

## Notes TPL Table 1 — Project 2010-11

August 11, 2010

### 1. Administrative Items

#### a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 0800 EDT on Wednesday, August 11, 2010 at the SERC offices in Charlotte, NC. Meeting participants were:

Darrin Church	Julius Horvath	Bob Jones
Brian Keel	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas	Dana Walters
Eugene Blick, FERC Observer	Ray Kershaw, Observer	Ruth Kloecker, Observer
Steve Rueckert, Observer	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

#### b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines – Ed Dobrowolski

There were no questions raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

Ed also reviewed the NERC meetings guide.

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

The objective of the meeting was for the SDT to revise footnote 'b' based on feedback received from the previous day's Technical Conference on the subject so that the footnote can be posted for industry comment.

### 2. Review Technical Conference – John Odom

The in person attendance was quite light with only 26 people in Charlotte. The late notice, travel budget problems, and the availability of the web ex undoubtedly hurt the attendance. However, 206 people participated through the web.

The SDT reviewed notes from the conference and discussed the material presented as well as the opinions expressed in the Question and Answer session.

### **3. Develop Revisions to Footnote 'b'**

The starting point for the discussion was the Minneapolis meeting revisions. It was noted that these revisions were never officially posted as they were designed in response to the original deadline from the March 18<sup>th</sup> order and were pulled back when that deadline was extended in the June 11<sup>th</sup> clarification order.

The SDT felt that this approach was creating many problems and any specific values would be widely debated. Additional definitions such as what constituted a bus and local demand would also be needed. Some members expressed the thought that since the temporary radial concept nearly passed the initial ballot; the SDT should look for ways to improve the language in that proposal.

An alternate approach was suggested that mirrored the case-by-case exception process without the ERO or FERC approval requirement. This approach utilizes the existing open and transparent planning processes and expands them to explicitly include a review and acceptance of any plans to interrupt non-consequential demand for a single contingency situation. The initial reaction by FERC staff was favorable to this approach as it closely followed the suggested case-by-case exception process. It was noted that FERC has oversight over the existing processes.

There was a discussion as to whether the revised approach still needed to establish constraints on the utilization of this demand interruption. The SDT feels that constraints are not necessary in the continent-wide standard since the appropriate constraints will be developed in each open and transparent process. FERC staff expressed concern about the lack of constraints.

The SDT discussed the implementation plan including the schedule and did not make any changes.

### **4. Develop Question(s) for Next Posting**

There will be one question for the next posting simply asking if people approve of the suggested changes to the footnote. However, the SDT prepared a significant background information section for the comment report form to explain the rationale behind the changes.

### **5. Next Steps – John Odom**

The SDT had two choices as to how to proceed. The project could proceed directly to a recirculation ballot or it could be posted for comments. The SDT felt that the

industry needed more time to review and comment than allowed for in a recirculation ballot and that the revised footnote should be posted for comment. However, the SDT will request an informal comment period to help expedite the work.

Due to the shift from the Minneapolis meeting approach to what is being proposed now, the comment responses will need to be revised accordingly. Ed will take a first pass at this and distribute it to the SDT for e-mail approval.

*AI* – Ed to revise the comment responses as quickly as possible for SDT review and approval.

## 6. **Next Meetings**

The next meeting for Project 2006-02 is in Denver, CO at the Xcel Energy offices on Wednesday, September 15, 2010 from 1330 MDT to 1700 MDT and Thursday, September 16, 2010 from 0800 MDT to 1700 MDT. The purpose of this meeting is to develop comment responses from the fifth posting.

There will be a conference call for developing responses to comments from the second posting of footnote ‘b’ on Friday, October 15, 2010 from 1300 EDT to 1600 EDT.

## 7. **Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action item was developed during the meeting:

- Ed to revise the comment responses as quickly as possible for SDT review and approval.

The project is on schedule at this time, however, if the second posting ‘fails’, then things could get tight.

## 8. **Adjourn**

The Chair thanked SERC for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 1330 EDT on Thursday, August 12, 2010.