

Meeting Notes for Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

August 4, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. MDT

August 5, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. MDT

WECC - Salt Lake City, UT

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. MDT on Tuesday, August 4, 2009 in the offices of WECC in Salt Lake City, UT. Meeting participants were:

Bill Harm	Bob Jones	Brian Keel
Ron Mazur	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas	Dana Walters
Steve Rueckert, Observer	Hari Singh, Observer	Ibrahim Oweis, FERC Observer
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines – Ed Dobrowolski

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

c. Meeting Agenda and Objectives – John Odom

The objective of the meeting is to finalize the comment responses and roadmap changes so that the 4th posting can proceed.

2. Resolve Draft responses to 3rd Posting Comments

a. Q1 – Darrin Church

Q1 was resolved prior to the meeting. However, a change was made to Measure M1 since it was referring to ‘such as models’ when only models were mentioned in the requirement and data retention items.

b. Q2 – Chifong Thomas

Chifong led the SDT through the remaining open issues in her comment responses. All of the issues were resolved.

The SDT then reviewed the proposed changes to the roadmap for Requirement R2. A number of the suggested changes involved the use of the words ‘assessing’, ‘studies’, ‘analysis’, etc. The SDT had previously done an extensive review of the uses of this terminology in the standard and made changes as required for the 2nd posting. The SDT did not believe that there was a reason to review the material again so those suggestions were not accepted and the text in those areas will remain the same. From CT6 – ‘Simulating’ will replace ‘assessing’ in the text.

Chifong needs to review her responses to reflect changes made in the definitions area and to account for the suggested text changes that were not made.

AI – Chifong will review her comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.

c. Q3 – Ron Mazur

Ron Mazur had two questions for the SDT to discuss. The issues were resolved and Q3 is now complete.

d. Q4 – Bob Jones

Bob reported that one of the major comments was on the generator ride through requirement. He suggested new wording for Requirement R4, part 4.3.2 based on the discussions held at the Akron meeting. With some minor changes, the proposed wording was accepted.

Footnote #3 was changed to allow 2LG fault studies to be acceptable.

The words in Requirement R4, part 4.3.1 were verified by the SDT and no changes were made to the requirement.

Only some of the proposed changes were made to Requirement R4, part 4.4 so the comment response needs to be changed.

A suggestion to add the word ‘applicable’ to the VSL was not accepted by the SDT.

e. Q5 – Brian Keel

Q5 was resolved prior to the meeting.

f. Q6 – Bill Harm

Q6 was resolved prior to the meeting.

g. Q7 – Bob Pierce

Bob suggested new wording for Requirement R7 (now Requirement R8), the accompanying Measure, and the VSL. He also added a new Requirement R8, part 8.1. All of the changes were accepted by the SDT.

h. Q8 – Dana Walters

Planning Event and Extreme Event definitions were deleted as the SDT felt that a formal definition wasn't needed.

The definition of Non-Consequential Load Loss was expanded to address the concepts contained in Load Reduction and Supplemental Load Loss. The definitions for Load Reduction and Supplemental Load Loss were deleted.

The SDT stated that UFLS was not considered applicable in planning events. No statements are needed to explicitly exclude it since the SDT felt that its use for planning events would violate other performance requirements. The SDT stated that UVLS, while primarily utilized as a stop-gap measure, may be a useful planning tool in certain circumstances.

Dana needs to review his comment responses based on the changes made during the meeting.

AI – Dana will review his comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.

i. Q9 – Doug Hohlbaugh

There were several open issues in the comment responses. The SDT reviewed these issues and drafted responses to all of them.

Doug needs to review his comment responses based on the changes made during the meeting especially the definition changes.

AI - Doug will review his comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.

j. Q10 – Charles Long

Slight wording changes were made to the responses for comments received on footnotes 5 & 10 based on John Odom's e-mail.

k. Q11 – Bernie Pasternack

Several commenters agreed with Charles Long that the SDT has raised the bar for P1 events with respect to local Load loss. Therefore, the Implementation Plan was revised to move P1-2 and P1-3 events to the 60 month timeframe. The SDT determined that the other elements of P1 are not involved in local Load loss issues. There was a question as to whether DC lines should qualify for the extension but the SDT couldn't identify a legitimate use justifying that action. Wording from the current footnote 'b' were used in drafting the new wording in the Implementation Plan.

3. Review and Resolve Remaining Roadmap Issues

a. Generation Tripping Ceiling – Tom Gentile, Chifong Thomas, and Bob Jones

Requirement R3, part 3.6 and Requirement R4, part 4.6 were drafted by the sub-team to address this issue. After slight semantic changes, the new wording was accepted by the SDT.

This sub-team also looked into moving footnote 1 into the requirements as the footnote was using requirement language. New Requirement R4, part 4.1.1 – 4.1.3 were proposed and after discussion and revisions was accepted by the SDT.

b. Regional Planning Requirements (R3.4, R4.4, and R9) – Doug Hohlbaugh, Tom Mielnik, and Bob Pierce

John Odom suggested new wording for Requirement R3, part 3.4.1. This wording was discussed and modified, then accepted by the SDT. The language will be duplicated in Requirement R4.

The SDT feels that the revised Requirement R3, part 3.4, Requirement R4, part 4.4, Requirement R8, and requirement R8, part 8.1 is an equal and effective solution for replacing TPL-005.

c. VRF, Time Horizon, Measure, Data Retention, and VSL

1) Requirement R5

The VRF, Time Horizon, Measure, data retention, and VSL for Requirement R5 were accepted by the SDT.

2) Requirement R6

Requirement R6 was deleted in favor of a new Requirement R2, part 2.1.3.

3) Generation tripping (if needed)

No changes to VRF, Time Horizon, Measures, data retention, or VSL were required for the accepted solution.

4) Regional Planning (if needed)

The VSL for Requirement R3 was adjusted to bring in the new Requirement R3, part 3.4. No other changes were required.

4. Review and Resolve Items from FERC Staff Conference Call of June 19th

- a. Modify the Implementation Plan with a statement on the assumed validity of MOD data and the assumption that the future revision of MOD will include a validation step.

The SDT accepted this concept and new wording will be added to the Implementation Plan following the prerequisite approval section.

- b. Check to see if performance is maintained for the spare strategy.

This is covered in Requirement R2, part 2.5.

- c. Review Requirement R4.3 to see if wording is needed for reconnections as well as disconnections.

This is handled in Requirement R4, part 4.3.1.

- d. Review the need for a requirement similar to Requirement R5 on transient voltage recovery for angular Stability.

This is covered in the new requirement R4, parts 4.1 & 4.2.

- e. Review the need for the criteria defined in footnote 1b to be pulled out to a requirement.

This item is covered in new Requirement R4, part 4.1.3.

5. Next Steps – John Odom

With the resolution of almost every open item during this meeting, the SDT is in good shape for delivering the documents for the 4th posting next week.

Ed will draft questions for the posting based on the questions issued for the 3rd posting.

6. Next Meetings

A conference call with FERC staff on Friday, August 7th from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. EDT has been added to the schedule. SDT members are invited to dial-in.

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Thursday, August 13th from noon to 4:00 p.m. EDT for clean-up of any and all remaining items.

7. Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed at this meeting:

- Chifong will review her comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.
- Dana will review his comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.
- Doug will review his comment responses based on the decisions made at this meeting and e-mail the changes only to Ed as soon as possible.

If the SDT can deliver the documents to NERC staff by August 14th, there is an excellent chance that the project can get back on schedule.

8. Adjourn

The Chair thanked WECC for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m. MDT on Wednesday, August 5, 2009.