

Meeting Notes

Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT — Project 2006-02

August 26–27, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT

TVA Offices

1101 Market Street, Chattanooga, TN

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. EDT on Tuesday, August 26, 2008 at the TVA Offices in Chattanooga, TN. Meeting participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Julius Horvath	Bob Jones	Brian Keel
Ron Mazur	Tom Mielnik	Bob Millard, Vive Chair
John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce
Chifong Thomas	Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters
Bob Williams	Tom Gentile, Observer	Charles Long, Observer
Ray Kershaw, Observer	Steve Rueckert, Observer	Hari Singh, Observer
Steve Lee, EPRI, Guest	Curt Stepanek, Ameren, Guest	Ed Dobrowolski, NERC

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The main goals for the meeting were to prepare for and hold the industry wide WebEx on the second posting and then to continue on with the work identified in the agenda.

2. Review of Presentation for Conference Call

John previewed his presentation for the afternoon call for the SDT members. Several changes were made as a result of the review and revision 5 was created for the actual call presentation.

The call will be transcribed and the presentation will be posted following the WebEx.

3. Update on NERC Survey of More Stringent Criteria (Missing WECC Criteria) — John Odom

There was data missing from the survey — PG&E and APS from WECC. In addition, WECC submitted its TPL standard for inclusion and it got dropped as well.

The SDT reviewed the PG&E and APS criteria and determined that no changes were required to TPL-001-1 as a result of the survey.

The SDT also reviewed the WECC TPL standard. There was some discussion as to whether the WECC requirements on reclosing needed to be brought forward to the national standard. However, it was determined that the topic was deemed to be sufficiently covered in existing wording. No changes will be made unless commenters shed additional light on the area.

The SDT reviewed the requirements on common right-of-way in the WECC TPL and determined that additional discussion was required in this area. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting.

4. Review Revised Sub-team Proposal to Address Issues Related to Protection System — Brian Keel

The Protection Sub-team provided their latest effort in a Power Point presentation. The last slide was the new material.

After review by the SDT, it was felt that a table heading was not the right method for restoring this information and that a requirement was needed. This would apply to both steady state and stability. NPCC has criteria on this topic and will provide the material to the sub-team for review.

Action Item — Dana will provide NPCC criteria on the protection system issue to the Protection Sub-team (Brian to lead).

The Sub-team will look at draft wording for new requirements to go into posting three and report back at the next meeting.

Action Item — The Protection sub-team will report back to the SDT in Austin on proposals for new requirements to bring the ‘old’ protection system requirements back into the standard.

5. Requirements for Assessment Case — John Odom (time permitting)

This item was postponed until the Austin meeting.

6. Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. — Dry Run of WebEx — Darrin Church & John Odom

The dry run was set up to make certain that the SDT could get out through the TVA firewalls to run the WebEx. The test was successful.

7. Tuesday from 1:30–4:30 p.m. — Industry Wide Conference Call and WebEx — John Odom

The call and WebEx were started at 1:30 p.m. EDT as scheduled. There were 145 participants recorded on the call.

One caller pointed out a factual error in the posting. Extreme Events note #1 makes reference to Requirement R5.5.4 when it should be Requirement R5.4.4.

All callers were reminded that they need to officially express their concerns and questions through comments regardless of whether they were asked and answered during the call.

8. Wednesday at 8 a.m. — Review of Conference Call and WebEx

The SDT reviewed some key points extracted from the question and answer session:

- There may still be some confusion with regard to steady state vs. stability in the tables since the events are referred to by the same designation (P1, etc.) in both tables.
- R9. — need to define the relationship of loads
- R9. through R14. — need to review the list of responsible entities. Should the TSP be included?
- Consequential Load Loss — definition was questioned. Does it need to be more specific? How is firm handled? Need to spell out the transmission entities.
- Extreme Events — Should #1 and #3b be combined?
- R3.2.1. — How do you interpret ‘treated’? Perhaps, ‘response’ would be a better choice of words.
- There is no performance requirement associated with the short-circuit analysis.
- Clarification of n-1-1
- Does the relay loadability wording create double jeopardy with FAC-009 or the MOD standards?
- R4. — provide example of increased short circuit with outage?
- DC lines — firm contracts vs. conditional firm
- Does P1 conflict with OATT?

9. Sample VSLs and Possible Need for Roadmap Re-organization — Doug Hohlbaugh, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile

The sub-team reviewed the proposal that they had e-mailed to the SDT prior to the meeting. This example was based on the existing format with every possible violation pulled out and specifically included in the VSL.

