazur	Manitoba Hydro	✓		✓		✓	✓						
11.	Jason Marshall	MISO		✓										
12.	Jim Cyrulewski	JDRJC Associates								✓				
13.	David Rudolph	MRO												✓
14.	Neal Balu	MRO												✓
15.	Terry Bilke	MRO												✓
16.	Al Boesch	MRO												✓
17.	Robert Coish, Chair	MRO												✓
18.	Carol Gerou	MRO												✓
19.	Ken Goldsmith	MRO												✓
20.	Todd Gosnell	MRO												✓
21.	Jim Haigh	MRO												✓
22.	Pam Oreschnik	MRO												✓
23.	Dick Pursley	MRO												✓
24.	Dave Rudolph	MRO												✓
25.	Eric Ruskamp	MRO												✓
26.	Mike Brytowski,	MRO												✓

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

	Commenter	Organization	Industry Segment											
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
	Secretary													
27.	Guy V. Zito	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
28.	Ralph Rufrano	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
29.	Ed Thompson	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
30.	Al Adamson	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
31.	Kathleen Goodman	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
32.	Roger Champagne	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
33.	Ron Falsetti	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
34.	Murale Gopinathan	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
35.	Greg Campoli	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
36.	Randy Macdonald	NPCC CP9 Working Group												✓
37.	Michael Calimano	NYISO		✓										
38.	Linda Brown	San Diego Gas and Electric	✓											
39.	Charles Yeung	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
40.	Alicia Daugherty	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
41.	Mike Calamino	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
42.	Ron Falsetti	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
43.	Matt Goldberg	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
44.	Brent Kingsford	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
45.	Anita Lee	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
46.	Steve Myers	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										
47.	William Phillips	IRC Standards Review Committee		✓										

Index to Questions, Comments, and Responses

1. Do you believe that there is a reliability-related need to provide additional detail, including specific issues for consideration, to the requirements in this set of standards as proposed in this supplemental SAR?..... 5

2. Do you agree with the expanded scope of the proposed project as set forth in this supplemental SAR? (The scope includes all the items noted on the “Standard Review Forms” attached to the SAR as well as other improvements to the standards that meet the consensus of stakeholders, consistent with establishing high-quality, enforceable, and technically sufficient bulk power system reliability standards. Please consider these items as non-mandatory and only for consideration by the drafting team.) 8

3. Do you think that there are any additional revisions that should be incorporated into this set of standards, beyond those that have already been identified in the April 30, 2006 version of the original SAR and this supplemental SAR? 12

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

1. Do you believe that there is a reliability-related need to provide additional detail, including specific issues for consideration, to the requirements in this set of standards as proposed in this supplemental SAR?

Formatted: Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.01" + Tab after: 0.26" + Indent at: 0.26"

Summary Consideration: All respondents agreed with the statement. The affirmative responses that included comments mainly dealt with procedural issues as opposed to content. The SAR DT believes that we have answered those concerns in the provided responses.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Question #1			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
Exelon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<p>I believe that most of the additional information contained in the draft 'supplemental' SAR is valuable and will assist the SDT in addressing the various stakeholder concerns. I am concerned with conflicting information addressed below.</p> <p>I am not familiar with the concept of a supplemental SAR and am not sure if there are going to be two SARs now, or if this new effort supercedes the existing SAR. This is especially a concern when there appear to be differences between them regarding functional applicabilities and principles, as well as the expansion of scope.</p> <p>I understand the Standards Development Procedure to require the original SAR to be modified, when it states, "If the standard drafting team determines it is necessary to expand the scope of the standard ot to modify the scope in a way that is no longer consistent with the scope defined in the SAR, then the drafting team may initiate or recommend another requestor initiate a new SAR (Step 1) to develop the expanded or modified scope. At no time will a drafting team develop a standard that is not within the scope of the SAR that was authorized for development."</p>
<p>Response: The SDT recognized that the scope of the original SAR needed to be broadened to encompass changes in the industry since the approval of the original SAR. We decided to use the concept of a supplement rather than completely re-writing the original SAR. These are not intended to be two distinct SARs. The Supplemental SAR is intended to be a true supplement to the original SAR in every sense of the word.</p>			
ODEC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<p>The planning of the transmission system is critical to the reliability of the transmission system. Additional details provided to all stakeholders are crucial to ensure that transmission is built in a timley manner to protect the reliability of the system. Also, by making the process and information available to all stakeholders, you ensure that everyone's interest is heard in the process and not just the large transmission owner/operators, but all users of the transmission system. The assumptions used in the evaluation process must be vetted by all stakeholders as they are the critical drivers on what transmission is needed and when it is needed.</p>
<p>Response: Stakeholders will receive their opportunity to vet the process during comment and balloting of the standards.</p>			

