

Notes

Regional Reliability Standards Working Group

October 29, 2009 | 10:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m. Eastern
Dial-in Number: 866.740.1260 | Code: 6088084
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Participants, click here to join the meeting:
<https://cc.readytalk.com/r/ocs9ze9maceo>

Participants:

Bob Millard (RFC)
Nick Henery (FERC)
Bob Pellegrini ()
Carter Edge (SERC)
Pat Huntley (SERC)
Dan Taft (ConEd)
Bob Snow (FERC)
Laurel Heacock (NERC)
Stephanie Monzon (NERC)
Patrick Harwood (FERC)

Bob Jones (Southern Company)
Kal Ayoub (FERC)
Andy Rodriquez (NERC)
Ted Franks (FERC)
Lee Pedowicz (NPCC)
Guy Zito (NPCC)
Gerard Dunbar (NPCC)
Scott Sells (FERC)
Danny Johnson (FERC)
Jason Christopher (FERC)

Chris Mak (FERC)
Ibrahim Oweis (FERC)

Phone Participation:

Jeff Pond (National Grid)
Tracy Lynd (Consumers)
David Kelley (SPP)
Brian Bartos (Bandera)
Jonathan Glidewell (Southern)
Bob Cummings (NERC)
Peter Heidrich (FRCC)
Judith James (TexasRE)

Sarah Hensley (TexasRE)
Larry Brusseau (MAPP)
Carol Gerou (MRO)
David Bertonilli (ISO NE)
Phil Tatro (NERC)

Agenda Items

1. **Introductions** — All

Stephanie Monzon thanked everyone for participating and thanked FERC staff for hosting the meeting. The group conducted introductions (including people on the phone).

2. **NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines** — Stephanie Monzon

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

3. **Review of the Agenda and Objectives** (added to the agenda)

Stephanie Monzon stated that the objective of the meeting is to review regional standards that are nearing completion of the development process and soon to seek approval from NERC and FERC. These regional standards generally fall into two categories: Underfrequency Load Shedding and Disturbance Monitoring. The regions at the meeting have either one or both regional standards in development either on the last posting or in the ballot stage. This is why the agenda was proposed as it is with a review of Disturbance Monitoring related standards from NPCC and RFC followed by a review of Underfrequency Load Shedding regional standards from SERC, NPCC and RFC. The last regional standard for review during this meeting does not fall into one of the two categories: RFC's MOD-024-RFC-1 standard. This standard is currently posted on the NERC web-site for 45-days.

Stephanie Monzon asked the participants and presenters if they had anything to add. Guy Zito asked Stephanie Monzon to provide some background on the fill in the blank standards that are being presented. Stephanie Monzon agreed and provided additional background. The RRSWG (many members present in the meeting) members in 2006 reviewed the NERC standards for fill in the blank elements and identified four that they felt required regional standards. These include: Disturbance Monitoring, Underfrequency Load Shedding, Special Protection Systems and Balancing Reserves. The RRSWG made their recommendation to NERC and added these regional elements into the 2009 Standards Workplan. Since then the regions have commenced regional standards projects in some of the four areas. This is why many regions are presenting today regional standards in two of the four mentioned areas.

4. **Overview of Disturbance Monitoring Regional Standards (incl. review of regional definitions)** — Regions

a. **Northeast Power Coordinating Council** — Guy Zito

- Bob Pellegrini reviewed the requirements.
- Bob Snow asked NPCC to highlight the things in the proposed standard that are more stringent than the NERC standard or the draft continent wide standard.

