

## Meeting Notes

### Transmission Loading Relief DT — Project 2006-08

**June 26, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m.**

**June 27, 2008 | 8 a.m.–noon**

OATI Offices

Plymouth, MN

#### 1. Administration

- a. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines
- b. Andy Rodriguez reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines with meeting participants.
- c. Introduction of Attendees

The following members and guests were in attendance:

- Jim Busbin, NAESB Co-Chair
- Ben Li, NERC Co-Chair
- Daryn Barker
- Ernie Cardone
- Blaine Earhardt
- Tony Elacqua
- Frank Koza
- Tom Mallinger
- Nelson Muller
- Pat O'Connor
- Ed Overtree
- Narinder Saini
- Ed Skiba
- Andy Rodriguez

- d. Approval of Agenda

The drafting team reviewed the agenda. Ben Li moved that the agenda be adopted. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

- e. Approval of Meeting Notes

The drafting team reviewed the meeting notes from the April 1–2 meeting and made slight modifications. Ben Li moved that the meeting notes be

approved as amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

## **2. Phase II Work (Field Test) Report**

Tom Malinger provided a report on the current status of the PJM, MISO, and SPP Field Test. As of June 1, the three entities are now utilizing 5 percent Market Flows (except for MAPP entities, which continue to use 0 percent). Tom provided a review of the June 1 report to the ORS and reported that the recommendations within it (to extend the test to October 31 and to increase the threshold to 5 percent) had been approved by the SC. Ben Li asked for more detail about when the report from the field test will be completed. Tom indicated that he believes that before the end of the field test, some actions will need to be taken related to the bridging issue. Bridging would need to be addressed before the end of the field test; otherwise PJM, MISO, and SPP would have to return to a 0 percent threshold, which would also mean a 30 percent success rate in providing relief. Ben Li believes that the return to 0 percent may be acceptable.

Narinder Saini pointed out that there might be some complexities in coordinating the changes to the business practices related to the PJM, MISO, and SPP regional differences. The regional difference will be deleted from the NERC Reliability Standards concurrently when the NAESB BPs are modified to include the new thresholds. This may be difficult to coordinate, and may also need to include coordination with entity tariffs as well.

There was also some discussion regarding effective dates, and general questions about how they are established. In general, approvals are tied to regulatory approval.

Frank Koza reported that PJM and Progress Energy are in the process of implementing a procedure that allows for a 3 percent threshold for transactions once all 5 percent threshold transactions have been curtailed. This would be implementing the concept of the “TLR 3C” as a local extension to the TLR process. There was some question whether this would need ERO approval, but PJM and Progress believes it does not need approval, as it is not being used “in lieu” of other cuts; it is additional cuts. Ben asked if transactions with 3 percent impacts that did not source or sink within the two areas would be curtailed. Frank responded that the curtailments were limited to only those that source and sink in the two areas. **UPDATE: Frank Koza reported back that this applies to transactions that source OR sink in the two areas.**

## **3. Joint Operator Manual (JOM) Status**

Jim Busbin presented the status of the JOM. Jim has found some additional errors, and wants to review the entire manual again. Ben Li suggested a target for the August 7 SC call. Jim was asked to deliver an updated manual by July 11.

Nelson Muller volunteered to assist if needed. The team will hold a conference call from 10 a.m.–noon on July 28<sup>th</sup> to review Jim’s work.

The team reviewed the Consideration of Comments, specifically looking at the NRG comments, which were included late. Some changes were made to the initial draft responses. Jim will look at these with the manual as well.

Andy was asked to follow up on HQ participation, as well as retirements from the team.

The drafting team reviewed the definitions included in the glossary of the JOM. Some minor issues were found in the definitions that were corrected. It was noted that the definitions of the functional model entities did not necessarily math the language used in the functional model. It was suggested that perhaps entity definitions should cite the Fm directly.

Ed will take any recommended definition changes to the NAESB BPS as a recommendation. The remainder on the NERC side will need to be handled via a SAR or as a long-term project effort.

#### **4. Phase III Work**

Ben Li and Andy Rodriguez presented the latest updates to the Phase III work. IRO-006-5 is completed and ready to move forward. IRO-006-EI-1 had some minor edits, but is now ready to move forward. The group discussed the use of the term “Market Flow,” and agreed to keep this term for the near term. NERC may need to create a definition for Market Flow that references the NAESB definitions and/or regional differences (since there is not necessarily a “definition” included in the NAESB BP). Andy will send these to the NERC Quality Assurance team, as well as the SDT.

There was some discussion about the NAESB language for TLR, in that it did not capture the concept of a TLR4 requiring curtailment of existing non-firm. There was one sentence was not moved over related to curtailment of non-firm. This was predicated on the incorrect belief that a TLR3 always would precede a TLR4. Jim Busbin will take this back to NAESB for further discussion.

#### **5. Future Meetings — Not Yet Confirmed**

September 8–9 — CANCELLED

September 29–30 — 1–5 p.m., 9 a.m.–5 p.m. Orlando, FL

December 10–11 — 9 a.m.–5 p.m., 9 a.m.–noon Toronto, ON at the Marriott Bloor Yorkville

#### **6. Adjourn**

The drafting team adjourned the meeting on June 27, 2008.