

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

March 16, 2007

Conference Call Notes

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The conference call was initiated by the Chair at 1120. The conference call participants were:

Bob Jones	Bob Millard (Vice Chair)	Darrin Church
Hari Singh (Observer)	John Odom (Chair)	Thomas Gentile
Thomas Mielnik	Bernie Pasternack	Doug Powell (Observer)
Bob Pierce	Bill Harm (Observer)	Bob Snow
Jim Useldinger	Anthony Jablonski (Observer)	Ed Dobrowolski (NERC)

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Copies of the Antitrust Compliance Guidelines have been distributed to the team. There were no questions.

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — John Odom

The objectives for the call were clearly outlined in the agenda and no questions were raised on this issue. However, several procedural questions were asked concerning the eventual standard:

- We do not have to submit a complete standard on the first iteration. Partial submittals are allowed.
- We can utilize the comment form to ask questions that express any minority opinions in the drafting of the standard language.
- We do need to include any new material generated by the FERC Final Ruling on Standards that was issued earlier this week. (Subsequent to the call, Bob Snow sent out a copy of the material in question.)

Bob Snow suggested that the FERC staff would like to meet with the drafting team at an appropriate time. This could be a face-to-face meeting or a conference call/WebEx. It could

be with the entire team or just a sub-set such as the chair and vice chair. If it is a face-to-face meeting, it could be held at the FERC Offices in Washington, DC.

2. Review Outline of Standard — John Odom

John Odom sent out a copy of the template for a standard for reference via e-mail prior to the call. It is included with these notes as **Attachment A**.

Mr. Odom stated that the team envisioned a single standard to replace TPL-001 through -004 and that he believes that we would have a 'section' for steady-state and a 'section' for dynamics. That concept is not set in stone however and won't be a force-fit. We will work on the requirements first and then go from there with whatever seems best.

It was mentioned that with the new applicability guidelines that we might want to crosscheck any applicability changes with the registration rules.

3. Develop Action Plan for Developing First Draft of Standard Requirements — John Odom

John Odom sent out a note containing his thoughts on the first draft via e-mail prior to the call. It is included with these notes as **Attachment B**.

The following items came out of the general discussion on the first draft of the standard:

- Each sub-team will provide a requirements statement(s) for its assigned items.
 - The entire SDT will then work together to merge these statements into a cohesive standard.
- Existing wording can be re-used if it is clear, concise and answers the sub-team points.
- All sub-teams should have a straw man available by the Houston meeting. Material should be made available to the SDT as a whole by March 30th in order to give people a chance to review it prior to the meeting.
- Each requirement statement should include the proposed applicable entity in parenthesis after the requirement for ease of reference when we put the standard together later.
- Sub-teams can add items that were not included in Mr. Odom's note as specific assignments to that sub-team, but they should provide justification and not duplicate work that was assigned to another team.
 - This can include the "don't" list but any forays into this area could be clearly marked and separated from the assigned material.
- Mr. Odom is anticipating general assessment requirements to be covered up front and then two sets of requirements to handle steady-state and dynamics.
 - Modeling requirements would be included in the specific steady-state and dynamics sections.
 - Corrective action plans could be included as general statements at the end or in the individual sections as appropriate.
- Steady-state and dynamic requirements will probably look quite different and we may end up with two tables – one supporting each state.
 - These two sub-groups may need to meet to come up with a coordinated approach.

AI – Each sub-team will have a straw man requirement(s) available for the Houston meeting for all of their assigned items.

A question was raised on short circuit studies. It was mentioned that these types of studies must be done whenever a new piece of equipment is added to the system. However, the RTOs have been performing these studies for every assessment regardless of the status of new equipment. We may need an explicit statement in the standard or appropriate table location to cover duty ratings or a statement that a study needs to be done annually. Another alternative would be to cite another standard (FAC for example) as containing the requirements if we can find the correct wording there. We might just need to add words covering fault duties every time we mention ratings in our standard. The general feeling of the team at this time seems to be that an explicit statement requiring such an assessment to be performed periodically will be necessary. Relay settings are a different issue, however and would be included in other standards. This item was assigned to the Assessment Sub-team to develop a recommendation to the entire team.

AI – The Assessment Sub-team will add the issue of how to handle short circuit studies to its list of assigned items.

Bill Harm will join the Models Sub-team replacing Mahendra in anticipation of his becoming a full member of the SDT.

We need to make certain that revisions to the MOD standards include requirements to pass on equipment data to whoever needs it regardless of whether it is considered proprietary data.

Sensitivities and stress factors are part of the Models Sub-team assignment.

“Sanity” checks of models should be done in TPL but true validation is handled elsewhere.

4. Develop Action Plan for Addressing Table 1 — John Odom

The Probabilistic Sub-team and the Stability Sub-team will both look at the structure of Table 1 and report back to the SDT at the Houston meeting. The SDT as a whole will then compare the two groups work and merge them together in Houston.

AI – Both the Probabilistic and Stability Sub-teams should look at the structure of Table 1 and report back to the SDT in Houston.

5. Discuss Plan for Addressing Probabilistic Methods — John Odom

This item was postponed due to time constraints.

6. Develop Action Plan for Addressing Comments on the Supplementary SAR — John Odom

John Odom, Bob Millard, and Ed Dobrowolski will review the comments on the supplementary SAR and make assignments to appropriate individuals or sub-teams. A draft of proposed responses to the comments should be available for the next conference call on March 27th.

7. Review Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

With the additional meetings that were added to the schedule at our last meeting, we have a good chance to meet our target dates for the release of a partial first draft of the standard.

Action items developed during this call were:

- Each sub-team will have a straw man requirement(s) available for the Houston meeting for all of their assigned items.
- The Assessment Sub-team will add the issue of how to handle short circuit studies to its list of assigned items.
- Both the Probabilistic and Stability Sub-teams should look at the structure of Table 1 and report back to the SDT in Houston.

8. Schedule Next Meetings

- a.** Tuesday, March 27, 2007 — Conference Call and WebEx from 1300 to 1600 EDT: call-in information will be provided. Check your Outlook calendars for the correct time due to the change to DST. The focus of this call is to review the preliminary requirements work assigned on the 3/16/07 conference call and to begin to address the comments on the supplementary SAR.
- b.** Wednesday, April 4, 2007 starting at 0800 CDT through Thursday, April 5, 2007 at 1700 CDT at CenterPoint Energy in Houston, Texas: Hotel information has been sent out with the official meeting announcement. CenterPoint will provide a continental breakfast both days and NERC will provide lunch for attendees. Paul Rocha will send out detailed maps and logistics. The focus of this meeting will be to clean up the requirements wording and Table 1.
- c.** Monday, April 16, 2007 — Conference Call and WebEx from 1300 to 1600 EDT: call-in information will be provided.
- d.** 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
- e.** Wednesday, May 2, 2007 — Conference Call from 1100 to 1400 EDT: call-in information will be provided (tentative - if required)
- f.** July 2007: week of 7/9, 7/16, or 7/23 in San Francisco, California, hosted by PG&E. We are still waiting to hear from Gentile, Hohlbaugh, and Williams before we set the exact dates.

9. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the conference call at 1300.