NERC

NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY CORPORATION

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

August 22–24, 2007

Meeting Notes

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

Bob Millard, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order since, the Chair, John Odom, was unable to attend. The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m. on August 22, 2007 at the offices of Georgia Power in Atlanta, Georgia. Meeting participants were:

Tom Gentile	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Jones	Tom Mielnik	John Odom, Chair
Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas
Yury Tsimberg	Bob Williams	Bob Snow, Observer
Steve Rueckert, WECC — Guest	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

Bill Harm, PJM, was appointed a member of the ATFNSDT at the last Standards Committee conference call.

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

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

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — Bob Millard

One item was added to the original agenda: the review of the last conference call action items.

The objective of the meeting is to finalize the tables and language for our first posting.

2. Review of Action Items

The following action item reports were received (reference to 8/6/07 conference call):

1. Probability number for SPS — Tom Mielnik: He is still waiting for final numbers and a configuration diagram from WECC. However, he moved forward on his own for a preliminary analysis. This should certainly provide an order of magnitude value for the probability. The analysis was handed out at the meeting and is included with these notes as **Attachment A**.

2. How many of the 65 SPS schemes involve actual loss of firm load or generation? — Chifong Thomas: 43 involve generation and 7 involve load but the load numbers reflect several scenarios that are no longer relevant due to retirements, etc.

3. Review the probability number for the outage of two generators — Tom Mielnik: Tom recommended that P14 be moved up to immediately following P6. Bob Jones implemented this recommendation in his table update.

4. Review and update the tables — Bob Jones: This was completed with Bob's e-mail of August 16th.

5. Are there any n-1 conditions associated with RAS in WECC that result in the loss of non-consequential load? — Chifong Thomas: It appears that there is only one instance of this condition and it is debatable as to whether it is an n-1 or n-2 condition.

3. Finalize the Tables

Bob Jones revised the tables and e-mailed them to the team prior to the meeting. He added words to the contingency descriptions in order to eliminate the 'clearing' columns. Bob suggested that it might make more sense and a more readable table to organize things by their performance characteristics as opposed to probability.

Bob Snow reminded the team of the importance to consider deliverability of generation and to avoid a least common denominator solution.

The table headings and all performance requirements were reviewed to ensure that the team could support them for the first posting. Changes to the tables were made on the screen during the meeting and then e-mailed to the team.

The tables need to be cleaned up and re-formatted. During this exercise an attempt will be made to categorize the contingencies by 'single' and 'multiple' to coincide with the text. The initiating event column in the stability table also needs to be populated.

AI — Ed will clean up the tables and distribute to Bob Jones for further work on the stability table as quickly as possible.

AI — Bob Jones will populate the initiating events column of the stability table and distribute it to the team prior to the September 6th conference call.

4. Finalize Language for Standard — All

Changes to the language were restricted to the yellow highlighted areas left over from the San Francisco meeting discussions and any other major contextual problems that team members had discovered.

Tom Mielnik provided some draft wording on generator runback and tripping that was amended and included in the draft text. The issue of when to allow generator

tripping for single contingencies was left as To Be Determined (TBD) and will be addressed by the team at a later date.

AI — Ed will distribute Tom Mielnik's draft wording on generator runback and tripping to the team as quickly as possible.

Yury pointed out that the order of the list of sensitivities is different for steady state and stability and that they should be the same to avoid confusion. Ed will clean this up as part of his final pass review and clean up activities.

The red-lined version of the text developed at the meeting was e-mailed to the team for their review.

AI — Ed will make one last pass through the revised text to clean up the grammar and formatting as well as the sensitivity order issue. Ed will then distribute the clean text to the team for their review prior to the September 6th conference call.

5. Develop Questions for First Posting — All

The following list of topics for questions for the first posting was developed:

   a. Any item where we raised the bar or made stricter requirements (Chifong & Bernie)
      i. Sample: The new TPL-001-1treats a (g-1+n-1) contingency in the same manner as the old category B contingency. Do you agree with this approach?
   b. Agreement on new definitions (Bob M.)
      i. Sample: The SDT has provided a new definition of Year One as part of the revision process. Do you agree with this definition?
   c. Generator runback (Tom M.)
   d. Generator tripping (Tom M.)
   e. N-1 generator tripping with conditions (Tom M.)
   f. Reasonably stressed case (Bill & Doug)
   g. Corrective action plans — committed vs. proposed, topology change tests (Yury)
   h. Stability issues (Bob J.)
      i. Sample: The SDT has included consideration of plant stability as well as system stability in the new standard. Do you agree with this approach? (Bob J.)

There also needs to be a question on estimated time and costs for implementation that was not assigned to anyone.

The question sets should be accompanied by a background section explaining the reasoning for what the team has done.

AI — Question sets need to be distributed to the team by August 31st.

John will work on a general background explanation to place in the front of the questions. The hope is that this will deflect some of the generic questions that might normally arise.

6. Next Steps and Schedule for Posting — John Odom

The final table and language will be quickly reviewed during the next conference call to ensure that the changes were incorporated correctly, but otherwise, the draft will be used for the first posting. Other changes to the language or tables will be discussed and incorporated into the draft for the second posting.

The questions will be reviewed thoroughly during the next conference call.

Following the September 6th conference call, the roadmap document will be submitted for the first posting.

7. Schedule Next Meetings

    a. Conference call and WebEx on Thursday, September 6, 2007 — noon–4 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time — clean up any details prior to posting submittal.
    b. Future meetings and conference calls will be scheduled during the September 6th conference call.

8. Review Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

If the team achieves posting following the September 6th conference call, the project will be approximately five months behind the original schedule.

Action items developed during this meeting were:

- Ed will clean up the tables and distribute to Bob Jones for further work on the stability table as quickly as possible.
- Bob Jones will populate the initiating events column of the stability table and distribute it to the team prior to the September 6th conference call.
- Ed will distribute Tom Mielnik's draft wording on generator runback and tripping to the team as quickly as possible.
- Ed will make one last pass through the revised text to clean up grammar and formatting as well as the sensitivity order issue and then distribute the clean text to the team for their review prior to the September 6th conference call.
- Question sets need to be distributed to the team by August 31st

9. Adjourn

John Odom, Chair, adjourned the meeting at noon on August 24, 2007 after thanking Bob Jones for hosting the meeting.