Deleted: was

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: ,

Deleted: i.e., anything that is covered in the original SAR is included by default in the supplement and vice versa.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #1			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		I recommend that you clarify that these lists of items in Appendix B are topics to consider, not topics that must be included. Also, I recommend that any standards requirements that are evident as Good Utility Practice or procedural in nature be retired as requirements, but retained in the form of reference documents, operating guidelines, or some other similar form that will be available to any industry participant that wishes to use them.
<p>Response: <u>The following excerpt is from point #3 of the Supplemental SAR Purpose Statement – "...consider the items mentioned in the Technical Issues Lists prepared by the NERC staff..." (emphasis added). The intent was always to consider the issues and not to make them necessarily mandatory changes. The comment on good utility practice <u>and procedural requirements will be passed on to the SDT. Please note that Appendix B as it was included in the Supplemental SAR was prior to the final FERC Order. Directions included with that Order must be specifically addressed in the standards drafting process.</u></u></p>			
MISO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<p>As the standards are written now, all of the requirements apply to both the Transmission Planner and Planning Authority. The NERC Functional Model Version 3 replaced the Planning Authority with the Planning Coordinator . The standards should reflect this change as well as the division of responsibilities between Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator in the functional model.</p> <p>Additionally, they should seek to clarify the relationship between Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator. How many transmission planners can their be per Planning Coordinator. Can there be overlapping Planning Coordinators?</p>
<p>Response: <u>Functional Model v3 will be used as the reference. Your comment and questions will be passed on to the SDT.</u></p>			
ITC Transmission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The original SAR did a good job of capturing many of the reliability improvements necessary to the TPL Standards. Now that additional information is available from the various stakeholder groups and drafting teams, it is clear that additional reliability-related improvements to the Standards can be made. It is not clear how to quantify the additional improvement the supplemental SAR will make to the existing Standard Drafting effort, but certainly there are additional reliability improvements to be made to each of the subject Standards.
Manitoba Hydro	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Manitoba Hydro believes the planning standards should ensure that complete and consistent assessments are conducted by the responsible entities.
AEP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
HQT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IESO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #1			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
ISO New England	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
KCPL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
MRO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
NPCC CP9 Working Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
NYISO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
San Diego Gas & Electric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IRC Standards Review Committee	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

2. Do you agree with the expanded scope of the proposed project as set forth in this supplemental SAR? (The scope includes all the items noted on the “Standard Review Forms” attached to the SAR as well as other improvements to the standards that meet the consensus of stakeholders, consistent with establishing high-quality, enforceable, and technically sufficient bulk power system reliability standards. Please consider these items as non-mandatory and only for consideration by the drafting team.)

