

**Comment Form: Project 2011-INT-001 Interpretation of MOD-028 R3.1 for FPL**

**IMPORTANT NOTE: \*Please make sure to hit the FINISH button at the bottom of this screen to submit your comments to NERC. A verification code will be provided on the next screen.**

Survey Response: Comment Form: Project 2011-INT-001 Interpretation of MOD-028 R3.1 for FPL  
Comment Request - Project 2011-INT-001 Interpretation of MOD-028 R3.1 for FPL  
Response GUID: 8104c242-0613-4acf-ad6d-740634635386  
Started: 11/16/2011 7:47:20 PM  
Completed: 11/16/2011 7:55:44 PM

Page 2

1) **Individual or group.**  
Group

Page 4

2) **Group Name**  
MRO NSRF

3) **Lead Contact**  
Will Smith

4) **Contact Organization**  
Midwest Reliability Organization

5) **Registered Ballot body segment (check all applicable industry segments)**

- 1 - Transmission Owners
- 2 - RTOs and ISOs
- 3 - Load-serving Entities
- 4 - Transmission-dependent Utilities
- 5 - Electric Generators
- 6 - Electricity Brokers, Aggregators
- 7 - Large Electricity End Users
- 8 - Small End Users
- 10 - Regional Reliability Organizations/Regional Entities

6) **Contact Telephone**  
###-###-####  
651-855-1718

7) **Contact E-mail**  
ws.smith@midwestreliability.org

8) **Please complete the following information.**

	<b>Additional Member</b>	<b>Additional Organization</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Segment Selection</b>
1.	Mahmood Safi	OPPD	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6

2.	Chuck Lawrence	ATC	MRO	1
3.	Tom Webb	WPS	MRO	3, 4, 5, 6
4.	Jodi Jenson	WAPA	MRO	1, 6
5.	Ken Goldsmith	ALTW	MRO	4
6.	Alice Ireland	XCEL/NSP	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
7.	Dave Rudolph	BEPC	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
8.	Eric Ruskamp	LES	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
9.	Joe DePoorter	MGE	MRO	3, 4, 5, 6
10.	Scott Nickels	RPU	MRO	4
11.	Terry Harbour	MEC	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
12.	Marie Knox	MISO	MRO	2
13.	Lee Kittelson	OTP	MRO	1, 3, 4, 5
14.	Scott Bos	MPW	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
15.	Tony Eddleman	NPPD	MRO	1, 3, 5
16.	Mike Brytowski	GRE	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
17.	Richard Burt	MPC	MRO	1, 3, 5, 6
18.				
19.				
20.				
21.				
22.				
23.				
24.				
25.				

Page 5

9) **Question 1**

1. Do you agree with the use of this "Rapid" approach to clarify the standard, rather than clarifying the standard through an Interpretation? If No, please explain your concerns.  
Yes

Page 6

10) **Question 2**

2. Does the language in the SAR adequately represent the issue raised in the interpretation request? If No, please provide your suggestions to modify the SAR.  
Yes

Page 7

11) **Question 3**

3. Does the proposed revision resolve the issue raised in the interpretation request? If No, please provide your suggestions to modify the standard.  
Yes

Page 8

12) **Question 4 Comments:**

NONE

