Meeting Summary - LCR Study Advisory Group (LSAG)
October 20, 2006, ISO Offices in Folsom

Overview

On October 20, 2006 LSAG conducted its second meeting. Those in attendance and meeting material are listed in Attachment 1. LSAG determined the date for the CAISO LCR Advisory Group Stakeholder Meeting which is December 6 at the CAISO facility in Folsom. LSAG decided to meet prior to the stakeholder meeting in early November and after the stakeholder meeting in late December.

Key Points and Conclusions

The group was briefed on a conference call that occurred between the CAISO and Bob Tang/Randall Hunt (Navigant). The purpose of the conference call was to step through the CAISO study and Navigant's analysis to determine why there was an inconsistency in results between the two studies. It was determined that Navigant did achieve consistent results with the CAISO study for the critical disturbance that the CAISO modeled. However it was pointed out that Navigant had not run all of the possible contingencies. Navigant also pointed out that the CAISO report was ambiguous on how this analysis was performed which made it more difficult to follow and reconstruct CAISO results. The CAISO has reviewed this portion of the report and concurs that it did not clearly communicate how the CAISO performed their work. Majority of LSAG members agree that the CAISO 2007 LCR results correctly reflect the methodology and criteria described in the 2007 LCR Study.

During the meeting the CAISO clarified that Randall Hunt was representing Bob Tang for the "Six Cities" as Randall is a technical expert advising Bob Tang on the technical issues. CAISO requested that Randall coordinate his comments through Bob.

A diagram was distributed by Les Pereira that helped illustrate the differences between the NERC N-1, N-1-1, and N-2 performance standards and how they should be applied to study results to determine if the NERC performance standards are being met. This diagram helped the group visualize and understand the differences in the performance requirements. The group did reach consensus on understanding how these standards should be applied.

Based on discussion of the diagram, the CAISO was able to articulate how it had applied these standards in their 2007 LCR study. The CAISO was able to further clarify for the group that it had identified LCR requirements needed in real time under normal conditions (NERC Category A) to maintain the system in a safe operating zone (i.e., within A/R) in preparation for the most critical NERC Category B and C5 contingency. Further, additional LCR requirements were identified to assure that under single contingency conditions (NERC Category B) the system would be in a safe operating zone (i.e., within A/R) in preparation for the next single most critical contingency (NERC Category C3). The CAISO noted that for the 2007 LCR study, they had applied the CAISO standards consistent with the consensus understanding of the group.

Zonal requirements have been mentioned however a detailed discussion about the ISO proposed methodology or any new methodology was not pursued mainly due to time constraints. There was acknowledgement that these needs exist and need to be addressed in the near future.

The Major Issues Table was discussed. This table was prepared to provide a place to collect issues identified by the group. The table consists of two sections.   The first section is more technical in nature and is identifies the issues that LSAG needs to address for the 2008 LCR analysis. The second section is more policy related issues that LSAG believed required further discussion within the full stakeholder forum. LSAG decided to assign particular issues to its members with the intent to exchange ideas and proposals in the next meeting to help clarify the issue for discussion. The status on the issues or the person the issue was assigned to are as follows:

Technical Related Issues: LSAG will address
Issue #1: Resolved
Issue #2: ISO
Issue #3: ISO
Issue #4: Resolved???
Issue #5: LSAG
Issue #6: Gary DeShazo
Issue #7: Les Pereira
Issue #8: Chifong Thomas & Brad Bentley
Issue #9: Mark Hesters
Issue #10: ISO???

LSAG will focus on discussing and resolving these ten issues at their next meeting in early November.

Parked Items (text as written on the flip chart)
- Year ahead vs. day ahead vs real time requirements & dispatch (RA res vs. non RA res)
- Diagram illustrating the NERC performance standards

Next Meeting
The next meeting of LSAG was scheduled for November 6, 2006 at the CAISO.