Summary Consideration: The majority of respondents agreed to the proposition. The negative opinions ranged from procedural matters to items, items that dealt with providing the SDT with sufficient flexibility to do their job or items that are more appropriately addressed at the standards drafting stage. The SAR DT believes that we have addressed their concerns in the responses provided.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Question #2			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
Exelon		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The approved SAR is of type 'New Standard' while the supplemental SAR type is not, but rather, 'Revision to existing Standards' as well as, 'Withdraw of existing Standard (possible)'.</p> <p>Regarding the Reliability Function Applicabilities, the supplemental SAR does not include the Reliability Authority or the Planning Authority which were included in the approved SAR, and the supplemental SAR includes the Resource Planner and Generation Owner functions, which are not included in the approved SAR. I believe that the Planning Authority needs to be addressed in terms of the FERC NOPR discussion, summarized on pages B3 and B4 of the supplemental SAR.</p> <p>The supplemental SAR includes item 7 in the Applicable Reliability Principles, while the approved SAR does not.</p> <p>If there are going to be two SARs then I believe that the supplemental SAR should include the previously approved SAR in the 'Related SARs' section on page 7.</p> <p>The concise summaries of the Version 0 Industry comments are appreciated, but these should be made more clear in that these will probably become key to any actual changes to planning contingencies. For example, it is not clear what, 'Address deliverability of generation to load' means. Also, does, 'Don't include generation runback or redispatch' mean that this shouldn't be addressed or that the standard should be worded to specifically not include them. Other terms such as, 'Don't include planning outage', and 'single terminals are not included' should also be more thoroughly described.</p>

Deleted: **The Supplemental SAR was intended to be a true supplement to the original SAR in every sense of the word, i.e., anything that is covered in the original SAR is included by default in the supplement and vice versa.**

Response: The SDT recognized that the scope of the original SAR needed to be broadened to encompass changes in the

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #2			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
<p><u>industry since the approval of the original SAR. We decided to use the concept of a supplement rather than completely re-writing the original SAR. These are not intended to be two distinct SARs. The Supplemental SAR is intended to be a true supplement to the original SAR in every sense of the word. The full text of all comments referenced in the Supplemental SAR Appendix B has been made available to the SDT so that there should be no confusion as to the intent or meaning of the comment.</u></p>			
ODEC		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	These are transmission planning standards and as such, should only apply to TPs, not RP, TO and GO entities. Certainly, information must be provided from the TOs and GOs on their facilities to be able to run the planning studies, but the MOd standards should cover this obligation. And RC are operating entities and not planning entities.
ISO New England		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We do not support a long-term planning standards applying to RCs. The NERC functional model is very clear that RCs are operational entities. Is the intent to replace RRO with RC for the fill-in-the-blank standards? That would be an inappropriate solution. A more appropriate solution would be to consider replacing the RRO with the planning coordinator.</p> <p>We also do not understand how a transmission planning standard could apply to the additional functional entities: Transmission Owner and Generator Owner.</p>
MISO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	We do not support a long-term planning standards applying to RCs. The NERC functional model is very clear that RCs are operational entities. Is the intent to replace RRO with RC for the fill-in-the-blank standards? That would be an inappropriate solution. A more appropriate solution would be to consider replacing the RRO with the planning coordinator.
NYISO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	It is unclear as to what obligations the RC, TO, and GO would have in a long-term planning standard. The NERC functional model is very clear that RCs are operational entities. The RC, TO, GO ,should not have a direct obligation in the process, but should be a resource for input into the process.
IRC Standards Review Committee		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>We do not support a long-term planning standards applying to RCs. The NERC functional model is very clear that RCs are operational entities. Is the intent to replace RRO with RC for the fill-in-the-blank standards? That would be an inappropriate solution. A more appropriate solution would be to consider replacing the RRO with the planning coordinator.</p> <p>We also do not understand how a transmission planning standard could apply to the</p>

