

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

December 18–19, 2007

Conference Call Notes

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at 11 a.m. EST on Tuesday and Wednesday.
 Call participants were:

Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh	Bob Jones
Brian Keel	Tom Mielnik	Bob Millard, Vice Chair
John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce
Paul Rocha	Chifong Thomas	Yury Tsimberg
Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters	Bob Williams
Tom Gentile, Observer	Ray Kershaw, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer
Daniella Hammons, CenterPoint Energy, Guest	Charles Long, Entergy, Guest	Steve Rueckert, WECC, Guest
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

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

c. Meeting Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The main objective of these calls was to receive sub-team progress reports.

2. Identify Issues for Group Discussion — Sub-team Leaders

a. Draft responses to these issues.

There was no report from Team #1.

Team #2 drafted new definitions for plant and system stability. The full team reviewed the drafts and made changes which were distributed via the mail server following the calls. Team #2 is looking at the possibility of preparing different requirements for different geographic areas similar to what was done with the ATC standards. However, that particular approach was spelled out by FERC in Order 693 and may not be applicable here. Team #2 is also considering allowing the continued use of any existing, approved SPS while not allowing them as a permanent solution moving forward.

Team #3 provided a Power Point graphical view of the process as a starting point for discussion on their proposed changes to the text wording for sensitivity and Corrective Action Plans. Review of the diagram elicited several comments from the full team:

- The ‘other factors’ shown in the graphical representation don’t contain a specific requirement reference but they are included in the definition of Planning Assessment. This is okay as long as that definition is retained and the terms remain in place there.
- The CAP feedback loop is to provide input for the subsequent year’s assessment.
- There is a need to show an explicit start/stop on the diagram.

Team #3 suggested specific wording changes to R2.1. Review of those suggestions brought out the following comments from the full team:

- The SDT still needs to address the concept of reasonably stressed versus sensitivities for design purposes.
- The suggested changes to R2.1 essentially point back to R1 so changes may be needed there as well.
- The handling of sensitivities is still not where FERC Order 693 was pointing.
- Changes may be needed to R2.7 to show how sensitivity analysis affects the CAP.
- The text still needs to be clarified to show that you do not need to build and design for every sensitivity study.

Team #3 also suggested changes to R2.7. These changes virtually eliminate the need for question #18.

At the conclusion of the review, Team #3 committed to going back over their suggestions to re-write them based on this discussion.

Team #4 discussed their issues as part of their draft responses to comments in agenda item number 3.

3. Review and Finalize Sub-team Responses to Comments

- a.** Team #1: Q 20 to 30 — John (lead), Doug, Tom, Dana, and Chifong

There was no report from team #1.

- b.** Team #2: Q 31 to 40 — Bernie (lead), Bob J., Brian, Jim, and Ray

Team #2 is waiting until they finalize the requirements changes to complete their responses to their assigned comments.

- c. Team #3: Q 12 to 19 — Bob M. (lead), Yury, Bob W., and Bill

Team #3 has not completed their responses at this time.

- d. Team #4: Q 1 to 11 and 41 & 42 — Paul (lead), Bob P., and Darrin

Team #4 submitted draft responses for the definitions (questions 1 through 11). The decisions reached by the full team review were:

1. Base Case — This term is no longer used in the standard so it will be deleted.
2. Consequential Load Loss — FERC Order 693 contains a suggested ‘definition’ for this term and the SDT probably shouldn’t deviate from that without good reason. It needs to be made clear however that you can’t plan on using this Load for planning purposes when analyzing P1–P5 conditions. There is still an open question as to how to handle local Load. This definition still needs work.
3. Extreme Events — The draft definition was accepted. Cascading Outage is a defined term and shouldn’t be changed.
4. Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon — The definition needs to incorporate the wording of R2.2.1 and provide clarification on the term ‘beyond’.
5. Near-Term Transmission Planning Horizon — No changes are necessary to the supplied definition.
6. Non-Consequential Load Loss — The definition needs to incorporate the term ‘firm’. Changes are needed to bullet #4 in the tables to align with this definition properly.
7. Planning Assessment — The proposed change was accepted. However, the team needs to look at whether the deleted elements should be included in a requirement.
8. Planning Events — No changes are necessary to the supplied definition.
9. Plant Stability Study — This was passed off to Team #2.
10. System Stability Study — This was passed off to Team #2.
11. Year One — This should be tied to the annual assessment and not to studies. ‘Submit’ should be changed to ‘complete’.

4. Review FAC-010 vs. TPL-001-1 for Consistency

This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

5. Next Steps — John Odom

This item was not addressed due to lack of time.

- a. Review plan (shown below) developed in Houston and chart progress.
- b. Make assignments and set deadlines.
 1. Responses by sub-team to questions 1–42.
 - a. Develop initial responses.

- b. Draft standard changes.
 - c. Full team review & approval of initial responses.
- 2. Responses for question 43.
 - a. See what responses can be cut and pasted from item #1. (CenterPoint)
 - b. Assign remaining comments to sub-team.
 - i. Develop initial responses.
 - ii. Draft standard changes.
 - iii. Full team review & approval of initial responses.
- 3. Correlation of responses.
- 4. Revisions to standard resulting from responses.
 - a. Structural changes?
- 5. Review comments for consistency with revised standard.
- 6. Factor in the data collected by NERC on more stringent entity planning criteria.
- 7. Develop implementation plan.
 - a. Wait on Measures, VRF, Time Horizons, Compliance (VSL).
- 8. Develop second question set.
- 9. Submit to NERC staff for posting.

6. Next Meetings

- a. Develop plan for sub-team meetings in January.

Sub-teams are free to set their own schedules as needed to complete their work. There will be a full team conference call on Tuesday, January 15, 2008 from 1100 to 1500 EST to discuss sub-team progress to date. Details will be sent out at a later date.

- b. Schedule face-to-face meeting for February.

There will be a face-to-face meeting in Houston, TX on Monday, February 11, 2008 from 1:30 p.m. to 4 p.m. CST, Tuesday, February 12, 2008 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. CST, and Wednesday, February 13, 2008 from 8 a.m. to noon CST. Logistical details will be sent out at a later date.

There will be an additional face-to-face meeting in Tampa, FL on Monday, March 3, 2008 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. EST, and Tuesday, March 4, 2008 from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. EST. Logistical details will be sent out at a later date.

7. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no new action items developed during these calls other than that the sub-teams are to continue with their work. The following items are from previous meetings:

- Ed will explore how to best present the proposed ‘tutorial’ within the NERC structure in order to minimize costs and travel while maximizing impact for all involved. Complete — awaiting response from NERC management.

- Bob Snow volunteered to research whether any of the existing SPS/RAS schemes are covered in approved tariffs. Open.
- Ed will provide team members a link where they can go to download the NUC standards filing. Complete.
- Ed will follow up with WECC on the subject of variances. Complete — awaiting response from WECC.
- Ed will poll the group for dates for conference calls and meetings in January and February. Complete.

There was no report on schedule due to time constraints.

8. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned each days call at 3 p.m. EST.