

Assess Transmission Future Needs Standard Drafting Team

Conference Call Notes

February 7, 2007

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The call commenced at 1100 EST.

Jason Atwood and Lloyd Linke have resigned from ATFNSDT due to the press of other duties.

Participants in the call were:

John Odom (Chair)	Bob Millard (Vice Chair)	Darrin Church
Doug Hohlbaugh	Robert Jones	Brian Keel
Tom Mielnik	Bernie Pasternack	Mahendra Patel
Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas	Yury Tsimberg
Robert Williams	Anthony Jablonski (Guest)	Ed Dobrowolski (NERC)

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

Revised guidelines were sent out to the team prior to the call. No questions were raised.

c. Review Meeting Agenda & Objectives — John Odom

The main objectives of this conference call were:

- Check on sub-team progress
- Allow all team members to hear the sub-teams reasoning
- Allow for all team members to comment on sub-team items
- Not to attempt to resolve issues at this early stage
- Identify other issues not already captured in the original work sheet
- Identify issues needing coordination with or transfer to other sub-teams

2. Reports from Working Sub-Teams

All of the sub-teams provided reports based on the work that they had done to date as reflected in the aggregated worksheet that was distributed to the team as a whole prior to the call.

All team members are encouraged to put any comments or questions about sub-team direction or conclusions in writing through the list server.

a. Assessment Team — Bob Williams

Some of the discussion items revolving around the sub-team report included:

- It must be clear that an assessment is not a study. It is not just a load flow but does contain local knowledge, studies, plans, corrective actions, etc.
- The sub-team could use some help in defining exactly how you stress the system for assessment purposes. It was stated that stress level is more important than simply performing seasonal assessments such as winter and summer conditions. The effect of known outages should be included.
- The assessments must be written but the scope of the required documentation needs to be fully and completely defined.
- Applicability of the standards must be written to the true responsible entities.
- The sub-team is evaluating ways to clarify periods for which assessments will be required. In their current thinking, year one would start immediately and year two starts one year after the initial assessment is completed. Therefore, year one falls in the operations horizon, near term is years two through five, and long term is years six through ten.
 - Timing of the assessment (when made and when submitted) should consider the dates set up by the NERC RAS.
- Corrective actions will need to be defined.

b. Steady State Team — Chifong Thomas

Some key items for this sub-team include:

- There is a need to coordinate the near and long term timeframes with the new ideas from the Assessment Team.
- While the team addressed the concepts of sensitivity in several of their discussions such as the need to vary dispatch studies, the terminology is not explicitly used in the report. We must directly address the sensitivity issue and make sure that we spell out the exact mechanism being employed to effectively provide the appropriate sensitivity studies.
- This team needs to consider operating vs. planning horizons as well as the stress vs. seasonal concept addressed by the Assessment Team.
- There is a definite need to coordinate with the ratings standards. Appropriate ratings for planning purposes must be defined. The team initially feels that time duration basis for ratings need to reflect the expected outage time for the simulation being analyzed.
- Coordination with MOD-016 is required to ensure consistency of data.

c. Stability Team — Bernie Pasternack

This discussion on this report included:

- There is a need to define the terms ‘partial and interim review’ as used in the report.
 - *AI* – Yury Tsimberg will send the team the NPCC document explaining these terms.
- There is a question as to whether there is a need for a separate response for steady state and stability in all instances.
- The team will need to define the included sensitivities from the provided list.

d. Models Team — Brian Keel

The key elements in this discussion included:

- WECC needs to support path ratings without contract considerations. This may lead to a regional waiver situation.
- Load models still need to be addressed. This would include reactive models for steady state conditions.

e. Corrective Action Plans Team — Bob Pierce

This team raised several questions:

- Is there a need for back-up plans in the standards? For example, do you need to have a ‘contingency’ plan in place for an outage that doesn’t return to service as planned?
- An approved definition of BPS is required to write this standard.
- Some events don’t seem to lend themselves to written standards. Cascading events were suggested as an example. It was thought that a white paper on this topic may be more appropriate than a written standard, but the status of a white paper was called into question. It was also pointed out that simply because certain events or situations were not included in the existing standard it doesn’t mean that they can’t be included in the revision. The SAR and the supplement have sufficient flexibility to allow the SDT to cover any pertinent situation.

3. Coordinate Future Actions of Working Sub-Teams — John Odom

Each team needs to continue their work based on the inputs received from the SDT during the call. Updates are not required to be placed on the worksheet but documentation of progress and decisions is a requirement. SDT members are encouraged to send any thoughts or comments on sub-team activities through the list server for all to see.

The following items should be explored by the sub-teams before the next meeting:

- Assessment: Define exactly what is included in an assessment.
- Steady State and Stability: Define exactly what studies are needed, when they are needed, and how they should be accomplished.
- Models: Coordinate with the MOD standards and consider forecasting models.
- Corrective Plans: What are the expected outcomes?

4. Review Action Items — Ed Dobrowolski

There was one action item raised during this call:

- Yury Tsimberg will distribute the NPCC document explaining partial and interim reviews to the team as a whole.

5. Schedule Next Meetings

- a. Thursday, March 1, 2007 at 0800 and Friday, March 2, 2007 until noon — Dallas, Texas at the DFW Marriott following the TADS Meeting
- b. Friday, March 16, 2007 – Conference call and WebEx from 1100 to 1300 EST
- c. Wednesday, April 4, 2007 starting at 0800 CDT through Thursday, April 5, 2007 at 1700 CDT at Center Point Energy in Houston, Texas (tentative – awaiting confirmation from Center Point on arrangements)

6. Adjourn

The call was adjourned by the chairman at 1400 EST.

Notes by Ed Dobrowolski