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #2			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
			additional functional entities: Transmission Owner and Generator Owner.
<p><u>Response:</u> The SAR DT felt that the TO & GO could potentially provide data that could come into play for some of the requirements in TPL-005 & 006. The SAR DT wanted to provide maximum flexibility to the SDT so these entities as well as the RC were included. However they are only for consideration and not mandatory. Your comments will be passed on to the SDT.</p>			
ITC Transmission		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Standard Drafting Teams should not be responding so heavily to comments made by FERC in a NOPR. The NOPR is just that ... "Proposed." There may be additional changes required as a result of the final Rule. The final Rule may even negate some of the proposed changes made in the NOPR. If the drafting team thinks that FERC hit on a good idea for improvement, then it would be appropriate for inclusion in the Standard, but simply to make changes to a Standard because an idea surfaced in a Proposed Rule is premature.
<p><u>Response:</u> The following excerpt is from point #3 of the Supplemental SAR Purpose Statement – "...consider the items mentioned in the Technical Issues Lists prepared by the NERC staff..." (emphasis added). The intent was always to consider the issues and not to make them necessarily mandatory changes. Directions included with the FERC Final Order must be specifically addressed in the standards drafting process.</p>			
AEP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Considering the current scope, the Std DT should be encouraged to consider a major re-write of TPL-001 thru TPL-006, possibly including a restructuring into a single standard rather than the present multiple standards.
<p><u>Response:</u> We agree with the general concept and the SDT will be provided with this option.</p>			
Manitoba Hydro	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Manitoba Hydro agrees in principle with the expanded scope, but believes that this scope should be a part of the Standards Development Procedures manual so all stakeholders have a voice in the requirements in Appendix A. We have some concern that the SAR gives the drafting team the power to add additional improvements beyond the SAR as this provides an opportunity for SDT members to forward specific owner agendas.
<p><u>Response:</u> The material in Appendix A is excerpted from the Reliability Standards Development Work Plan 2007 – 2009 that was reviewed and approved by the Standards Committee. As stated, it represents general guidelines and not mandatory changes for the revision of existing standards. Stakeholders will receive their opportunity to vet the process during comment and balloting of the standards.</p>			
ERCOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Please also see my response to Question #1.
HQT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IESO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
KCPL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: The following excerpt is from point #3 of the Supplemental SAR Purpose Statement – "...consider the items mentioned in the Technical Issues Lists prepared by the NERC staff..." (emphasis added). The intent was always to consider the issues and not to make them necessarily mandatory changes.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #2			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
MRO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
NPCC CP9 Working Group	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
San Diego Gas & Electric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

3. Do you think that there are any additional revisions that should be incorporated into this set of standards, beyond those that have already been identified in the April 30, 2006 version of the original SAR and this supplemental SAR?

Summary Consideration: Only two respondents suggested revisions. In both cases the comments are more appropriately addressed at the standards drafting stage. The SAR DT believes that we have satisfactorily addressed the expressed concerns with the provided responses.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Question #3			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
Manitoba Hydro	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		The SAR should considering adding a requirements to the standards to mandate tests for robustness by doing sensitivity to critical system parameters such as load growth rate, load power factor, etc., to provide insight into the margin between the operating point and unacceptable performance. There should also be a specific requirement to assess reactive power adequacy, voltage stability and system damping.
<p>Response: <u>The SAR DT is aware of the interest in these items. The scope of both the original and supplemental SARs allows these items to be incorporated in the standards drafting process. We will pass your comments on to the SDT.</u></p>			
San Diego Gas & Electric	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<p>SDG&E believes that there are additional revisions that need to be incorporated into this set of standards.</p> <p>The Supplemental SAR dated January 17, 2007, has an Appendix B that summarizes issues to be resolved in this new set of standards. Those issues are a collection of comments from FERC NOPR, FERC Staff Report, Industrial comments on version 0, Phase III/IV, etc.</p> <p>In order to develop a set of reliability standards for transmission planners, SDG&E believes there are a few more issues to be addressed and/or clarified in this set of standards.</p> <p>1. Critical System Conditions These "Critical System Conditions" are referring to system conditions to be studied for the transmission planning. Typically, entities deem several system conditions as critical on the basis of accumulative institutional knowledge.</p> <p>However, in recent FERC NOPR, FERC directs industry to conduct sensitivity studies to identify these critical system conditions and document the sensitivity studies. The sensitivity factors in FERC's direction include load power factors, generation</p>

