

## Conference Call Notes Disturbance Monitoring SDT — Project 2007-11

**Tuesday August 18, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. MDT**  
**Wednesday August 19, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. MDT**  
**Thursday August 20, 2009 | 8:00 a.m. – noon MDT**  
**WAPA Electric Power Training Center – Golden, CO**

### 1. Administrative

#### 1.1. Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon conducted roll call. Those present are listed below:

- Navin B. Bhatt — American Electric Power (Chair)
- James R. Detweiler — FirstEnergy Corp. (phone)
- Barry G. Goodpaster — Exelon Business Services Company (phone)
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Jeffrey M. Pond — National Grid
- Jack Soehren — ITC Holdings (phone)
- Stephanie Monzon — North American Electric Reliability Corporation
- Alan D. Baker — Florida Power & Light Company
- Daniel J. Hansen — RRI Energy, Inc.
- Charles Jensen — JEA
- Tracy M. Lynd — Consumers Energy Co.
- Susan McGill — PJM (phone Day 2)
- Larry E. Smith — Alabama Power Company
- Felix Amarth — Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Robert (Bob) Millard — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Willy Haffecke — Springfield Missouri City Utilities
- Richard Ferner — WAPA

#### Observers:

- Anthony Jablonski — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Sherry Goiffon — Oncor
- Greg Bradley — APP Engineering

- Kevin Howard — WAPA
- Bob Cummings — North American Electric Reliability Corporation
- Bruce Pickett — FPL
- Charlie Childs — Ametek Power Instruments
- Ron Losh — SPP
- Danny Johnson — FERC
- Cynthia Pointer — FERC
- Laura Zotter — ERCOT (sitting in for Steve Myers)

## **2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines**

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines with the group.

## **3. Opening Remarks**

Tim Meeks, Western Area Power Administration Administrator, provided opening remarks.

## **4. Policy on Face to Face Meetings**

Stephanie reviewed the general policy that typically face to face meetings are not WebEx enabled; however, there may be exceptions. Navin indicated that at the close of the meeting the team will decide when a face to face meeting is necessary and will set the agenda for that meeting.

The team wants to post a status to the industry to indicate that we are working on the responses to the first comment period. Stephanie indicated that they can post a general status on the NERC website (standards under development - disturbance monitoring).

**Action Item:** Stephanie will work with NERC staff to update this section of the standards page and elaborate on the status section.

## **5. Status of the MVA Task Team**

Chuck provided a status of the template and task team activities.

The data template has been revised and distributed to the DM SDT plus and MVA team members. Chuck is soliciting comments to the template. The template is about 95% complete.

The team held a conference call. The template, preamble and other supporting information was discussed during this conference call. Bob C. participated on the call.

The package of information is almost ready to go and will need to find out how to issue the data request.

Stephanie and the team had discussions about the MVA team roster. Stephanie expressed concern that having too many DM SDT members on the MVA team will be add to the already constrained schedule resources are currently under. Stephanie referenced the May meeting notes to pull out the names of the people on the MVA team. Chuck requested that Jim, Jack, and Sherry participate and they agreed. Chuck requested that Barry participate; however, Barry had already left the call and could not confirm. MVA Team:

**\*Chuck Jensen**  
**Larry Smith**  
**Jeff Pond**  
**Tracy Lynd**  
**Felix Amarh**  
**Jack Sohren**  
**Sherry Goiffon**  
**Jim Detweiler**

**MVA Task Team – Overall Timeframe:**

- The data request period: 8 weeks from request date (September 1, 2009 tentatively) due date October 30, 2009
- Data consolidation process 6 week period
- Data Analysis process 4 week period
  - Bob Cummings event disturbance data analysis
  - Data analysis
  - Regional Survey on DDR location criteria analysis (Navin and Felix – due date December 1, 2009)
- Generating technical conclusions that map back to substation, lines, MVA and criteria – this will be the “hand off” to the DM SDT 6 week period

The team suggested that to answer questions that team should conduct a webinar two weeks after the data request is issued. Chuck also suggested including a diagram in the preamble to visually explain the data request.

**Action Item:** Stephanie will coordinate and schedule a meeting between MVA team members, Bob and Gerry to discuss the data request and the status of the MVA team.

**Action Item:** Stephanie will email out the redlined preamble to the team for review – the team will discuss concerns with content by exception on Day 2 of the meeting. Complete (Stephanie distributed documents on the evening of Day 1)

**Action Item:** Chuck will revise the preamble to include a diagram(s) example and will include a statement about ownership independence. By September 1

## **6. Substation Definition**

The team began discussing this in the April in person meeting in Florida. The team continued to discuss and will propose a definition to be included in the standard (for the next posting).

