

Conference Call Notes for Project 2006—02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at noon EDT on Thursday, August 13, 2009.
Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Bob Jones
Ron Mazur	Bob Millard	John Odom, Chair
Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas
Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters	Charles Long, Observer
Curt Stepanek, Observer	Ruth Kloecker, ATC, Guest	Eugene Blick, FERC Observer
Bob Snow, FERC Observer	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Conference Call Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The objectives of this call were to discuss issues raised by FERC staff, decide what changes need to be made to the project documentation due to these issues, and to finalize the documentation for the fourth posting.

2. Discuss Issues from FERC Staff Conference Call of August 7, 2009

a. Non-Consequential Load Loss definition

FERC staff expressed concern about the changes made to the definition of Non-Consequential Load Loss and the subsequent deletion of the second sentence of header note 'b'. The SDT explained the reasoning for the change and pointed out that the second sentence in header note 'b' had been replaced by new header note 'i'. Staff was satisfied with the changes to the header notes but still expressed concern about the definitions of Consequential Load Loss. The SDT reviewed

this definition and made slight wording changes to provide greater clarity as to the intent of the SDT.

b. P1-2 raising the bar issue

This issue includes P1-3 as well as P1-2. Bob Snow summarized his interpretation of the Order 693, paragraph 1771 language concerning the old footnote 'b'. His feeling was that the Order 693 language cleared up any ambiguity as to how to interpret footnote 'b' and that no one should be using Non-Consequential Load Loss as a solution in these circumstances. Furthermore, he stated that in order 693, paragraph 1792, that NERC had accepted this interpretation.

John Odom pointed out that Order 693, paragraph 1794 stated that this issue should be 'considered' as part of the standards development process as opposed to being a directive. This allowed flexibility to an SDT to handle the situation as best as possible. The SDT has considered the issue and has definitely tightened the language surrounding this area. While members of the SDT may disagree with the interpretation of footnote 'b' by some entities, it seems fair and practical to allow for additional time for these two items. The SDT decided to leave P1-2 and P1-3 in the 60 month timeframe.

c. R2, part 2.1.3 language

Staff is looking for the language from the old Requirement 1.3.12 to be included here. The SDT feels that the changes made in TPL-001-1, including Requirement R2 part 2.1.3 and P5 is stronger than the old R1.3.12 and is appropriate for planning. Six months is seen as a reasonable timeframe for the planning horizon with shorter outage periods being addressed in the operating horizon. The SDT made a slight grammatical change to requirement R2, part 2.1.3 but left the context intact.

d. R2, part 2.7.5

Staff felt that this part should be deleted as exceptions are handled through filings with FERC on a case by case basis and not through standards language. The SDT doesn't feel that Requirement R2, part 2.7.5 is an exception and did not delete it.

e. R2, part 2.9 duration issue

Staff pointed out that Order 693, paragraph 1795 specifically cited duration. However, it was also pointed out that the language included 'consider' as opposed to directing an action. The SDT had duration in the standard but received considerable pushback for industry during the comment periods and has deleted it. The SDT decided to leave duration out in the fourth posting.

f. R3, part 3.6 tariff issue

Staff expressed concern that this item might violate or conflict with existing FERC approved tariffs. The SDT reviewed the requirement and doesn't believe that there is a cause for concern. The part was left as is.

g. R5 absolute minimum issue

The SDT discussed expanding the minimum for transient voltage response criteria and decided to leave the requirement as is.

h. Table 1, header note 'b' – deletion of 2nd sentence

See item 'a'.

i. Table 1, extreme events, Stability item 2a

This discussion ties back to old Requirement 1.3.10 and the interpretation of those words. The SDT reviewed the existing standards and feels that a three phase fault is clearly considered as category D and that it has been interpreted correctly in TPL-001-1.

3. Finalize TPL-001-1 Roadmap

The SDT agreed to delete Requirement R2, part 2.1.6 since it was replaced by Requirement R2, part 2.1.3 at the Salt Lake City meeting.

The document was then accepted by the SDT and will be forwarded for posting.

4. Finalize TPL-001-1 Implementation Plan

The document was accepted by the SDT and will be forwarded for posting.

5. Finalize TPL-001-1 4th Posting Questions

A note will be placed with Question 12 indicating that a 'No' will not need to have additional comments entered as the SDT will consider any comments to Questions 1 through 11 as indicative of the reasoning for a "No".

The document was then accepted by the SDT and will be forwarded for posting.

6. Finalize TPL-001-1 3rd Posting Comment Responses

The document was accepted by the SDT and will be forwarded for posting.

7. Next Steps — John Odom

This will be a 30 day posting. With the submittal of the documents for posting on August 13th, the SDT can reasonable expect a mid-September actual posting date. Therefore, the comments should be back by mid-October. Based on that schedule, a face to face meeting has been tentatively scheduled for 2 full days, November 3rd and 4th in San Francisco, CA. SDT members are being requested to block out time between mid-October and the beginning of November for comment response work. SDT members are also requested to block out the meeting dates at this time but not to make reservations until the actual posting date is known.

A clean-up conference call and WebEx was scheduled for Monday, November 23, 2009 from noon to 4:00 p.m. EST.

Details on the meeting and conference call will be sent out later.

SDT members were encouraged to start ‘beating the bushes’ to encourage their organizations (and any other groups that they are involved with) to explain why they should accept this standard when it goes to ballot, hopefully at the end of the year.

8. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no action items developed during this call.

If the fourth posting happens in mid-September and the SDT can handle the comments as shown above without an additional posting, the project will be back on schedule.

9. Adjourn

The call was adjourned at 2:30 p.m. EDT.