

**Joint Meeting  
NERC Transmission Loading Relief IRO-006 Standard Drafting Team  
NAESB Business Practices Subcommittee**

**Houston, TX  
January 10, 2007 - January 11, 2007**

**Draft Minutes**

**Attendance**

David Zwergel – MISO	Larry Middleton – MISO
Bill Lohrman – Prague Power, LLC	Jim Eckelkamp – Progress Energy
DeDe Kirby – NAESB	Neal Balu
Joel Dison – Southern Company	Dave Marton – First Energy
Jim Busbin – Southern Company	Kathy York – TVA
Sue Mangum-Goins – TVA	Narinder Saini – Entergy
Dennis Harrison – Prague Power, LLC	Stephanie Honzon – PJM
Frank Koza – PJM	Daryn Barker – EON US

**Administrative**

Chairman David Zwergel led the welcome of the TLR drafting team members, NAESB Business Practices Subcommittee, and guests. Bill Lohrman reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines. Chairman Zwergel then reviewed the objectives of the meeting.

Bill Lohrman reviewed the minutes of prior meetings. Minor corrections and location additions were made to the October 3<sup>rd</sup>, November 6<sup>th</sup>, and December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2006 meetings. The minutes were approved as corrected with no objections.

**TLR Procedure**

Chairman Zwergel led a review of the final draft of the TLR SAR, looking at the description of the post split changes to the NERC TLR. Post split refers to changes to the NERC TLR standard that occurred after the agreement arrived at by the Joint NERC NAESB TLR Subcommittee on June 1-2, 2005. The group also reviewed the changes to the SPP Urgent Action (Section E2) and TLR 3b and 4a. The MISO/PJM regional difference (Section E1) was incorporated into the NAESB split as a result of a request by NERC staff on October 4-5, 2005. The group is investigating the continuing basis for authorization of the MISO/PJM/SPP field test if Section E1 is retired and left as part of the NAESB Appendix A (MISO/PJM), and NAESB Section B of Appendix D (SPP). Questions to be answered include:

1. Which organization would have responsibility for administering the field test?
2. When does it make sense to move the waiver over? Can it be in both NERC and NAESB at the same time? Can the waiver be moved later?
3. Would the NAESB standard need to be revised?

**TLR IRO-006 Standard Drafting Team  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 10 – 11, 2007**

4. How would future field tests be handled if the waiver is moved to NAESB? (a request should be shared with NERC on a joint basis if it contains reliability aspects)

The Standard Drafting Team will build on the agreed-upon original split (**Exhibit A**). The drafting team recognizes that they may receive comments on the split during the ballot of the complete revised standard as part of the NERC standard process. The industry will be asked to comment and subsequently vote on the NERC portions of the TLR standard. The “package” will show which portions of the NERC reliability standards are to be retired, and where they would go in the NAESB business practices. The drafting team will prepare an outreach program to educate the industry on history of the open process that has led up to the agreed split between NERC and NAESB.

During the review of the NERC / NAESB split the drafting team will need to be sure to realize that there are two versions of changes to IRO-006 for the post split NERC / NAESB evaluation. Since the waiver is in both the NERC standard (Section E.1) and NAESB business practices (Section XXX), the drafting team is recommending in that in order to complete the field test that Section E1 – MISO/PJM waiver remain in the NERC TLR procedure standard until completion and evaluation of the MISO/PJM/SPP curtailment threshold field test.

*Joel Dison/Frank Koza moved to recommend that authority for conducting and monitoring the field test for Section E.1–MISO/PJM waiver remain with the TLR Standard Drafting Team until completion and evaluation of the MISO/PJM/SPP curtailment threshold field test. In the meantime, the TLR drafting team will continue to work to complete the NERC / NAESB split of the TLR procedure. After completion of the field test for Section E.1 any subsequent recommended changes to E.1. would be handled by the entity responsible for that section of the standard.*

*Motion passed with no objections and no abstentions.*

The group reviewed IRO-006-2 related to changes to TLR 3b and 4

1. For level 3B:
  - a. (2.4.2) The old deleted section 2.4.2 from the NERC reliability standard should be considered in the NAESB.
  - b. Business Practice 3.4.2 and 3.4.3. need to be reviewed to be sure that they adequately capture the deleted original NERC 2.4.2 See September 7, 2005 BPS minutes. Some drafting team members believe that those paragraphs may need to be reworded. Kathy York and Jim Busbin volunteered to work on it.
  - c. The drafting is recommending that new NERC 2.4.2 (old 2.4.3) as revised should be considered as a NAESB business practice, because it is already captured in NAESB 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 and 3.4.3. Review is recommended to be sure that all of the redlined NERC changes are captured. Kathy York and Jim Busbin volunteered to work on it.
2. For changes to level 4, it was recommend that section 2.5.3 stay in the NERC procedure.

**TLR IRO-006 Standard Drafting Team  
Joint Meeting Minutes  
January 10 – 11, 2007**

The group then reviewed IRO-006-3 related to the SPP waiver.

1. For the SPP Section E.2 it was recommended that it be retired, as it is appropriately considered as a business practice (it is already in NAESB Appendix D, Section B, as requested in R06002).
2. No further action is needed on the SPP Urgent Action at NERC, assuming the NERC / NAESB split and joint operating manual is completed prior to the expiration of the urgent action.

The group then reviewed the related NAESB TLR Business Practices, and determined that from the NAESB perspective that NAESB completed recommended split. The group left for a later meeting the discussion of the format for a joint NERC / NAEB TLR operators manual. That discussion would include maintenance of the manual and related training requirements.

**MISO/SPP/PJM Curtailment Threshold Field Test**

Chairman Zwergel provided the group with an update on the status of the field test. He reviewed the schedule, and indicated that the field test must start by either May 1<sup>st</sup> or after September 1<sup>st</sup>. The Standard Committee required that the field test must be completed by year end 2008, and that the TLR drafting team must report monthly to the SC. The ORS will monitor the field test from a reliability perspective, and will use criteria similar to that used for the BAL field test.

The group then reviewed related IDC changes that would be needed. The IDC WG is looking at C/O #225, and will also add a feature that will report when relief was not achieved to help the RC monitor the effectiveness of the test.

- a. MISO/SPP/PJM have agreed to pay for the change.
- b. Looking for a May 1<sup>st</sup> start date.

Frank Koza and David Zwergel agreed to develop a presentation for the next ORS meeting, which has assigned a small task team to work on the field test. February 14, 2007 was mentioned as the next ORS meeting. Chairman Zwergel and Mr. Koza will present an update at the next Operating Committee meeting

**Next Meetings / Next Steps**

During the next meeting the group will begin formatting the NERC standard, considering the sections dealing with:

1. Purpose
2. Applicability
3. Measures
4. Levels of Compliance
5. Risk Factors

The group will also consider how the use of Attachment(s) should be used in consideration of the new standard format.