

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

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The call was brought to order at 3:00 EDT on Friday, August 07, 2009. Call participants were:

Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bob Pierce
Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters	Charles Long, Observer	Curt Stepanek, Observer
Ruth Kooecker, ITC, Guest	Eugene Blick, FERC	Ted Franks, FERC	Keith O'Neal, FERC
Ibrahim Oweis, FERC	Bob Snow, FERC	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC	

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no questions raised on the NERC Antitrust Guidelines.

c. Conference Call Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The objective of this call was to hear comments from FERC staff on the proposed 4th posting of TPL-001-1. It was noted that FERC staff does not speak for the Commission.

- 2. Review of Implementation of Commission Directives (or an Equally Effective/Efficient Implementation)**
- 3. Changes in proposed TPL-001-1 Addressing Last Staff Review**
- 4. Changes in TPL-001-1 Addressing Industry Comments**

FERC staff comments were in logical order and not separated by agenda item.

Definitions — Staff stated that the revised definition of Consequential Load Loss was now closer to the Commission's definition. However, terminology was introduced in

the definition of Non-Consequential Load Loss such as voltage sensitive Load that is not consistent with the Commission's position. The SDT does not feel that Planning Events or Extreme Events need to be continent-wide definitions as long as the requirement language always states 'planning events in Table 1', etc.

Effective Date — P1.2 and P1.3: The SDT felt that P1-2 and P1.3 was raising the bar over the existing footnote 'b', since "local load" loss was allowed. Therefore, it is now included in the 60 month timeframe. Staff felt that TPL-002 had been accepted by the Commission on the basis that only Consequential Load Loss was allowed under footnote 'b'. Therefore, there is no raising of the bar since this condition was already in place. Paragraph 1794 of FEERC order 693 was cited as a reference. The SDT feels that they are reinforcing and clarifying paragraph 1794 as requested. FERC staff will look into supplying additional documentation on this issue to the SDT.

Staff stated that many entities are already enforcing the EHV provisions of the proposed TPL-001-1 and voiced concerns about whether this was raising the bar. It was pointed out that without requirements in a standard, such actions can't be enforced.

Staff expressed concerns about the addition of compliance language in the effective date section of the standard. It was stated that the SDT can't state that penalties can't be imposed. Such things are currently being handled by FERC on a case by case basis.

Requirement R1, part 1.1.2 – The SDT considers the change from 'planned' to 'known' as being more inclusive and thus strengthening the requirement. Staff wanted to know why Requirement R2, part 2.1.6 still said 'planned'. The SDT proposed Requirement R2, part 2.1.3 as a replacement for Requirement R2, part 2.1.6 but forgot to delete Requirement R2, part 2.1.6. Staff the asked why the Protection System and maintenance outage wording didn't get transferred to Requirement R2, part 2.1.3. Staff also questioned the 6 month timeframe associated with outages in the proposed standard and indicated that if 6 months remained in the standard that there could be problems accepting an eventual filing. Staff will provide Order 693 paragraph reference(s) indicating the directive(s) associated with this item.

Requirement R1, part 1.1.5 — Staff questioned the change to 'known' commitment. It was pointed in industry comments that some areas of the country don't have Firm Transmission Service. Therefore, the SDT changed the wording to be more generic while retaining the concept.

Requirement R2, part 2.1.4, bullet #3 — These changes were made due to the NERC Glossary of Corrective Action Plan including the requirement for a timetable. This also covers the changes to Requirement R2, parts 2.7.3 and 2.7.4.

Requirement R2, part 2.7.5 — Staff indicated that this requirement is not consistent with a previous FERC order. In that order, FERC directed that this type of exception should be addressed on a case by case basis.

Requirement R2, part 2.4.3, bullet #1 — The intent of the SDT was that all aspects of Load modeling were addressed including load forecasts. Staff pointed out that the wording could be clearer.

Requirement R2, part 2.9 — The SDT is trying to gather data for the eventual imposition of a ceiling. Staff wants to make sure that such a number is properly vetted. Staff also questioned why duration had been deleted from the requirement.

Requirement R3, part 3.6 — Staff is concerned that the requirement is inconsistent with approved tariffs. The SDT does not feel that this requirement violates any tariffs.

Requirement R5 — Staff asked why the SDT had not been more specific and had not followed the WECC criteria for this requirement.

Table 1, header note 'b' — Staff was concerned about the deletion of the 2nd sentence. The SDT intent was not to change any meaning by the deletion.

Table 1, extreme events, Stability, item #2a — Staff stated that they do not consider the loss of a single protection System element as an extreme event.

Table 1, footnote 9 — Staff questioned the intent of the 2nd sentence. The intent of the SDT was that if an entity only had limited choices for re-dispatch, that the planner should run sensitivities to ensure reliability. Staff questioned if this was really a requirement that should be moved out of footnotes. The SDT has supplied what they feel is an equal and effective approach to the Commission directive on this matter.

5. Other Issues — John Odom

No other issues were reported by anyone on the call.

6. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this call:

- FERC staff will look into supplying additional documentation on the P1-2 and P1-3 issue to the SDT.
- FERC staff will provide Order 693 paragraph reference(s) indicating the directive(s) associated with maintenance outage timeframes.

John stated that the SDT would discuss the issues raised during today's call.

7. Adjourn

The call was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. EDT.