

Conference Call Notes for Project 2006-02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the call to order at 1:00 p.m. EDT on Wednesday, May 27, 2009. Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Jones	Brian Keel	John Odom, Chair
Bernie Pasternack	Chifong Thomas	Jim Useldinger
Dana Walters	Tom Gentile, Observer	Ray Kershaw, Observer
Chuck Lawrence, Observer	Charles Long, Observer	Hari Singh, Observer
Bob Snow, FERC Observer	Curt Stepanek, Observer	Steve Rueckert, Observer
Eugene Blick, FERC Guest	Stuart Hansen, FERC Guest	Ganesh Velumyllum, PJM Guest
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Conference Call Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The goal of the call was to resolve the remaining open issues from the FERC staff meeting.

2. Discuss Possible Roadmap Changes from FERC Staff Meeting

Requirement R1.1.6: The SDT used the generic term “network resources” to provide flexibility and not to tie this requirement to a specific type of unit. Staff feels that energy only units are the only ones allowed to be tripped in the old category ‘b’. Tripping capacity units for category ‘b’ Contingencies may be seen as promoting a less reliable system. Planning models were described as generation rich, since the planning reserve requirements are greater than the operating reserve requirements and thus a handoff to operators based on such a plan could give the operator a system that cannot be reliably operated since significantly more units will be unavailable in the operating timeframes. Staff felt that a ceiling on the amount of generation that may be tripped might be in order or a better solution would be not to allow generators to be tripped for single Contingencies.

The SDT noted that the only units listed as on in planning studies are those required to serve Load, accommodate transfers, and meet reserve obligations.

Questions were asked of industry in the first posting as to whether generation tripping should be an allowed part of a planner's tools. The overwhelming response was that it should be and the SDT agreed as long as no Load was tripped as a result. The NERC TIS also addressed this issue in a letter to the SDT.

The SDT agreed however that some sort of ceiling may be required. There are words in footnote 1.a.ii for Stability addressing this issue but steady state is not addressed. The footnote wording is approaching the status of a requirement and the SDT has agreed that requirements shouldn't be buried in footnotes.

Any solution must allow for tripping those units that have contracts calling for tripping in agreed upon situations and must consider deliverability of generation to Load.

A sub-team of Tom Gentile, Chifong, and Bob Jones will develop appropriate wording (and location within the roadmap) for new requirement(s) that will address both steady state and Stability. Their work will include a recommendation as to how to handle footnote 1.

AI — A sub-team of Tom Gentile, Chifong, and Bob Jones will develop appropriate wording (and location) for new requirement(s) that will address both steady state and Stability by June 9th so that it is available prior to the next conference call. Their work will include a recommendation as to how to handle footnote 1.

3. Report from Sub-team on Transient Voltage Recovery Issue — Bob Jones, Tom Mielnik, and Ron Mazur

This discussion started with a comment on header note 'b': FERC staff asked why Supplemental Load could be used to resolve a Stability concern.

Supplemental Load Loss was not considered due to the Stability timeframe. After some discussion, the SDT decided that Header note 'i' described the condition correctly but there was no transient voltage response requirement in the text.

The SDT decided that a new requirement was needed on transient voltage response. This will be located as Requirement R4 and may include criteria with defined boundaries. A sub-team of Bob Jones, Tom Mielnik, and Ron Mazur will draft wording for the new requirement prior to the next conference call.

The sub-team was unable to meet prior to this call and this discussion was postponed until the next conference call on June 15th.

AI — A sub-team of Bob Jones, Tom Mielnik, and Ron Mazur will draft wording for the new requirement (R4) on transient voltage response by June 9th so that it is available prior to the next conference call.

4. Resolve Discrepancy between R2.7.2 and R2.1.3 and R2.4.3

In Requirement R2.7.2, multiple sensitivity runs are assumed while in Requirements R2.1.3 and R2.4.3, only a single run is required. This appears to be inconsistent.

After much discussion, it was determined that the words in the text are consistent as multiple studies are required in Requirements R2.1.3 and R2.4.3. To provide some clarity, the word ‘scenarios’ was changed to ‘studies’ in requirement R2.7.2.

5. Discuss Regional Planning Criteria from TPL-005-0, R1

The Implementation Plan calls for the retirement of TPL-005 and TPL-006. Most of the requirements in those 2 standards will be picked up through NERC’s Rules and Procedures. However, the need for regional planning in TPL-005-0 doesn’t fall into that realm.

Requirement R8 starts to cover the issue through the peer review distribution and consideration process but stops short of requiring any action should there be a question raised during the peer review. There needs to be some sort of feedback loop in Requirement R8.

This discussion led to another related issue in that there is no current requirement in TPL-001-1 that mandates that a planner must look outside their own footprint in considering Contingencies. New wording was developed for Requirements R3.4 and 4.4 to cover this need. There was additional discussion as to whether the revised language was enough to address the regional planning requirements from TPL-005-0 and if it was appropriate for Stability. After further debate, the new words were left as is and SDT members were encouraged to submit proposed changes via the mail server for group discussion.

6. Next Steps — John Odom

The standard was posted Tuesday, May 26, 2009. As previously discussed, a more aggressive approach is needed for responding to comments. The following schedule was developed with that in mind:

- Thursday, July 9th — 3rd posting concludes
- Friday, July 10th — Comments sent to Edd
- Monday, July 13th — Comments distributed to SDT
- Monday, July 13th through Friday, July 17th — Assigned SDT members carve out time in their schedules ***now*** to respond to comments (12 – 16 working hours minimum)

Individual responsibility for the responses is being emphasized this time as opposed to the previous team approach. The assignments for responding to comments are as follows:

- Q1 (modeling and data) — Darrin Church
- Q2 (assessments) — Chifong Thomas
- Q3 (steady state) — Ron Mazur
- Q4 (stability) — Bob Jones
- Q5 (proxies) — Brian Keel
- Q6 (joint responsibilities) — Bill Harm
- Q7 (890 and peer review) — Bob Pierce
- Q8 (definitions) — Dana Walters
- Q9 (table and performance elements) — Doug Hohlbaugh
- Q10 (footnotes 5 and 10) — Charles Long
- Q11 (implementation plan) — Bernie Pasternack

The SDT approved the plan.

7. Next Meetings — All

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Monday, June 15, 2009 from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. EDT. Details will be distributed.

There will be a WebEx associated with this posting. The exact time and date is still being developed.

The next meeting will be from Tuesday, July 21st through Thursday, July 23rd (noon) in Akron, OH where assigned SDT members will summarize their comment responses and lead discussions on items requiring group input. Meeting logistics will be distributed.

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Tuesday, August 4th from noon to 4p.m. EDT to resolve action items from the Akron meeting

There will be a conference call and WebEx on Thursday, August 13th from noon to 4p.m. EDT for clean-up of any and all remaining items.

Another meeting with FERC staff is anticipated in this timeframe but is unscheduled at this time.

8. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this call:

- A sub-team of Tom Gentile, Chifong, and Bob Jones will develop appropriate wording (and location) for new requirement(s) that will address both steady

state and Stability by June 9th so that it is available prior to the next conference call. Their work will include a recommendation as to how to handle footnote 1.

- A sub-team of Bob Jones, Tom Mielnik, and Ron Mazur will draft wording for the new requirement (R4) on transient voltage response by June 9th so that it is available prior to the next conference call.

This project can be brought back on schedule if the plan described in item #7 and the schedule of meetings and calls described in item #8 are adhered to.

9. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 4:15 p.m. EDT.