- Kal Ayoub provided some specific examples where the proposed standard was more stringent than the NERC standard or the draft continent wide standard. Some of the examples discussed were that the NPCC standard requires frequency and real and reactive power recording for faults (R5), event triggering requirements (R6), a maintenance and testing program (R14), and the last date tested (R17).
 - Guy and Bob highlighted that there isn't a national standard in place now and therefore the regional standard is needed. There are items in the regional standard that are not covered by the proposed national standard (in the draft stage) such as the trigger settings, the RC involvement, and other program specifics. In addition, the regional standard is covering more equipment (more stringent threshold) than the draft continent wide standard. NPCC is proposing several regional definitions that are not currently in the NERC glossary.
 - Stephanie Monzon asked the NPCC representatives about the origin of the requirement specifying a minimum number of DDRs per MW. Bob P. indicated that this requirement is based on historical practice and has proven to provide enough data to recreate an event. Bob Cummings added that the concept of establishing a similar requirement for the national standard would probably not work because of the differences found in the WECC region.
 - Stephanie Monzon asked NPCC to talk more about the RC involvement proposed in the NPCC regional standard. Bob P. responded that the regional standard requires that the RC's within NPCC (there are five) establish the DDR requirements for the region. The standard also establishes a minimum DDR requirement.
 - Bob Snow and Nick Henery emphasized the guidance provided in Order 723 on regional definitions. The Regions should strive to utilize the existing definitions as much as possible.
- b. *ReliabilityFirst* — Bob Millard
- Bob Millard provided a powerpoint presentation of the RFC regional standards including Disturbance Monitoring.
 - Bob Millard reported that the regional standard may be submitted to NERC for approval in the near future. The regional standard would be retired once the continent wide standard is approved.
 - Bob Snow asked Bob Millard to explain the 200 kV threshold – what is this based on? Bob Millard explained that it is based on history, and existing practices. Bob Snow added that this approach is not necessarily in the best interest of reliability.
5. **Overview of Underfrequency Regional Standards (incl. review of regional definitions)** — Regions

a. SERC — Pat Huntley

- Pat Huntley began by providing an overview of the development progress. The standard is anticipated to move to pre-ballot review within the next several weeks.
- Bob Jones provided a powerpoint overview of the SERC UFLS regional standard. The regional standard is more stringent than the draft continent wide standard since it is requiring that at least 30% of the load be in the UFLS scheme. .
- Chris Mak asked if the team had considered the interaction of manual and automatic load shed specifically conflicts between the two. Bob Snow and Bob Millard both clarified that the UFLS standards all focus on automatic load shedding (not manual load shedding). Chris M. added that he understood the difference; however, the concern is in case that manual load shedding takes place because of other conditions (prior to automatic load shedding) such that the load is not there any longer if/when automatic load shedding kicks in.
- Bob Jones pointed out that the SERC regional UFLS standard applies to both Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners. There are 17-18 Planning Coordinators in SERC and for the most part they are one and the same with some exceptions.

b. Northeast Power Coordinating Council — Guy Zito

- Dan Taft provided an overview of the regional standard. The regional standard is being proposed because there isn't an approved national standard at the moment.
- The group discussed the compensatory requirements in the NPCC regional standard. Dan Taft explained that there are several units (nuclear) that cannot meet the UFLS requirements. Guy Z. added that he thinks it may be possible to handle this through compliance. Compensatory load shedding is a legacy issue with older nuclear units. Newer units would not be allowed to connect to the grid without applying settings to support UFLS.
- Bob Snow expressed concern that the compensatory requirements appear to be allowing the shedding of firm load to meet UFLS requirements. Guy Zito asked Bob S. if he was open to continue discussing the issue and that NPCC would look into the compensatory requirement in the regional standard.
- Bob Snow pointed out that modeling of frequency response is neither in this regional standard nor in the draft continent wide standard. This point has been made to the continent wide drafting team in the past – it has been suggested that the standard should incorporate estimating frequency response. SERC responded that it assumes no governor response for

UFLS. Guy Zito asked Phil Tatro (former chair of the NPCC drafting team and chair of the NERC team) to add some insight into the existing NPCC practice. Phil indicated that both teams deliberated on this issue and determined that modeling frequency response accurately is important. NPCC uses an average of (historical) frequency performance in its studies. The teams; however, think that adding a requirement for modeling in the UFLS standard may not be the best place for such a requirement. The requirement could go into the modeling set of standards. Putting such a requirement in the modeling standard would ensure that the standards “down stream” benefit from having improved models. Bob Snow added that the teams should look at the Blackout Report and apply lessons learned. He also added that Balancing Authorities can provide input on frequency performance.

c. *ReliabilityFirst* — Bob Millard

- Bob Millard reviewed the RFC UFLS regional standard.
- The standard development is nearing completion and will be submitted to NERC for approval in the near future.

6. **Overview of MOD-024-RFC-1 — Verification and Data Reporting of Generator Gross and Net Real Power Capability** — Bob Millard

- Bob Millard provided an overview of the proposed regional standard (in powerpoint). Bob M. highlighted some of the more stringent aspects of the regional standard such as the temperature specifications.
- Bob M. reported that this regional standard will also be submitted to NERC in the near future for approval.

7. **Open Discussion on Regional Standards** — All

- Stephanie M. suggested that discussion on regional standards should take place after the Region’s review of the standard. The group supported this proposal.

8. **Review of Action Items**

- No specific action items were identified during the meeting.

9. **Adjourn**