

## Meeting Notes

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

October 9, 2012  
Conference Call and ReadyTalk Webinar

#### Administrative

##### 1. Introductions

Doug Hohlbaugh (chair) contacted Scott Barfield-McGinnis (project advisor) on Monday, October 8, 2012 to ask if he would run the meeting due to an unexpected conflict. The project advisor accepted. Attendance was taken and the list is provided below.

Name	Entity	
Bill Middaugh	Tri-State Generation and Transmission	Member
Bob Pierce	Duke Energy	Member
John Zipp	ITC Holdings	Member
Eugene Blick	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Tom Bradish	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (Project Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
Phil Tatro (Technical Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff

##### 2. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was not achieved as three of the seven total members were present.

### 3. **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement**

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

### 4. **Review Current Team Roster**

The project advisor noted that no members were added or removed.

### 5. **Review Meeting Agenda and Objectives**

The project advisor reviewed the agenda and objectives.

## **Agenda**

### 1. **Review of Meeting Notes**

The project advisor advised the meeting notes from September 19, 2012 were posted on October 7, 2012 which did not allow sufficient time for members to review. The review and acceptance of the meeting notes would be tabled until the next meeting.

### 2. **Review of Action Items from Last Meeting**

None

### 3. **Respond to Quality Review Feedback**

The members who were present reviewed the quality review feedback. Overall, the members were accepting of the preliminary responses prepared by the chair and project advisor. Below are highlights.

### 4. **Revise Interpretation Response**

The members decided to change the ReliabilityFirst Corporation (RFC) comment response in question 1 to no change made. In this comment, RFC suggested that the interpretation drafting team revise its response by replacing two occurrences of "must." In prior meetings, the team concurred with the suggestion; however, after considering the quality review team's feedback, it raises concern whether or not the acceptance of RFC's suggestion communicated the same intent the interpretation team intended originally.

### 5. **Review of Schedule**

The project advisor noted the project was currently about 1 to 1 ½ weeks ahead of schedule. Upon determination of the 45-day comment period posting and 10-day initial ballot, the schedule status will be clearer.

### 6. **Next Steps**

The next step is to return the quality review feedback and revised interpretation to Standards Process for a final review and a 45-day formal comment period with an initial ballot in the last 10 days of the comment period. Industry stakeholder comments will be assembled following the comment period and the team will reconvene to respond to comments and make revisions to the interpretation, if necessary.

**7. Action Items or Assignments**

Project advisor – Issue documents from the close of this meeting.

**8. Future Meeting(s)**

Team members should expect to have a conference call the week of December 17, 2012. The posting for 45 days and initial ballot needs to consider the Thanksgiving holiday and avoid having the ballot during the holiday. Given this condition; the ballot will most likely occur the week after Thanksgiving allowing for a mid-December 2012 team call.

**9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m. ET on October 9, 2012.