

**ERAG Management Committee Meeting
Final Minutes
April 19, 2007
Orlando, Florida**

April 19, 2007 (8:00 a.m. – noon) – MC only

In attendance:

Nelson Burks	Dominion Virginia Power
Jay Caspary *(Vice Chair)*	Southwest Power Pool
Dennis Chastain* (proxy for David Till)	TVA
Mike Falvo*	Ontario Independent Electricity System Operator
Bill Harm*	PJM
John Odom*	Florida Reliability Coordinating Corporation
John Seidel*	Midwest Reliability Organization
Paul Roman*	Northeast Power Coordinating Corporation
Russ Schussler*	Georgia Transmission Corporation
Charles Yeung*	Southwest Power Pool

1. Approve Jan. 31, 2006 and March 6, 2007 conference call minutes

The minutes from the Jan. 31 and March 6 conference calls were reviewed and approved with minor revisions. **Jay Caspary will e-mail the final versions to the ERAG Management Committee (MC).**

There was a question on whether ERAG MC as a committee will be providing comments on draft NERC standards. It was agreed that would only be done if there was content in a standard that had significant impact on interregional planning or operation and the comment would carry more weight if it was perceived as coming from the Eastern Interconnection rather than from individual entities.

2. Review 2nd Draft of MC Handbook

There is language in the EI Agreement that meeting costs would be split based on Net Energy to Load (NEL). ERAG MC felt this may be excessive and proposed that relatively low expense bills, such as ERAG MC meeting setups, may be split 6 ways and billed accordingly. It was agreed that for costly items allocation by NEL will be used. The region hosting a meeting will send out the bills.

Dennis Chastain questioned a reference in the ERAG Agreement to “generation expansion” studies. He questioned whether ERAG also had to do generation expansion analyses. The ERAG MC message to the Steering Committees will be to clarify that there are many resource

adequacy studies done in various locations and they presently are felt to be adequate to address this reference. The main need for the ERAG Management Committee/Steering Committees is to evaluate any remote generation impacts and interregional effects.

3. Determine details (who will do what by when, etc.) for the following:

a. ERAG web site

RFC had previously volunteered to establish and maintain the ERAG web site. During the previous day's joint meeting with MMWG it was pointed out that with MMWG under ERAG there may be more effort and expense than originally anticipated if the FTP site (or similar mechanism) for exchange and posting of data and cases is considered part of this. **Jay Caspary will contact Jeff Mitchell to confirm that RFC is still willing to support the web site, data posting and data exchange location.**

b. ERAG email exploders (and rosters)

NPCC will maintain the e-mail exploder lists and rosters. It was agreed that the regional representative ERAG MC members will indicate by e-mail to Paul Roman any additions or changes that should be made to the erag-all@npcc.org mailing list. This should eliminate the addition of any addresses to the list that may not be appropriate.

c. ERAG FTP site (and for MMWG)

It was assumed this goes along with the web site sponsorship responsibility.

d. ERAG Administrative Changes in the Handbook

A section 10 will be added to the ERAG handbook to indicate the information on responsibility for and maintenance of the web site, FTP site, mailing lists and roster.

4. Discuss the need for ERAG to incorporate in relation to payment and billing for MMWG and other costs. Discuss other options, such as contractors billing all six regions, etc. – John Odom to lead discussion

There is a need to have a mechanism in place for ERAG to pay the contractor that does the MMWG case development and coordination or other future associated work. In other organizations this need has been met by incorporating but that would have a cost (possibly as high as \$50,000 and would likely have other complications). ERAG MC judged that to not be a worthwhile approach. Also, if invoices were issued separately by the 6 regions the process would be cumbersome. Furthermore, there would be no contractual basis for insuring that payment would be made on time or on the course of action if there were a default. Contractors would balk at entering into such an arrangement. NERC had previously collected the funds from the regions and made the payments but they have indicated they will not do this in the future.

The ERAG MC agreed that the best way to handle this is to have one region serve as the coordinator, making the payments and collecting the shares from the other 5 regions. None of the regions was able to commit to do this so Jeff Mitchell will contact the regional managers to see which one can serve in this role. ERAG MC felt that the smaller expenses, such as sponsoring and paying the expenses for ERAG MC meetings, would be handled best by rotating the meeting locations with the hosting region picking up the costs. ERAG MC was aware that language in the ERAG Agreement calls for even those expenses to be allocated on a Net Energy to Load basis but ERAG MC felt that was an unnecessary complication and could be an exception.

John Odom drafted the following language to address this point, which will be inserted as Section 7.2 in the ERAG handbook.