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: in sensitivity studies

Deleted: and will

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #3			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
			<p>retirements, generation dispatch, transaction patterns, controllable loads, demand side management, transmission outages.</p> <p>As those will result in extensive scope of study, we would like to see this set of standards clearly answer following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How often do we required to perform such sensitivity studies to identify critical system conditions? b. Do we check those sensitivity factors one by one to find the worst, or do we define the worst combination as the critical? Or c. Do we continue to leave the "critical system conditions" determination to study performer's discretion? <p>2. Contingencies In Appendix B of the latest Supplementary SAR for TPL standards, comments and modification requests were summarized. Contingencies for planning studies is one of critical elements. This can be split into three issues and SDG&E provides following comments for each of them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Study all contingencies One of the comments suggests to study "all contingencies". Clearly, "All contingencies" need to be clarified. The additional workload incurred due to the dismissal of planners' accumulative institutional knowledge may be unreasonable. b. Study non-common mode contingencies The issue regarding reasonable workload also applies to the "non-common mode" contingencies. The non-common mode refers to combination of unrelated elements, say one 230 kV line in CFE (Mexico) and other 230 kV line in Alberta, Canada, as one contingency. This too needs clarification. c. Study event-based contingencies Evaluating the impact of "event-based" contingencies makes sense. However, translating an event, such as an earthquake, into a list of elements to be taken out for power flow and stability computer simulation, will need clear guidelines. <p>3. "Identification of options for reducing the probability or impacts of extreme events that cause cascading" This is a direct quote of FERC's directed modification in its NOPR.</p>

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #3			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
			<p>a. If the impacts only need to be identified with conceptual methods, how do we maintain "consistency" among entities?</p> <p>b. If FERC intends to request the entities to identify the probability/impacts with quantitative methods, then there is a long list of issues to be addressed before a transmission planner could in reality perform such an analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to define "cascading" in system simulation analysis. • Reasonable and feasible probabilistic variables need to be defined. For instance, in addition to the equipment failure as probabilistic variable, other probabilistic variables need to be considered to meet FERC's direction, such as hurricanes, fires, earthquakes, lightening, flooding, landslides and even an airplane falling into a critical substation, and so on. • Regional efforts need to be taken to develop a probabilistic methodology and probabilistic database that can be applied uniformly so entities can be treated equally. • Regional efforts need to be taken to guide selection and/or development of probabilistic analysis software tools. Such tools have to be ready for transmission planners to use and derive quantified solutions.
<p>Response: <u>The following excerpt is from point #3 of the Supplemental SAR Purpose Statement – "...consider the items mentioned in the Technical Issues Lists prepared by the NERC staff..." (emphasis added). The intent was always to consider the issues and not to make them necessarily mandatory changes. Directions included with the FERC Final Order must be specifically addressed in the standards drafting process. The Supplemental SAR was intended to be a true supplement to the original SAR in every sense of the word. The SAR DT is aware of the interest in these items. The scope of both the original and supplemental SARs allows these items to be incorporated in the standards drafting process. We will pass your comments on to the SDT. We refer the commenter to the NERC web site for previous meeting notes and comments concerning related issues.</u></p>			
ODEC		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This should be more than enough to try to get into these transmission planning standards.
MISO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
MRO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
NPCC CP9 Working Group		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
NYISO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
IRC Standards Review		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: , i.e., anything that is covered in the original SAR is included by default in the supplement and vice versa

Deleted: Your comments will be passed to the SDT for consideration.

Consideration of Comments on Supplemental Assess Transmission Future Needs SAR

Question #3			
Commenter	Yes	No	Comment
Committee			
AEP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ERCOT		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
HQT		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
IESO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ISO New England		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
ITC Transmission		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
KCPL		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Exelon			None.