

## Meeting Minutes – March 18, 2014

Time: 9:30 am to 3:00 pm

Location: AESO Offices, 2500, 330 5th Ave SW; 25th Floor; Room 2538 or via Conference Call

Attendance List:

Attended	Name	Company	Email
X		AESO	
		AESO	
X		AESO	
X		AltaLink	
		AltaLink	
		EPCOR	
		ENMAX	
		ENMAX	
X		ATCO Electric	
X		ATCO Electric	
		ATCO Electric	
		TFCMC	
X		UCA	

CC = via Conference Call

### 1 Review of Needs List

- Item 40: Economic Parameters - ACTION: UCA ( ) to review wording in the ID with respect to line optimization and ACSS (parameters other than economic) and report back to the WG.
- Item 50: Sequence of Failure - The WG reviewed the revisions to section 13 that AltaLink ( ) previously sent to the WG and engaged in discussion regarding the changes. It was discussed and agreed by the WG that in 13(1) to add “composite or engineered material” to the construction material as well as add “outage, duration and cost” along with damage in the wording of the rule. It was also discussed and agreed to change the wording for “design loadings” to “nominal strength” in the first sentence of 13(2). The WG then suggested that a new section number be added to move the wording from the ID regarding foundations for underutilized angle towers. ACTION: UCA ( ) will further revise the rule based on the WG’s comments and suggestions. [AESO] also let the WG know that he will share this with the TFCMC members at an upcoming meeting, however, just as an fyi.
- Item 51: Rule 19 – The WG reviewed the revisions to section 19 that EPCOR ( ) previously sent to the WG and engaged in discussion. The WG agreed to take out wording in section 19 (1)(a) where it says “of CSA C22.3 No. 1 for conductors to buildings or other objects”. The WG also discussed removing wording in section (3) where it says “or for areas where the placement of the buildings or other objects is unlikely.” The WG then suggested that a new section number be added in to account for situations where spans have adequate vertical clearance and sections (1), (2), (3) don’t apply. The WG did not come to a consensus of the wording, however. ACTION: AltaLink ( ) will review the wording in AltaLink’s existing right of way standards and report back to the WG.
- Item 56: Update ID on Optimization - No update was brought forward. Item carried forward.
- Item 57: Rule 14 Shield Wire Exemption Wording – The WG reviewed the wording that AltaLink ( ) previously shared with the WG. The WG had further discussion on this topic. ACTION: ATCO ( ) will take the WG’s comments and propose wording in the Rule and ID by the next meeting.
- Item 58: Galloping – AESO ( ) presented a proposed scope to the WG that incorporated the WG’s

	<p>comments from the last meeting. They then engaged in further discussion. Committee agreed that study should include ice unloading which should limit as galloping requirements are removed. Also suggested the HW tower may provide a better starting point than the R series towers but, if the R series is used, the RB would be a better choice than the RA. Should initial study indicate further saving, the effect on foundations should also be considered. ACTION: AESO (██████) will modify the scope based on the WG's comments and send to the WG by Monday, Mar 24.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 62: Galloping - Item discussed in item 58.</li> <li>• Item 63: Economic Parameters - Item declared complete.</li> <li>• Item 64: 240kV 100C Requirement – Item carried forward to next meeting.</li> <li>• Item 65: Failure Containment - Item discussed in item 50.</li> <li>• Item 66: Transferring revisions to the ID – Item carried forward.</li> </ul>
2	<p>Other Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Item 67: Radial Lines - ACTION: AESO (██████) to get started on proposed scope of work.</li> <li>• Item 68: AESO Regional Plans – [AESO] to engage AESO planning to further review the regional plans and determine a course of action to identify how many km's of transmission line and what size have been identified in the AESO's regional plans. This will be brought back to the WG for further discussion. NOTE: It appears AESO Planners used 2x795 in their models so further planning work may be required to determine if 1 x 1590 or another size would be acceptable.</li> <li>• Item 69: ACTION: AESO (██████) to set up meeting with [AESO] with regards to the item 68.</li> <li>• Item 70: ACTION: AESO (██████) to push back the April 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting to the week of April 10<sup>th</sup> as well as schedule another meeting 3 weeks after that (May 1<sup>st</sup>).</li> </ul>