

Notes

Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

November 3-4, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. PST

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 0800 PST on Tuesday, November 3, 2009. Participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh, Vice Chair
Julius Horvath	Bob Jones	Brian Keel
Ron Mazur	Bob Millard	John Odom, Chair
Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas	Dana Walters
Ray Kershaw, Observer	Charles Long, Observer	Steve Rueckert, Observer
Steve Lee, EPRI, Guest	Liang Min, EPRI, Guest	Al McMeekin, NERC
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	Eugene Blick, FERC Observer	

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Meeting Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The goal of the meeting was to hear the summary responses to the industry comments for the fourth posting, identify and resolve any major issues with the proposed responses, and to make a decision as to whether the SDT felt the standard was ready to proceed to pre-ballot stage or if a fifth posting was required.

John pointed out that if the SDT recommends moving to pre-ballot stage that there might be a perception problem due to the large number of 'No' responses to question 12. If one just looks at the raw number, the feeling may be that the industry doesn't feel that the standard is ready for pre-ballot and that the SDT may be ignoring the standards development process if they recommended that approach. However, question 12 was worded poorly and a number of respondents indicated that they said 'No' simply because they felt that that was the only way

to make certain that the SDT responded to their comments. Therefore, you need to look deeper at the responses. There were 63 commenters. 45 of those indicated 'No' since the SDT need to address their comments. So, the bottom line is that the majority of commenters may be okay with moving to pre-ballot if their comments were addressed. Additionally, the majority of these comments were seeking clarification to requirements rather than proposing substantive changes.

2. **Resolve Draft responses to 4th Posting Comments**

3.

a. **Q1** — Darrin Church

Darrin led the SDT through a summary of his draft responses. The only change made to the requirements was a wording change for clarification to part 1.1.6.

The SDT did not feel that this change warranted a re-posting.

b. **Q2** — Chifong Thomas

Chifong also presented a summary of the comments wither draft responses. Minor wording changes were made for clarity in parts 2.1.4, 2.4.3, and 2.7.

Part 2.9 was deleted by the SDT. This requirement was placed in the standard in response to a comment in FERC Order 693 asking the SDT to consider such a requirement. The SDT tried to come up with wording for the requirement for several postings but the feedback from industry commenters continued to be overwhelmingly negative. Commenters pointed out that the requirement was solely administrative in nature as it was a record keeping task and that it had no bearing on BES reliability. The SDT agreed with the comments and deleted the requirement. Since the FERC directive was to consider a cap, the SDT believes that it has fulfilled its obligation with regard to this directive. The SDT does recommend that this data be gathered as part of a NERC data request which is allowed under the ERO Rules and Procedures.

The SDT believe deleting part 2.9 is in line with the vast majority of comments and does not considered it a significant change to the standard since it does not add or substantively alter a requirement in a manner that could potentially place additional burden on industry. The SDT believes that the other changes to Requirement R2 were simple clarifications so there is no need to re-post based on the Requirement R2 changes.

c. **Q3** – Ron Mazur

Ron presented his summary and draft responses. Minor clarifying changes were made to the wording of parts 3.3 and 3.3.3. In addition, part 3.3.2 will be made consistent with its corresponding part in Requirement R4 by adding GSU to the wording – this was an omission in the last draft. (Note – Parts 3.3 and 4.3 will now have identical wording when these changes are completed.)

The SDT decided to delete part 3.6. This is strictly an administrative task and does not directly affect the reliability of the BES. Many commenters asked for the deletion of this requirement so the SDT is not treating the deletion as a significant change to the standard.

The SDT felt that there was no need to re-post due to the changes in Requirement R3.

d. **Q4** — Bob Jones

Bob went through his draft responses. Several of the responses will need to be updated to be consistent with the responses in Requirement R3 that were drafted at the meeting. There was a minor clarifying change to part 4.1.2 that was accepted by the SDT. As noted above, the wording in part 4.3 will be made consistent with the clarifying changes made to part 3.3.

As a result of a comment in Q4, the wording in extreme event 3a was changed from ‘plant’ to ‘station’.

The SDT felt that there was no need to re-post due to the changes in Requirement R4.

e. **Q5** — John Odom

John presented a summary of the issues presented in the comments for Q5. Double jeopardy concerns were raised here but the SDT didn’t feel that the concerns raised were legitimate issues. In addition, FERC and NERC are on record that double jeopardy will not occur.

As a result of a comment made for Q5, the measures and data retention for all requirements will be checked for a grammatical problem regarding the use of ‘all’ instead of ‘the’. All text will be corrected and made consistent.

A slight clarifying change was made to the language of Requirement R5.

Questions were raised in Q5 as to the correctness of the VSLs. Some commenters felt that the VSLs needed to be re-worked to provide a gradient approach. The SDT did not make any changes to the VSLs at this time. Based on their understanding of the proposed process for separating compliance elements from reliability requirements in standards moving forward, the SDT felt that the best approach for changing VSLs would be to wait until after ballot using the new proposed procedure.

