

# Meeting Notes

## Project 2012-INT-02 Interpretation of TPL-003-0a and TPL-004-0 for SPCS

September 19, 2012  
Conference Call and ReadyTalk Webinar

### Administrative

#### 1. Introductions

Doug Hohlbaugh (chair) requested the Scott Barfield-McGinnis (project advisor) to proceed with the anti-trust items and kick off the meeting. The project advisor took attendance and the list is provided below.

Name	Entity	
Doug Hohlbaugh (chair)	FirstEnergy Corp.	Member
Bill Middaugh	Tri-State Generation and Transmission	Member
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy	Member
Patrick Sorrells	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Member
John Zipp	ITC Holdings	Member
Eugene Blick	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (Project Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
Phil Tatro (Technical Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff

#### 2. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as five of the seven total members were present.

### 3. **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

The project advisor read the NERC Antitrust Guidelines and disclaimer to the team, there were no questions.

### 4. **Review Current Team Roster**

The project advisor noted no members were added or removed.

### 5. **Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives**

The project advisor reviewed the agenda and objectives. Agenda items 3 and 4 were swapped to facilitate consensus on the response to question 2, and then the team would address the responses to comments for question 2.

## **Agenda**

### 1. **Review of Meeting Notes (Reviewed)**

#### a. June 13, 2012 (no objections)

Missed action item response from the May 9, 2012 meeting concerning if any previous interpretation ever had an associated implementation plan. Need to revise Review of Action Items from last meeting to acknowledge the advisor received confirmation from the Director of Process on May 17, 2012 that there has been no implementation plans associated with interpretations to date.

#### b. September 5, 2012 (no objections)

The chair requested that any member that needed additional time to send any concerns to the project advisor by the end of the day.

### 2. **Review of Action Items from Last Meeting (Complete)**

- a. Chair and Project Advisor – Work to complete the response to comments and distribute to the team to refine via email with the goal of only having a follow call only if necessary.
- b. Project Advisor – Distribute the team roster to have members verify their information NERC has on file.
- c. Project Advisor – Create an online poll to determine team availability not earlier than September 14, 2012 and not later than September 21, 2012.

The project advisor reviewed the action items from the September 5, 2012 meeting.

### 3. **Discuss Interpretation Response (Complete)**

The chair and project advisor worked to draft revisions to the team's response for question 2 and provided to the team for discussion prior to the meeting. The team agreed that the revised response is much better. The FERC staff observer offered a suggestion to improve the reference to clearing time of the fault based on the comments of the System Protection and Control Subcommittee (SCPS). Phil Tatro, NERC technical advisor noted that based on participation with the SPCS that the FERC staff suggestion was analogous with the intent of the SPCS. The team

revised the wording to use “increases the fault total clearing time” rather than the “increases clearing times of protection systems.”

The team reached consensus on the responses and decided to have the chair and project advisor work on completing the responses. The revisions will be shared with the team to obtain responses to affirm the interpretation and the response to comments is ready for quality review and posting.

#### **4. Discuss Interpretation Response to Comments (On-going)**

The chair and project advisor agreed to the draft revisions to the team’s responses to comments for question 2 and will provide to the team for review and consensus via email.

#### **5. Review of Schedule – Complete**

The chair asked for a review of the schedule. The project advisor presented the NERC project Gantt chart showing the project on schedule. The planned initial ballot period shows to begin in middle November 2012; however, the project advisor noted the posting would probably occur earlier.

#### **6. Next Steps**

The next step is to provide the interpretation to Standards Process for quality review and then its second posting which will be a 45-day formal comment period with an initial ballot in the last 10 days of the comment period. Industry stakeholder comments will be assembled following the comment period and the team will reconvene to respond to comments and make revisions to the interpretation, if necessary.

#### **7. Action Items or Assignments**

Project Advisor – Issue availability request for a conference call to address the response to comments when interpretation posting period is known.

#### **8. Future Meeting(s)**

A meeting is tentatively scheduled for the first or second week in November 2012. The project advisor will request availability of the team pending the posting of the interpretation.

#### **9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m. ET, September 19, 2012.