

Meeting Notes Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EDT on Monday, March 3, 2008 at the FRCC offices in Tampa, FL. Meeting attendees were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Jones	Brian Keel	Tom Mielnik
Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Paul Rocha	Jim Useldinger
Dana Walters	Bob Williams	Matt Bordelon, CLECO — Guest
Tom Gentile, Quanta — Guest	Daniela Hammons, Center Point — Guest	Ray Kershaw, ITC — Guest
Charles Long, Entergy — Guest	Bob Snow, FERC — Guest	Guy Zito, NPCC — Guest
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — E. Dobrowolski

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

3. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — John Odom

The objective of this meeting was to continue the progress on finalizing the documents required for posting after the April meeting.

Project Work Items

1. TPL-001-1 Revisions

A. Finalize the Text for the Second Posting.

Paul Rocha reported on his sub-team's progress:

Data modeling: The sub-team provided a draft that included the deletion of R1 with several of its sub-requirements being moved to other requirements as directed by the SDT at its last meeting. The rationale for this decision was that the requirement was mainly duplicative of requirements in the MOD standards as was pointed out in the industry comments.

In order to do this properly, it was felt that there should be an explicit reference to the applicable MOD standards in TPL-001. However, this would cause future maintenance problems.

The SDT then raised the question as to whether they could rely on the MOD standards being truly sufficient for TPL purposes and how to ensure that they would be followed.

The SDT also pointed out that in the first posting they forgot to inform the industry that R1 was a placeholder for TPL modeling requirements until the MOD standards were updated accordingly. At that time, R1 would be deleted from TPL-001. If this statement had been included with the first posting, it was felt that many of the comments would have been negated. This statement should be included as background information in the second question set.

Action Item — Paul Rocha's sub-team should include a statement on the MOD and TPL ties and the future deletion of modeling requirements from TPL-001 once the MOD standards are updated.

At this time, several of the sub-requirements of R1 do not exist in the MOD standards and therefore, they need to be kept in TPL-001 as there would be a hole in the data and modeling requirements otherwise. Therefore, the sub-team was requested to take another look at the wording of R1 and its sub-requirements to eliminate those sub-requirements that are sufficiently covered in approved MOD standards while making certain that the wording for the remaining sub-requirements that are not handled in approved MOD standards are correct and measurable.

It was felt that TPL-001 shouldn't start with the modeling requirements. Therefore, they will be moved to the bottom of the list. This will also serve to make it easier and less confusing to delete the requirement once the MOD standards are revised.

Action Item — Paul’s sub-team will delete the requirements from R1 that are duplicative of requirements in approved MOD standards. The remaining requirements will be re-written as required to ensure measurability. Whatever is left of the R1 requirements will be moved to the bottom of the list of requirements.

Action Item — Ed will make an entry in the NERC database of standards issues concerning the tie between the revised data and modeling requirements in TPL-001 and the future MOD standards revision project to ensure that the proper links are made to allow for clean-up of the TPL-001 data and modeling requirements in the MOD project.

Short-circuit wording: This item was tabled pending the resolution of Bob Millard’s sub-team proposed wording changes as that will influence this wording.

Bob Millard reported on his sub-team’s progress:

Sensitivity and CAP wording: If the sensitivity list is exactly the same for both steady-state and stability, then why not pull sensitivity out to a generic section of its own? The lists are not identical. The requirements shown in R2.3.4.1 are different for the two scenarios. Also, there are fewer cases required for stability.

Overall, this wording needs to be coordinated with R2.7 and the wording for CAP.

It was decided not to include wording such as ‘good utility practice’ for sensitivity handling.

The SDT decided to leave the sensitivity lists embedded in the requirements as per the current version. The lists will be different for the two scenarios: steady-state and stability.

- R2.4.3.1 will be re-written to clarify ‘assumptions’.
- R2.4.3.2 and R2.4.3.7 will be deleted.
- R2.4.3.3 and R2.4.3.5 — suggested wording changes were approved.
- How should sensitivity cases be handled? The SDT added the word ‘technical’ in front of rationale in R2.4.3 and decided to leave R2.7.2 as is.

- R2.4.4 should be deleted as it is not really a requirement and an entity can always do more than what is in the standard.
- The wording of R2.4 should be returned to what it was in the posting. The concept of 'annual' is not required for stability.
- R2.7.1.3 needs to be re-worded for clarity.

Action Item — Bob Millard's sub-team is to provide another revision to the sensitivity and CAP wording per the discussions in Tampa.