The SDT did not feel that any of the changes discussed under Q5 require re-posting.

f. **Q6** — Brian Keel

Brian presented his draft responses to the SDT. The wording in measure M6 and data retention for Requirement R6 was made consistent with the wording for the actual requirement.

The term ‘cascading outage’ was replaced by ‘Cascading’ throughout the standard.

The SDT did not feel that any of the changes in Requirement R6 will necessitate re-posting.

g. **Q7** — Bill Harm

Bill suggested some changes to the wording of the requirement but the SDT did not feel that the changes added any clarity or understanding and the proposal was rejected.

As in Q6, commenters noted an inconsistency in the wording for Measure M7 and the data retention for requirement R7 when compared to the actual requirement wording that was corrected.

The SDT did not feel that any of the changes made to Requirement R7 warranted re-posting.

h. **Q8** — Bob Pierce

Bob presented a spreadsheet summarizing the issues raised and his proposed responses. The word ‘adjacent’ will be placed in front of Planning Coordinator.

The wording of the lower and higher VSLs was changed to agree with the wording in the actual requirement.

The SDT suggested revised wording to resolve the question on FERC Order 890.

Minor wording changes were made to Requirement R8 to address CEII concerns.

The SDT does not feel that the changes made to Requirement R8 should result in a re-posting.

i. **Q9** — Dana Walters

Dana suggested several changes to the existing definitions.

The SDT did not accept the proposed changes to Planning Assessment.

The SDT did accept Dana’s proposed change to Non-Consequential Load Loss. A suggested change to this definition by TVA was not accepted as the SDT felt that the items cited are covered under Interruptible Load.

The SDT did not accept proposed changes to the Purpose Statement or to the Year One definition.

The SDT did not feel that any of the changes made for Q9 would require a re-posting.

j. **Q10** — Doug Hohlbaugh

A clarifying change to footnote 1 was accepted by the SDT.

The SDT re-iterated that it wants the Table moved in front of the Measures as it is considered to be part of the requirements. This change was also supported by some industry stakeholders during the Draft 4 comment period.

The question was raised as to whether the typographical errors in referencing some of the footnotes caused sufficient confusion that commenters didn't actually review the material. The SDT did not feel that this was the case since no one complained in that regard. Also, the footnote placements weren't changed, nor was there any substantial change to the content of the footnotes, from draft 3.

The SDT did not feel a need to re-post for any changes made in response to Q10.

k. **Q11** — Bernie Pasternack

There is still some debate as to where TPL-001-1 should 'stop'. Some commenters commented that the standard goes too far and essentially mandates construction over which a planner has no control. The SDT debated this issue once again and came to the same conclusion – the standard and the Implementation Plan are correct in their approach as it does make sense to create plans with no real solutions. The SDT feels that proper safeguards have been built in to the standard to protect planners who make reasonable efforts to correct System deficiencies.

There is a slight difference in the wording of the Effective Date section of TPL-001-1 and the Implementation Plan that was corrected.

The SDT agreed with Bernie's handling of the error introduced in the Implementation Plan when the new Requirement R5 was added – the wording of the Implementation Plan with regard to Requirements R7 and R8 didn't get adjusted properly.

The SDT did not feel that any of the changes discussed with regard to Q11 would necessitate a re-posting.

Q12 — John Odom

Q12 was basically a summary question and John will craft his responses to be consistent with what was agreed upon for Q1 through Q11.

4. **Next Steps** — John Odom

Each question respondent needs to fill out the official response form with the responses agreed upon at this meeting and distribute the form via the list server no later than close of business on Monday, November 16, 2009 so that other members can review the responses prior to the conference call.

All members were reminded of their obligation to review all responses for correctness.

John raised the possibility of one final review meeting with FERC staff prior to submitting the documents to NERC staff for the next step in the process. Since the SDT felt that no changes made due to the responses to Q1 through Q11 would necessitate a re-posting and since Q12 is a summary question, the next step should be to request that the standard move to pre-ballot stage. Members will be asked to confirm that approach in the forthcoming conference call.

5. **Next Meetings** — All

There will be a conference call and web ex on Monday, November 23rd from 1200 to 1600 EST to resolve action items from the San Francisco meeting. Details will be provided.

6. **Action Items and Schedule** — Ed Dobrowolski

Each question respondent needs to fill out the official response form with the responses agreed upon at this meeting and distribute the form via the list server no later than close of business on Monday, November 16, 2009 so that other members can review the responses prior to the conference call.

At this point, the project is on schedule for submitting its documents for pre-ballot prior to the end of the year.

7. **Adjourn**

In appreciation of the service to standards in general, and to this SDT in particular, the SDT presented Bob Millard with a card and small gift (to match Bob's wardrobe choices, the SDT presented Bob with a loud Hawaiian shirt and a brown sweater) to mark his imminent retirement. Ed Dobrowolski gave Bob a card signed by members of the NERC Princeton staff.

The Chair thanked PG&E for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 1730 PST on Wednesday, November 4, 2009.