**Why do we need a definition for sub-station?**

A definition is needed in order to define DM locations and to develop criteria.

Propose to define a term for Disturbance Monitoring Substation – Transmission voltage substation

Or use the following construct to eliminate (avoid) the need to define substation:

“Locations where DM functionality may be required: Transmission switching station, transmission substation, generating station, HVAC converter station, HVDC converter station.”

The criteria applied to the locations above (determining if DM functionality is required) will be determined when the MVA task team completes their work and the DM SDT establishes requirements.

The team revised the draft standard to include the above language of definitions. The team reviewed the issue of failures (Alan B.) and decided that they would table this discussion.

## **7. Frequently Asked Questions**

The team discussed that this is a lower priority item that will be addressed as part of the action plan at a later date. The higher priority tasks are itemized in the action plan below.

## **8. Review Response to Comments**

The sub-teams are as follows:

- 4, 5 and 6 Chuck, Jeff and Felix - Completed first pass of Question 6 on 8/19
  - **August 26, 2009 from 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. EDT (Question 4, 5)**
- 7, 8 and 9 Barry, Willy, Jack and Larry
  - **September 9, 2009 from 10:00 a.m. – Noon EDT (Question 7, 8)**

- **September 24, 2009 from 1-3:00 p.m. EDT (Question 9)**
- 11, 10, 12, 18 and 13 Tracy, Dan, Navin, Richard
- **September 29, 2009 from 1-4:00 p.m. EDT (Question 10, 13, 18)**
- **October 7, 2009 from 1-3:00 p.m. EDT (Question 11, 12)**
- 16 and 17 Alan, Jim and Susan
- **October 14, 2009 from 1-3:00 p.m. EDT (Question 16 -17)**
- **October 20, 2009 from 1-3:00 p.m. EDT (Overflow date)**
- 1,2, 14, 15 and 3 Tony, Steve, Bob - First Pass Complete on 8/19

The sub-teams prepared responses to those questions that they can answer without the input of the data analysis team. The team reviewed the draft responses to Questions 1, 2, 3, 6, 14 and 15. The team scheduled conference calls-WebEx to discuss the remaining questions.

#### **9. Recent FERC Action on PRC-023 – Chuck J.**

Chuck J. suggested that the team should discuss the recent FERC action on PRC-023 as it may impact this team.

**Action item:** Navin, Stephanie, Chuck and Bob will take an action item to coordinate with FERC staff on data analysis and work that they may be performing on appropriate threshold levels. Stephanie will speak with Bob C. to discuss this concept (Bob C. was not at the meeting). Stephanie will coordinate with FERC staff to arrange a meeting with FERC staff. The meeting will focus on 1- status of the team's development including MVA analysis team 2- coordinating efforts on definitions of critical 3- understand FERC staff comments on DME requirements (from first posting).

#### **10. Review of Regional Work on DME (RFC, NPCC)**

Navin suggested that we review the work at the Regions in particular to leverage lessons learned.

RFC DME Standard: <http://www.rfirst.org/documents/Standards/RSVP/PRC-002-RFC-01.pdf>

**Action Item:** the DM SDT drafting team will review the RFC standard to understand how it fits into the continent wide drafting efforts. What are the impacts? Tony J. from RFC added to the discussion that it is most likely that the RFC DME standard

will be retired once the DM continent wide drafting team standard is approved. **Due by September 3, 2009.**

### **11. Review of BES Definition – Regional Work (FRCC, NPCC)**

BES definition work is happening within the Regions and they are defining critical elements in this process. This may impact the work this team is doing within the drafting team.

The NOPR on PRC indicated that the BES definition is moving from 200 kV to 100 kV. NERC surveyed the industry to identify the “Operationally significant circuits” (OSC) and the industry reaffirmed their OSC. The definitions as a result are being modified through the standards development process.

### **12. Overall Schedule**

Stephanie reviewed the overall schedule. Points made during the discussion

- It is unknown at this point whether a fourth posting should be added to the overall schedule. The team will know better after the second posting (and after it has incorporated the MVA task team’s findings).
- The development process will continue through 2010 with the approval process taking place in 2011. The team discussed the potential to extend the drafting efforts into early 2011 if the MVA team takes longer and/or if a fourth posting is added to the schedule.
- The MVA task team should have findings for the team to begin incorporating into the standard by Jan. Feb timeframe. The second posting is scheduled to occur by April, 2010.

