

Meeting Notes

Project 2007-11 Disturbance Monitoring Standard Drafting Team

April 16-19, 2013

Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introductions – chair remarks

The meeting was brought to order by Lee Pedowicz, chair at 1:00 p.m. ET on Tuesday, April 16, 2013. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)			
			4/16	4/17	4/18	4/19
Lee Pedowicz (chair)	NPCC	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Frank Ashrafi	Southern Cal. Edison	Member				
Alan D. Baker	Florida Power and Light	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Daniel J. Hanson	NRG	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Jack Soehren	ITC Holdings	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Robert Grabovickic	National Grid	Observer	W	W	W	W
Tony Jablonski	RFC	Observer	W	W		W
Ryan Quint	Bonneville Power Adm.	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Juan Villar	FERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Bob Cummings	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Barb Nutter (Standard Developer)	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP

2. Determination of quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or Team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as five of the six members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Barb Nutter. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded of the NERC Antitrust Guidelines each morning.

4. Review team roster

Barb Nutter informed the team that no changes were made to the roster.

5. Review meeting agenda and its objectives

Shoukat Khan's questions via email – due to time constraints this was not addressed during the meeting.

Agenda

1. Revised SAR

Barb Nutter informed the team the revised SAR was on the May 2, 2013 Standards Committee (SC) agenda for approval. If the revised SAR is approved by the SC, it will be posted for a 30-day comment period from May 3 – June 3, 2013.

2. PRC-002-2

- a. The team reviewed all of the requirements and made revisions.
- b. Requirement R2 – There was discussion that the TO and GO will need to cooperate in this requirement because the TO is the entity that can tell the GO the locations. There are issues with roles and responsibilities of the PC in the different regions. It was noted that there needs to be more participation from the regional entities where this is concerned, especially WECC. R2.1 - Must be 1500 MVA or above as calculated as the three phase short circuit MVA levels at maximum short circuit system configuration/duty for bus locations within each TOs fault study area
- c. Requirement R6 – “Each Generator Owner shall have Fault Recording for the generators with a nameplate rating of 500 MVA or above, or for an aggregate nameplate rating of 500 MVA or above with a common point of connection to the facilities identified in Requirement R2.” The team removed R6 because it was decided that because this Standard was designed to govern the acquisition of data for significant BES disturbances, the fault recorders installed by TOs would capture all the necessary data from the generators' outlet interconnections with the BES,

this fault recorders for the generators would not be necessary. . Bob Cummings and Juan Villar from FERC were in agreement.

- d. Requirement R11 – Alan Baker noted that different regions triggers are based on past history. The requirement needs to be written so the entity puts together a philosophy document on how they record fault data. This would be best done in the guidelines section. Robert Grabovickic from National Grid note FR is under the PC or RC and DDR triggering is not owned by National Grid.
- e. **Issue:** Using absolute value for MVA would not allow for enough fault recorders. Need to include buses that are also greater than 100 KV to capture necessary data. Need to use some factor other than absolute MVA.

DFR placed to capture local system events, DDRs placed in key areas designed to capture events on a wider area view, approximately 10-1 relationship between DFRs and DDRs.

In MVA method in end with areas where highest MVA is going to be a good number, but other areas where lower MVAs and remote buses it is. Bob Cummings will send this issue to Eric Allen.

- f. Requirement R19 – Bob Cummings suggested 30 calendar days in place of 10 calendar days. The team felt that 10 days was enough because it is not practical to keep longer than 10 days due to storage issues.
- g. Steve Myers requested a refresher on results based standards for the team. Barb Nutter reviewed the results based format with the team and provided examples from current projects.
- h. Chuck Jensen called into the meeting the morning of April 17 and reviewed the presentation and spreadsheet that he put together. Chuck explained to the group the results of the calculations. Juan Villar from FERC felt more at ease with the MVA study once he heard how the study was conducted and the results. Chuck is going to send the data to Barb Nutter via a thumb drive.

3. **Technical Documents** – were not addressed.

4. **Outreach**

The team spent a fair amount of time discussing whether to hold the webinar or workshop first and if an informal comment period should be held prior to the workshop. The team agreed to have the webinar prior to the workshop.

- a. Workshop - TBD
- b. Industry webinar
 - i. May 22, 2013 – 1:00–3:00 p.m. p.m. ET

c. Outreach Opportunities

- i. Events Analysis Subcommittee (EAS) June 10, 2013, Atlanta, Bob Cummings
- ii. System Protection and Control Subcommittee (SPCS) June 25-26, 2013 – Bob Cummings will dial in and give update. A team member should be on the call also.
- iii. I Subcommittee of the Power System Relaying Committee on Relaying Practices May 13 -16, 2013 Jeff Pond is the chair and will amend agenda and provide outreach.

In order to provide consistent outreach, the team put together the talking points below.

Talking points for consistent DM outreach:

- In the fall of 2010, due to the number of standards projects the Standards Committee placed the Disturbance Monitoring team on informal development. Team was reactivated January of 2013.
- History in brief was the team based on counts of lines, bulk transformers and size of generation at sites 200kV and above. DDR, FR, and SOE
- Pushback on how this was justified
- Team decided on three-phase short circuit MVA at bus locations – for FR and SOE data
- DDR placement criteria is based on the PC or RC working in conjunction with the TO and GO
- Webinar May 22, 2013 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. ET

5. **Review of Consideration of Comments**

- a. The team reviewed and revised Question 10 and 5.3.
- b. Barb Nutter to remove requirement references to the revised standard.

6. **Next Steps**

- a. Develop webinar presentation
- b. Hold webinar on May 22, 2013
- c. Either informal comment period or workshop

7. Assignments

Below are the assignments for updating the background and rationale boxes. The due date for the assignments is COB April 29, 2013.

Bob	Background
Dan	R1, R2
Jack	R3, R5, R9, R10, R11, R20
Alan	R4, R21
Lee	R6, R7, R8
Ryan	R12 – R18
Steve	R19

8. Future Meeting(s)

- a. May 21-23, 2013 – NERC Headquarters – Atlanta
- b. June 4-7, 2013 – NERC Headquarters – Atlanta
- c. July 15-17, 2013 – ITC Holdings – Novi, MI
- d. July 30, 2013 to August 1, 2013 – To be determined – webinar July 30/31, 2013
- e. August 6-9, 2013 – NERC Headquarters – Atlanta, GA – webinar August 6/7, 2013

9. Adjourn

- a. Prior to adjoining Lee Pedowicz, chair, asked the team what the chair and developer could do better. Steve Myers wondered if all team members understood the urgency of the new paradigm in getting projects completed in a more timely fashion. Alan Baker noted there was less availability in summer for meetings due to vacations. Felt is team had 15 members it would be better. Barb Nutter noted that more is not necessarily better – that is has been shown that smaller groups around seven worked better. Juan Villar agreed that smaller number team members.

Steve Myers noted there was more pressure on the chairs to get projects done in a more timely manner. Juan Villar noted he was not sure where the team landed on having the workshop but said the workshop would expedite the development process. He said the webinar informs the industry the direction the team is taking and the workshop enables discussion in order to come to a better understanding and product.

The meeting adjourned on Friday, April 19, 2013 at 10:45 a.m. ET.