Bernie Pasternack reported on his sub-team's progress:

- R3.3.2.2: There was confusion in the first sentence as to when redispatch is allowed. This language will need to be consistent with FAC-010 and may need to coordinate with the ATC work as well.
- R3.5/R3.6: Several changes were made to R3.5 during the meeting and the sub-requirements were re-ordered for clarity. Similar changes will need to be made to R3.6 in order for it to have consistent wording with R3.5. These changes will also be made to R4.5 and R4.6. Brian will need to check with WECC on the proposed re-wording of R3.6 and R4.6. Due to the changes made here, questions 41 and 42 from the first posting should be continued in the second posting.

Action Item — Bernie's sub-team is to re-word R3.3.2.2, R3.5, R3.6, and R4.5 and R4.6 as per the SDT discussions in Tampa.

Action Item — Brian needs to check the re-wording of R4.5 and R4.6 with WECC.

Doug Hohlbaugh (for Chifong) reported on their sub-team's progress:

- R4.6.1: The SDT did not accept the suggested changes and decided to return to the original wording.
- Bus-tie breaker: The SDT accepted the proposed definition with minor re-wording. The summary response to comments should specify that the reason for the differentiation is based on probability as bus section faults are far less likely than line faults and therefore bus-tie breakers get far less exposure.

Action Item — Doug's sub-team will revise the bus-tie breaker definition as per the SDT discussion in Tampa. An explanation will be included with the summary response in the first question set.

B. Discuss Handling of Conditional Firm Transfers.

This item was delayed until the next SDT meeting.

C. Finalize the Performance Tables

Doug reported on the performance tables:

- No changes were made since the Houston meeting as he was waiting for open SDT discussion on several items.
- The current groupings are a problem. The SDT decided to split up P1 generally based on probabilities. The current P1-1 through P1-4 will be merged with the current P1-9 as the new P1. A new P2 will be made up of the current P1-5 through P1-7. Both the new P1 and the new P2 will be considered as single contingencies.
- The current P1-10 will be moved to the current P6. Note — It may be necessary to differentiate different designs of bipolar DC in the future.
- The current P1-6 and P1-7 should be noted as internal faults.
- The current P1-8 needs to be in both steady-state and stability.
- The old P9-3 should be retained and placed in the new P2 with the description of single-ended line with no fault descriptor.
- The event list for the current P2 should be the same as the new event list for the new P1.
- The current P4 and P5 should be combined and the list of events should be the same as the new P1 except for generators.
- The stuck breaker terminology should be left as is.
- The list of events for the stuck breaker should include shunt devices but should not include DC.
- There should be a new, separate category created for protection system failure. It should be handled similarly to stuck breaker but with no 300KV separation and 'Yes' for both firm transfers and non-consequential load.
- Delete 'inadvertent trip' from the stability column for P1.
- Delete '(pick worst case)' from the stability column for multiple contingencies.
- All of the old P9 events need to be in the revised table although P9-6 may need some clarification.

- The old P8-3 needs to be checked as it appears to have been worded incorrectly.

Action Item — Doug's (Chifong's) sub-team is to revise the performance tables as per the SDT discussions in Tampa.

D. Review Draft Measures

This discussion was postponed until the requirements are finalized.

E. Review Draft VRF and Time Horizons

Doug reported on this issue:

- VRF: A draft was presented but the SDT had numerous questions about how to assign VRF and how to handle sub-requirements. The goal is to only have VRF at the requirement level and not at the sub-requirement level. The SDT felt that there may be existing sub-requirements that should be classified differently than the parent requirement. If that is the case, the standard should be re-formatted to make those sub-requirements full requirements. In order to get a feel for how extensive this might be, the SDT will be polled on assigning VRF to requirements and sub-requirements based on the current posted version of TPL-001. The findings will be summarized so that the SDT can decide how to move forward.

Action Item — Ed will poll the SDT members on VRF assignments for the currently posted version of the requirements and sub-requirements.

- Time Horizon: The SDT accepted the proposal of Long-term Planning for all time horizons in TPL-001.

2. **Review Draft Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack**

The SDT reviewed the draft prepared by Bernie's sub-team. Several generic items need to be cleaned up:

- The implementation plan for TPL-001 must clearly address when the current standards will be retired including TPL-005 and TPL-006.
- All approval dates are based on regulatory approval. Normal wording is 'the first day after the first quarter following regulatory approval'.