### **13. Action Plan**

#### **13.1. Response to Comments**

##### 13.1.1. First Pass

13.1.1.1. Team has conference calls through October to address remaining questions

13.1.1.2. **By October 20<sup>th</sup>** (team will complete first pass response to comments)

##### 13.1.2. Second Pass

13.1.2.1. **TEAM NEEDS TO SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING (February 2-3:00 p.m. Location TBD)**

#### **13.2. MVA Task Team**

13.2.1. Industry Webinar – NEED TO SCHEDULE (~2 weeks after release of Data Request)

##### 13.2.2. Template

13.2.2.1. Chuck will lead /coordinate

13.2.2.2. **By September 1** – final version

##### 13.2.3. Regulatory Review

13.2.3.1. Stephanie will coordinate

- 13.2.3.2. By **August 26** (will have made initial contact)
- 13.2.3.3. **By September 9 the team will have met with FERC staff**
- 13.2.4. Preamble
  - 13.2.4.1. Chuck will lead
  - 13.2.4.2. By **September 1** – final version
- 13.2.5. Data Request Administration (Legal review, etc.)
  - 13.2.5.1. Stephanie will lead coordinating with Gerry, Bob C. and others
    - 13.2.5.1.1. Discuss MVA team membership outside the DM SDT (PSRC)
  - 13.2.5.2. By **August 26** (will have made initial contact)
  - 13.2.5.3. **August 26 Conference Call with Gerry, Bob, et. al**
- 13.2.6. Issue Data Request
  - 13.2.6.1. NEED TO CONFIRM ISSUE DATE (Most likely mid-September)
- 13.3. Develop Standard Version 2 / Parking Lot**
  - 13.3.1. **November 3 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., November 4 from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. LOCATION TBD (FRCC/Juno, ITC)**
    - 13.3.1.1. **Action Item:** Version 2 of Draft Standard (Navin, Dan and Laura will present proposal to the drafting team prior to the Nov. in person meeting)
    - 13.3.1.2. Maintenance and Testing
    - 13.3.1.3. Other parking lot items
- 13.4. Supporting Documentation**
  - 13.4.1. Mapping
    - 13.4.1.1. XX will lead
  - 13.4.2. Implementation Plan
    - 13.4.2.1. XX will lead
  - 13.4.3. Other / Technical Reference Document
    - 13.4.3.1. XX will lead

**14. Action Items**

Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
<p>The group must resolve how to develop requirements for maintenance and testing of disturbance monitoring equipment (DME). Possible options include, adding maintenance and testing requirements to the draft PRC-002 standard, asking the Standards Committee to transfer the maintenance and testing requirements to the standard drafting team (SDT) for Project 2007-17 Protection System Maintenance and Testing, or some other solution. Ultimately, the maintenance and testing requirements for DME should “look and feel” like the maintenance and testing requirements developed by the SDT for Project 2007-17 <b>Protection System Maintenance and Testing.</b></p>	<p><b>In Progress</b></p> <p><b>This issue will be addressed in the comment form to solicit industry feedback on how to proceed.</b></p> <p><b>Discussed at the 12/08/08 call:</b></p> <p><b>The team reviewed the status of the issue clarifying that the team was going to post the standard and solicit industry feedback on omitting these requirements. The team would use this feedback to propose an alternate to the SC or NERC staff – possibly create a supplemental to SAR to the Maintenance project.</b></p>	<p>All</p>



Action Items	Status:	Assigned To:
	<p><b>5/6/09 –</b></p> <p><b>Bob Cummings will take a proposal to the June SC meeting that the requirements for maintenance and testing be removed from Project 2007-11 and be included elsewhere (PRC-005). The team has reviewed an initial proposal of requirements for maintenance and testing that can be used once the team has direction regarding where to include these requirements.</b></p>	
<p>The team reviewed the suggestion made by WECC to move R6 from PRC-018-1 into the proposed standard. The team decided that this was a feasible approach to addressing the maintenance and testing requirements. Richard suggested that we should reword Requirement R6. Richard volunteered to reword for review by the team.</p>	<p><b>Created 4/1</b></p> <p><b>5/6/09-</b></p> <p><b>Richard proposed requirements (5/3 e-mail to the team) that the team reviewed on 5/6/09. See action item above regarding maintenance and testing requirements.</b></p>	Richard F.

