

## Meeting Minutes – Jan 29th, 2015

Time: 9:30 am to 3:00 pm

Location: AESO Offices, 2500 330 5<sup>th</sup> Ave SW, Room 2538

Attendance List:

Attended	Name	Company	Email
X	[REDACTED]	AESO	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	AESO	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]	AESO	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	AltaLink	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	AltaLink	[REDACTED]
X-CC	[REDACTED]	EPCOR	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	ENMAX	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]	ENMAX	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	ATCO Electric	[REDACTED]
X	[REDACTED]	ATCO Electric	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]	ATCO Electric	[REDACTED]
	[REDACTED]	TFCMC	[REDACTED]
X-CC	[REDACTED]	UCA	[REDACTED]

CC = via Conference Call

1 The purpose of this meeting was to review the final WG comments which were submitted UCA ([REDACTED]), AESO ([REDACTED]), EPCOR ([REDACTED]) and Altalink ([REDACTED]). The following items were discussed:

### RULE

- Section 5(1) (e) – Obstruction Marking Standard - WG suggested taking out the reference from the rule and put into the ID. WG agreed to keep it more general and make a reference to ID.
- Section 6(4) – Weather Load Return Periods - WG discussed the wording regarding the specified return period. The use of “designed for” and “greater than” the minimum values were discussed.
- Section 12 (1) – WG agreed to adding wording that restricts it to electrical loading.
- Section 13 – Sequence of failure: WG agreed that it has to say 240kV and above and steel. In ID need to identify that 138kV is excluded.
- Requirements (2) “Subject to subsection 2(3)...” - Discussion to remove Subject 2(3) and let the 2 clauses stand alone. AESO ([REDACTED]) to have this reviewed by AESO technical writer.
- Functional specification 3 (1) – EPCOR ([REDACTED]) suggested moving sentence to end to improve the flow. AESO ([REDACTED]) to include this in the review by AESO technical writer.
- Weather loading for Wet Snow and Wind Section 8(2) – EPCOR ([REDACTED]) suggested deleting (as set out in subsection 8(1)) - AESO ([REDACTED]) to include this in the review by AESO technical writer.
- Section 9(3) – Suggested using different wording instead of rime ice. WG discussion ensued. No change recommended.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure Containment Loading 10(1) – “withstand failure containment loading” – suggested rewording. WG agreed term needs to be defined. <b>Action item:</b> EPCOR (██████) will look at ID and then propose how we could further clarify the term.</li> <li>• WG agreed that adding “subject to subsection 10(4)” to section 10(3) would add clarity.</li> <li>• Section 10(8) – Adding for a wood “or composite” pole proposed – WG discussed and agreed that this should apply to all pole structures as a broader concept. Add “pole of any material:”</li> <li>• Table 2 Reliability Based Strength Factors-. WG agreed to move to ID instead of rule</li> <li>• Section 17 (2) (ii) –CSA reference – Should this be CSA or AEUC? – To be reviewed by AESO technical writer.</li> <li>• Section 18 – WG agreed to remove reference to air gap values “specified I subsection 17(5).</li> <li>• Fall free spacing – Section 20 (1) – AESO (██████) will confirm ID is clear with respect to 240kV lines.</li> <li>• 20(2) (b) – Failure at ground line – This was discussed by the WG – No changes to rule.</li> <li>• Missing requirement 27, 28 &amp; 29?. There are no Section 27, 28, or 29 in the rules. ID has these sections which were rules in earlier draft version. As this information is related to line design it will remain in the ID.</li> <li>• Plenty of other minor grammatical changes were provided in the markups that the AESO will give consideration to.</li> </ul>
2	<p>Changes to ID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2 - WG agreed to take out the first “currently” in second paragraph.</li> <li>• Section 5 - Other Code Requirements - WG agreed to leave it to CSA C22.3 No 1 with NO reference to a specific version.</li> <li>• Section 6A – Reference to “subsection 6 through 15” to be changed to “subsection 6 through 14”</li> <li>• Section 10 – Change reference from 8(2) to 8(3).</li> <li>• Section 17 – A specific version of CSA is referenced – Per section 5 no version reference is required.</li> <li>• Section 19 - Clearance to edge right of way: Opening sentence is confusing. <b>Action item:</b> EPCOR (██████) to provide another opening sentence for next meeting.</li> <li>• Section 27,28, and 29 – Identify these items are not in the rule.</li> <li>• Plenty of other minor grammatical changes were provided in the markups that the AESO will give consideration to.</li> </ul>
3	<p>Review of Outstanding Items from the Meeting with the Transmission Facilities Cost Monitoring Committee Member (TFCMC), [CCA]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AESO (██████) let work group know [CCA]'s request to join the WG at this stage was denied as it was late in the rule development process and the technical level of expertise was not there. However, to address the concerns of the TFCMC, [AESO] and [AESO] will continue to meet with [CCA] independently and may arrange for a final [CCA] (TFCMC) and Transmission Line Rules Review WG meeting.</li> </ul>