- Regular and special meetings of the ERAG Management Committee, MMWG and other groups sponsored by ERAG will be hosted by an individual Region. This responsibility will be rotated between the Regions to ensure that responsibility is shared. Since these costs are incidental and the Regions benefit equally, the cost (such as meeting room costs, audio/visual materials, etc.) to host the meetings, but not individual travel costs, will be divided equally between the 6 Regions in ERAG. However, a Region may host a meeting at its own facilities and not invoice the other Regions, if so desired.

5. Discuss the Need and/or coordination of Short Circuit Database(s) for the Eastern Interconnection. Should ERAG provide guidelines for regional development, etc.?

Chuck Chakravarthi had made a request to the ERAG MC for “uniform guidance” on development of steady state, dynamics and short circuit models. ERAG MC discussed the short circuit data base request. This would not apply for protection system analysis work, as that work has considerably different needs. The ERAG members observed that the main use of an Eastern Interconnection (EI)-wide short circuit model would be for representations near area seams and for development of equivalents, otherwise it was not clear how such a data base would be beneficial. Presently a consistent data format used throughout the industry does not exist and various formats are in use (ASPEN, in-house, PSS/e, etc.). Having a common format for exchange of data is what is really needed but one does not exist. It was suggested that use of PSS/e as a common format may be a good way to make this happen because of its widespread use for network analysis. The problem with this is that some entities do not use PSS/e.

ERAG MC discussed possibilities to seek information to determine: 1) how an EI-wide short circuit data base would be used and 2) whether a policy can be established for exchanging short circuit data.

The ERAG region representatives will obtain information on what they presently do for short circuit data and modeling. Jay Caspary will prepare a spreadsheet to use for compiling the survey information and issue it to the Management Committee by May 2.

The ERAG MC will collect the information by the end of May. The information will be analyzed to determine a direction.

6. Discussion of how FCITC is used in each region and whether other possible benchmarks could be used to this classical representation of transfer capability – Ed Weber to lead discussion

Ed Weber and John Seidel discussed whether the compilation and evaluation of transfer case study FCITCs is sufficient to assess impacts on system reliability. This was used as a model for comparison in the results of transfer limits for the RFC-MRO-SERC west-SPP steering committee and its predecessor groups. There was then a sharing of what has been done by the other Study forums. Some other calculations such as total transfer capability and simultaneous transfer capability are also useful for system analysis. However, it was observed that no matter what transfer capability calculation is used the results will be driven by the base and transfer case assumptions (e.g generation dispatches, firm transaction assumptions, generation and transmission additions/changes, etc.). Comparisons are only valid where there are very similar starting assumptions.

More discussion of this will be conducted at the joint steering committee meeting in Boston on May 1.

b. Study of planning case to seasonal case conversion

Mike Falvo and Bill Harm agreed to join the ad hoc group looking at the two options to determine what to do for seasonal cases.

7. MMWG Database Proposal and RFP

MMWG had considered trying to implement this concept for a long time. In 2006 MMWG developed a proposal and has gone ahead with it. The RFP was issued and they will be evaluating the responses in the next few weeks. Some ERAG MC members voiced concerns that this was previously handled wholly within NERC and has moved along quickly. ERAG MC has only recently seen the information on this concept and proposal and will need to evaluate the overall cost versus benefit of doing this as part of the MMWG process. The ERAG MC will review what comes in the responses to the RFC and consider whether sufficient benefit will be derived based on the base cases to be produced.

8. Approval of Interregional Study Reports

The ERAG MC will review the reports via e-mail but not approve them. This is because the Steering Committees have much more expertise to judge adequacy of content for approval of reports for their own vicinity. ERAG MC members would not have familiarity with the system characteristics or familiarity with the content for Study forums outside their own areas. Also, because of the often tight time schedules for publishing the seasonal reports ERAG MC did not

want an approval requirement to delay issuance of final reports. With the review of the reports the ERAG MC members will still be able to provide comments and suggestions.

9. Future Conference Call and Meeting Schedule

a. August 9-10, 2007 (noon to noon) – coincides with SERC pig roast

This meeting was confirmed. ERAG MC members are invited to attend the pig roast the following day. In addition, there is a Generator Modeling and Stability Analysis Study Seminar being held in Chattanooga, Tenn. on May 23-24. Attendance for these can be arranged by contacting David Till to get the necessary information.

b. October 29-30—2007 (noon to noon) –

ERAG MC members agreed to hold this meeting at the new RFC Offices in Fairlawn, Ohio subject to confirmation by Jeff Mitchell.

c. Other meetings/calls needed?

Jeff Mitchell will be requested to set up a date for a one hour ERAG MC conference call. This can be done via e-mail.

Draft for Comment minutes issued by Paul Roman on April 25, 2007.

Draft for Approval minutes issued on June 13, 2007.

Final Minutes issued on June 21, 2007.