

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

Friday, June 1, 2007

Conference Call Notes

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The call was brought to order by John Odom, Chair, at 1100 EDT. Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Tom Gentile	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Bob Snow	Yury Tsimberg
Jim Useldinger	Bob Williams	Hari Singh, Observer
Tony Jablonski, RFC, Guest	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

There were no questions on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — John Odom

The main objective of this conference call was to review the draft of TPL-001-1.

2. Review Draft Language for TPL-001-1

Ed Dobrowolski led the group through a review of the aggregated TPL-001-1 draft language which had been sent out prior to the meeting. In general, the document was either red-lined where agreement was reached or comments were inserted to mark where additional discussion was still required. General comments included:

- Due to the extent of the changes being made, the document number may be changed to TPL-007-0. Ed will check with Maureen on this.
- There is a general concern that the aggregation has made the differentiation between steady state and stability less clear.
- The length of the final standard may become an issue.
 - Bob Snow (FERC Staff) pointed out that there are longer standards currently in place.

- Therefore, we will continue to try to stay with the one standard to replace the current four.
- We could consider the use of bookmarks or sub-section headings if we feel they are required for ease of navigation even though such devices have not been employed in other standards as yet.
- We need to be careful with establishing new definitions for use with the TPL standard. Once approved, such definitions will become part of the NERC glossary and will be used for all standards, not just the TPL standard. The TPL SDT would be responsible for a review of the possible impact on other standards.
- Bob Williams will provide the definition of assessments that the original Assessment sub-team came up with.
- R1 may need to be split to make certain that the specific entities are properly aligned with the requirements.
- The team reviewed each requirement through R3.4, discussed concepts, and made revisions to the standard language.
- In addition to the team's observations and comments, Bob Snow (FERC staff) made the following comments:
 - We need to coordinate 4.2 with the NERC registry requirements.
 - A specific identification is needed for R1.
 - DSM is to be included regardless of the applicable entity and time frame involved.
 - Paragraph 1789 of Order 693 contains some clarification on load modeling.
 - Need explanation of how we were going to handle resources in one area supplying load in another area.
 - Asked if the intention in R1.4 was to remove every piece of equipment for maintenance. He pointed out that you might not have enough time in a year to perform all of the required maintenance each year.
 - Pointed out that the new R1.6 should include post-contingency switching.
 - Asked if there was any differentiation in the applicability for R2. Similar to R1, a clear identification of the applicable entities is required.
 - Pointed out that in R2.2.2, Off-Peak may need to be expanded beyond minimum load level.
 - Asked if R2.2.4.2 included inadvertent energy. The response was that non-firm did include inadvertent energy.
 - Stated that planning events should include sensitivity analysis.
 - Asked if there was any intention of looking at misoperation of SPS as a contingency.
 - Pointed out the need to link deliverability with dispatch in R2.2.4.5.
 - Asked if auxiliary requirements for nuclear power plants are included in R3.3.
 - Reminded the team of the need to address the proxy issue as per Order 693.
 - Stated that the magnitude of consequential load loss needs to be determined.

3. Develop Questions for First Posting

Due to time limitations, this item was not addressed.

4. Next Steps

The need for an additional conference call to complete the review of the draft language was clearly identified. The group will be polled to see their preference for a date for this call.

5. Schedule Next Meeting — John Odom

- a.** Conference call and web ex – Tuesday, June 12, 2007 from 1100 to 1500 EDT to discuss the steady state table. Stability table will be discussed if time permits.
- b.** Wednesday, July 18, 2007 starting at 0800 PDT through Thursday, July 19, 2007 at 1700 PDT in San Francisco, CA, hosted by PG&E. Please be prepared to attend the entire meeting. Hotel information has been distributed. There is no block of rooms set aside at any of the hotels so you are encouraged to make your reservation early. Remember to ask for the PG&E rate.

6. Review Action Items & Project Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

Action items developed during the conference call were as follows:

- Ed will check with Maureen on document numbering.
- Bob Williams will provide the A-Team definition of ‘assessment’.

With the continuing delays that have been experienced, we are looking at a two month delay from the originally posted estimate for the first posting.

7. Adjourn

The original time for the call was extended and the Chair adjourned the session at 1630.