

Meeting Notes

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

May 9, 2012 | 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. ET
Conference Call and ReadyTalk Webinar

Administrative

1. Introductions

Scott Barfield-McGinnis (advisor) took attendance and reviewed the roster, there were no additions or changes. Those in attendance are listed below. A quorum was met.

Name	Entity	
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
Eugene Blick	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Tom Bradish	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Doug Hohlbaugh (chair)	FirstEnergy Corp.	Member
R. W. Mazur	Manitoba Hydro	Member
Bill Middaugh	Tri-State Generation and Transmission	Member
John E. Odom	Florida Reliability Coordinating Council	Member
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy	Member
Patrick Sorrells	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Member
Phil J. Tatro	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
John Zipp	ITC Holdings	Member

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

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

3. Review Current Team Roster

The advisor presented the team roster and noted no members were added or removed.

4. Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives

The advisor reviewed the agenda and objectives. There were no changes or additions.

Agenda

1. Review of Action Items from Last Meeting

- a. Advisor – Communicate with Al McMeekin, NERC staff, to obtain chairs of the Regional relay working groups. (Complete)
- b. Advisor – Reach out to the Regions, chairs of transmission planning working groups. (Complete)
- c. Advisor and chair – Draft questions and email letter request to the planning and relay working group chairs, circulate to the team, then issue to the working group by April 20, 2012 with a May 4, 2012 response date. (Complete)

2. Discuss Regional Working Group's Feedback – Complete

An outcome of the April 10, 2012 meeting was to solicit informal feedback from one person (i.e., working group chair) in each of the planning and protection areas of expertise from each Region. In some cases there was not a planning or protection working group available. The team members identified a total of 16 experts with some regions having more than one person. The advisor and chair crafted a memorandum (outlining the request for feedback), a form with the interpretation questions, and the team's draft response. The advisor and chair received 12 responses from seven of the eight regions. The feedback was positive, noting the team had drafted an interpretation response that is on the path. The advisor prepared a summary of the feedback along with the actual comments and distributed it to the team as well as a list for discussion at this meeting.

The feedback was not necessarily from the specific regional entity and may have come from a stakeholder participating in a working group. Team members were pleased with the positive feedback. The chair directed the team through each region's comments. Each received some discussion. Overall, the team agreed that the suggestions and comments did not warrant any changes to the current draft.

Based on the feedback, the chair asked the advisor if the interpretation could have an implementation plan if stakeholders believe the interpretation promotes a different planning philosophy from their current practices. The advisor said it could, but did not know if there have been cases of interpretation implementation plans. Later, the advisor noted he would research the

question further. The advisor commented that the team should consider the efforts of the Order No. 754 Data Request, which may have a two-year completion period and is focusing on this very issue. The idea is not to burden entities with an implementation that would be contrary to the work that will be accomplished over two years and may provide the details beneficial to an implementation of the interpretation. Another NERC staff member recommended using the comment period to ask the question about the need for an implementation period.

3. Discuss and Finalize Interpretation Responses – Complete

After considering the feedback from the regions, the team focused on the current draft responses. Some team members referred back to the feedback as well as the original interpretation request to ensure the responses were satisfactory. FERC staff recommended striking the word “considered” in “components considered.” This change was initially accepted by the team; however, this change was eventually replaced following a team member’s suggestion of a new sentence instead of the last of two sentences in Response #2. The team evaluated the new language and made revisions. FERC staff made another good observation that the team also endorsed. That was using “one or more” in place of “more than one” as not to exclude one protection system. The team refined the new proposed sentence and accepted it.

4. Review of Schedule – Complete

The advisor reviewed the schedule with the team noting that the delivery to quality review is anticipated on or before May 18, 2012. Also, based on quality review and the formal comment period, the team should expect to meet again mid-August 2012 to respond to comments.

5. Next Steps – None at this time

6. Action Items or Assignments

The advisor will determine if there have been any previous implementation plans with interpretations.

7. Future Meeting(s)

The advisor will update the team when the quality review feedback will be available. At that point in time, the team will determine a conference call to respond to quality review feedback. The next major meeting the team to respond to comments following the 30-day formal comment period. The chair asked the team if the next meeting should be an in-person meeting. The advisor recommended determining the dates after knowing the posting dates and block off one or two days in case an in-person meeting is necessary. To address the in-person meeting need, the advisor recommended watching the level of commenting to see if there are indicators on how extensive the comments might be.

8. Adjourn