## 15. Next Steps

## 16. 2009 Schedule

Date and Time	Location	Comments
February 18, 2009	Conference Call	To discuss the technical paper
March 2, 2009	Conference Call	Webinar presenters and NERC staff required on this call to prep for the webinar
March 12, 2009 11 a.m.–12:30 p.m. EST	Industry Webinar	Need to confirm date with team and speakers
March 30, 2009 — 1–5 p.m. EST March 31, 2009 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST April 1, 2009 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST	FRCC Offices Tampa, FL	Confirmed by Chuck.
April 27, 2009	Conference Call	To identify the comments that require discussion with the entire team during our May 5-6 meeting.
May 5, 2009 – 8 a.m.–5 p.m. May 6, 2009 – 8 a.m.–5 p.m.	FPL Juno Beach	Confirmed



June 3, 2009 – 1-4 p.m. EST	Conference Call	The team decided to conduct a conference call on June 3 from 1-4 p.m. EST
July 13, 2009 – 9 -11:30 a.m. EST	Conference Call	
August 18-20 2009	Two and a half day meetings	WAPA EPTC
August 26, 2009 2-4p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Questions 4-5
September 9, 2009 10 am- Noon eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Questions 7-8
September 24, 2009 1-3 p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Question 9
September 29, 2009 1-4 p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Questions 10, 13, 18
October 7, 2009 1-3 p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Questions 11-12
October 14, 2009 1-3 p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Questions 16-17
October 20, 2009 1-3 p.m. eastern	Conference Call and WebEx	Overflow date
November XX, 2009 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. (both days)	In Person Meeting	FRCC or ITC
February 2 -3, 2009 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. (both days)	In Person Meeting	TBD

**17. Other**

**18. Adjourn**

## Attachment 1 Antitrust Guidelines

### I. General

It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition.

It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

Antitrust laws are complex and subject to court interpretation that can vary over time and from one court to another. The purpose of these guidelines is to alert NERC participants and employees to potential antitrust problems and to set forth policies to be followed with respect to activities that may involve antitrust considerations. In some instances, the NERC policy contained in these guidelines is stricter than the applicable antitrust laws. Any NERC participant or employee who is uncertain about the legal ramifications of a particular course of conduct or who has doubts or concerns about whether NERC's antitrust compliance policy is implicated in any situation should consult NERC's General Counsel immediately.

### II. Prohibited Activities

Participants in NERC activities (including those of its committees and subgroups) should refrain from the following when acting in their capacity as participants in NERC activities (e.g., at NERC meetings, conference calls and in informal discussions):

- Discussions involving pricing information, especially margin (profit) and internal cost information and participants' expectations as to their future prices or internal costs.
- Discussions of a participant's marketing strategies.
- Discussions regarding how customers and geographical areas are to be divided among competitors.
- Discussions concerning the exclusion of competitors from markets.
- Discussions concerning boycotting or group refusals to deal with competitors, vendors or suppliers.
- Any other matters that do not clearly fall within these guidelines should be reviewed with NERC's General Counsel before being discussed.

### III. Activities That Are Permitted

From time to time decisions or actions of NERC (including those of its committees and subgroups) may have a negative impact on particular entities and thus in that sense adversely impact competition. Decisions and actions by NERC (including its committees

and subgroups) should only be undertaken for the purpose of promoting and maintaining the reliability and adequacy of the bulk power system. If you do not have a legitimate purpose consistent with this objective for discussing a matter, please refrain from discussing the matter during NERC meetings and in other NERC-related communications.

You should also ensure that NERC procedures, including those set forth in NERC's Certificate of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Rules of Procedure are followed in conducting NERC business.

In addition, all discussions in NERC meetings and other NERC-related communications should be within the scope of the mandate for or assignment to the particular NERC committee or subgroup, as well as within the scope of the published agenda for the meeting.

No decisions should be made nor any actions taken in NERC activities for the purpose of giving an industry participant or group of participants a competitive advantage over other participants. In particular, decisions with respect to setting, revising, or assessing compliance with NERC reliability standards should not be influenced by anti-competitive motivations.

Subject to the foregoing restrictions, participants in NERC activities may discuss:

- Reliability matters relating to the bulk power system, including operation and planning matters such as establishing or revising reliability standards, special operating procedures, operating transfer capabilities, and plans for new facilities.
- Matters relating to the impact of reliability standards for the bulk power system on electricity markets, and the impact of electricity market operations on the reliability of the bulk power system.
- Proposed filings or other communications with state or federal regulatory authorities or other governmental entities.
- Matters relating to the internal governance, management and operation of NERC, such as nominations for vacant committee positions, budgeting and assessments, and employment matters; and procedural matters such as planning and scheduling meetings.