The SDT decided that this approach was too complex and asked the sub-team to consider something simpler. After some debate, it was decided to write the VSL against the major requirements and to utilize a 'sliding scale' for the VSL. In this approach, those items deemed as lower in R2. would be listed as such and the VSL would simply state that if an entity missed on of the following, it was not in compliance. Then moderate would roll up the lower VSL and be invoked if the entity missed two of the lower items or any of the list of items pulled out of R2. that were considered moderate. This would then roll up into higher and then on to severe.

The sub-team broke off from the main meeting to create an example of this new approach.

As part of the review of the VSL, it was determined that there is a problem with R2.5. It references R5.5 which creates a circuitous path that should be fixed. Bob Jones will look at changing the wording of R2.5 to fix this problem.

Action Item — Bob Jones will create a draft of R2.5. to clean up the circuitous references by October 14th so that it can be reviewed in Austin.

The sub-team reported back with the example of the new approach and the SDT agreed to pursue this for all VSL. The sub-team will create a draft for review in Austin.

Action Item — Doug, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile will create a draft set of VSL by September 29th that will be reviewed in Austin.

All SDT members were requested to look at the sub-team's proposed measures for R2 and to send comments out through the mail server.

Action Item — SDT members are to review the draft measures for R2 and send out any comments via the mail server no later than September 12th.

10. Review Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack

The aggregated version of the plan, dated July 8, 2008, and containing comments from Chifong, Dana, and Bob Millard was used for the review. Yury also sent in comments but they were more semantic than technical so that version was not reviewed.

There is a significant problem with the concept of a grace period or transition time. An implementation plan can't grant a waiver from compliance nor can it introduce

new requirements. Any concept of transition is going to have to be addressed through interim measures written into the requirements. That will allow the necessary link between performance and compliance.

The sub-team was requested to draft a proposal for the Austin meeting.

Action Item — The Implementation Plan Sub-team will draft new requirements to accommodate the concept of a transition period for review in Austin.

11. Assignment of Sub-teams to Respond to Comments

Four sub-teams were created and assigned specific questions to review. The goal is to have these sub-teams up and running via conference calls prior to Austin so that work will begin on the responses before the meeting. The first day of the meeting will be primarily devoted to break-out sessions of the sub-teams to finalize their responses. These sessions will also be utilized to identify any SDT-wide issues that will then be discussed on day two of the meeting.

The sub-teams and their assignments are:

- Team A: Bernie (lead), Jim, Brian, Bob Jones, Ray — Q1, 2, 4, and 6
- Team B: Chifong (lead), Doug, Tom Mielnik, Dana, Charles — Q3, 7, 8, 9, and 11
- Team C: Darrin (lead), Julius, Bob Pierce, Curt, Hari — Q5 and 15
- Team D: Bob Millard (lead), Bill, Bob Williams, Ron, Tom Gentile — Q10, 12, 13, and 14

12. Next Steps — John Odom

The next steps for the SDT are to continue work on the standard so as to support a third posting complete with VRF, Time Horizon, Measures, Data Retention, and VSL by early 1st quarter of 2009.

13. Next Meetings

- a. Face-to-face meeting in Austin, TX on Tuesday, October 28, 2008 and Wednesday, October 29, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT (both days). Details to follow.
- b. Face-to-face meeting in St. Louis, MO (tentative location but dates are set) on Tuesday, November 18, 2008 and Wednesday, November 19, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. CST both days and Thursday, November 20, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon CST. Fall back locations are Charlotte and Atlanta. Details to follow.
- c. Face-to-face-meeting in Charlotte, NC (tentative location but dates are set) on Wednesday, December 10, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST and Thursday, December 11, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon EST. (**Note:** This is a slight change from the dates discussed in TN as there was a potential conflict with hotel space in

- Charlotte due to a Monday night football game. Therefore, the meeting was pushed back one day.) Fall back location is Atlanta. Details to follow.
- d. Conference calls will be scheduled as required during the Austin meeting.

14. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this meeting:

- Dana will provide NPCC criteria on the protection system issue to the Protection Sub-team (Brian to lead).
- The Protection Sub-team will report back to the SDT in Austin on proposals for new requirements to bring the 'old' protection system requirements back into the standard.
- Bob Jones will create a draft of R2.5. to clean up the circuitous references by October 14th so that it can be reviewed in Austin.
- Doug, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile will create a draft set of VSL by September 29th that will be reviewed in Austin.
- SDT members are to review the draft measures for R2. and send out any comments via the mail server no later than September 12th.
- The Implementation Plan Sub-team will draft new requirements to accommodate the concept of a transition period for review in Austin.

The importance of meeting the SDT derived schedule which calls for a third posting in 1st quarter of 2009 was emphasized. This will require considerable effort in the 4th quarter of 2008.

15. Adjourn

The Chair thanked TVA for its hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 4 p.m. EDT on Wednesday, August 27, 2008.