The SDT pointed out that the implementation plan may have to accommodate the need for expansion or building plans. Even though this is a planning standard and there can be no mandate to build, sometimes the only solution available in a CAP is to build. That reality needs to be incorporated in whatever time periods end up in the implementation plan. Therefore, the implementation plan must include a timeframe

for producing the assessments, studies, and CAP required by the standard with a secondary timeframe for allowing time to catch up to what the CAP requires.

As an example, WECC took a quick, unofficial survey of their members and came up with multiple concerns in dealing with items P2, P3, and P5 in the current proposed performance table.

It was pointed out that there were a significant number of comments that complained about P5 as well. After reviewing the comments at a previous meeting, many expressed their concerns by stating the 300 KV split was not appropriate. The responses to these comments will explain the SDT's rationale for the 300 KV split and will ask a question(s) about the performance requirements again.

Action Item — Bernie's sub-team is to revise the draft implementation plan based on the SDT discussions in Tampa.

3. Review Draft Questions for Second Posting — Paul Rocha

The draft question set will be revised based on the SDT discussions in Tampa.

There should be a general question in the second set similar to question 43 in the first set. It may be accompanied by a companion question asking if there are any show-stoppers in TPL-001.

The SDT also wants to include a question on cost-benefit of raising the bar.

Question 41 on regional differences and question 42 on tariffs, etc. from the first question set should be retained in the second question set.

4. Develop Plan for Completing the Issues Matrix — John Odom

The issues matrix that Doug created needs to be finalized prior to the second posting and before the SDT meets with FERC staff to discuss TPL-001.

5. Confirm Action Plan for Finalizing Responses — Sub-Team Leaders

The action plan created in Houston was affirmed. The remaining action items are shown under item 7.

6. Next Steps — John Odom

The March 19th conference call and the April meeting will be used to finalize the documents required for posting. The goal is to be ready to submit documents to NERC staff following the April meeting.

7. Review Action Items and Schedule — E. Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this meeting:

- Paul's sub-team should include a statement on the MOD and TPL ties and the future deletion of modeling requirements from TPL-001 once the MOD standards are updated.
- Paul's sub-team will delete the requirements from R1 that are duplicative of requirements in approved MOD standards. The remaining requirements will be re-written as required to ensure measurability. Whatever is left of the R1 requirements will be moved to the bottom of the list of requirements.
- Ed will make an entry in the NERC database of standards issues concerning the tie between the revised data and modeling requirements in TPL-001 and the future MOD standards revision project to ensure that the proper links are made to allow for clean-up of the TPL-001 data and modeling requirements in the MOD project.
- Bob Millard's sub-team is to provide another revision to the sensitivity and CAP wording based on the discussions in Tampa.
- Bernie's sub-team is to re-word R3.3.2.2, R3.5, R3.6, and R4.5, R4.6 as per the SDT discussions in Tampa.
- Brian needs to check the re-wording of R4.5 and R4.6 with WECC.
- Doug's sub-team is to revise the performance tables as per the SDT discussions in Tampa.
- Doug's sub-team will revise the bus-tie breaker definition as per the SDT discussion in Tampa. An explanation will be included with the summary response in the first question set.
- Ed will poll the SDT members on VRF assignments for the currently posted version of the requirements and sub-requirements.
- Bernie's sub-team is to revise the draft implementation plan based on the SDT discussions in Tampa.

The following action items were carried over from the Houston meeting:

- Daniela Hammons will aggregate the question 43 responses.
- Sub-team leaders will review their responses to comments based on the Houston and Tampa meetings, revise as required, and submit the updates to the mail server.
- The revised responses will be reviewed by another sub-team for sanity and responsiveness.
- Once the responses have received their sanity check, they will be compiled in the master form by Ed.

- Once all of the text revisions have been received, Ed will compile a master red-line version of TPL-001.

Every effort should be made to complete action items prior to the March 19th call but all action items must be complete prior to the April meeting.

8. Future Meetings and Conference Calls

- A. Conference call and WebEx — Wednesday, March 19, 2008 from noon–3 p.m. EDT. Details to be supplied.
- B. Meeting (tentative) — Tuesday, April 15, 2008 from 8 a.m. EDT through Thursday, April 17, 2008 at noon EDT in Washington, DC at FERC. Details to be supplied.
- C. Conference call and WebEx — Monday, April 28, 2008 from noon–4 p.m. EDT. Details to be supplied.
- D. In addition, the SDT will need to schedule a meeting with FERC staff prior to the next posting.

The SDT members thanked FRCC for their hospitality and the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m. on March 4, 2008.