

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT — Protection 2007-17

September 3–4, 2008

Oncor Electric Delivery

Fort Worth, Texas

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EST on September

3. The following were present for the meeting:

- Charles Rogers
- Dave Harper
- Bob Bentert
- Mark Peterson
- Carol A. Gerou
- John Kruse
- John A. Zipp
- Russell C. Hardison
- Roger D. Green
- Rick Ashton
- Richard Ferner
- John B. Anderson
- Eric A. Udren

Guests:

- Sam Francis
- Jim Kinney
- Steven Boyd
- Tom Rosenberger
- Byron Reed
- Shirley Goifon

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Al Calafiore and Charles Roger reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

3. Standards Comments and Revisions

Discussion continued on line by line wording of the combined document. The team addressed the comments from the beginning of the document including the Tables. The Performance Based Maintenance section was completed, and a great deal of time was spent on rewording the specific requirements associated with PBM and the definitions associated with it.

Issues from previous meetings and resolutions:

The team decided to proceed with taking “Testing” out of the title. The team has the discretion to "recommend" a modification to the title and ask for feedback from stakeholders through the comment form. The team must make sure they ask a question on the comment form about keeping “Testing” in the title...if most stakeholders agree than the SDT can change the title. (E-mail from Maureen Long on 8-4-08).

On the issue of “Should there be an allowance or extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters, it was decided to put a discussion about “non-compliance” due to storms or other extenuating circumstances” in the FAQ and include response received from compliance. Note: compliance said it will take all circumstances into account and, in cases such as described above, may not levy fines. However, it will still remain a reportable event but not to be considered a “black mark” on individual entities such as in the case of repeat offenders. The team will further consider this if necessary to respond to industry comments. **A specific question about this on the posting may be worth considering.**

An issue that emerged in the April SDT meeting and is still unresolved is how to treat a situation where an entity, after following an RCM programs for sometime, discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle. That entity would switch to a time based program if it has a longer cycle, (presumably to avoid higher cost of the shorter cycle requirements discovered by the RCM program. The team decided to hold this issue and will further consider it as part of detailed discussions of RCM.

On the issue of should there be an FAQ that describes where DME Maintenance requirements will be found; it was pointed out that there is currently a FAQ that loosely suggests that DME, when also a relay, will be according to PRC-005, and refers users to PRC-002 and PRC-018 for Maintenance requirements for other DME. The issue is to be resolved within this FAQ.

On the issue of continued discussion on different relays types, particularly analog as opposed to digital with microprocessors that do continuous monitoring and determine if there is a problem and provide alarms or information. The SDT did not fully respond to the concerns, and will need to have an additional discussion. The team wants to keep this item in the agenda as a reminder that although there is a FAQ, they need to make sure that the subject is adequately covered. The resolution rests with the level of monitoring definition and the FAQ.

On the continued discussion on replacing or upgrading some elements as part of maintenance, should verification of settings etc. on replaced elements (same as commissioning) be required in this standard? Or is it covered in other standards? [This issue is still outstanding, retain as a reminder.](#) The team believes some aspects are covered in PRC-001, Sam Francis and Al Calafiore will double check with the PRC-001 team and provide an answer; some aspects are covered in a FAQ.

4. Action Items

Assignments from this meeting:

1. Everyone: If you have summary statistics of observed Protection System performance during testing, please provide them to the group to assist in justifying the allowable error rate ("Countable Events") for performance-based maintenance programs. Essentially, we would like to see a list of defined "segments" (relay type, model, etc.), number tested per year, and number found with out-of-bounds issues. If you have such reports, we would like them as far back as you can provide them. Charles Rogers will provide this for our program here at Consumers.
2. Charles Rogers will develop a FAQ on performance-based maintenance to discuss how a problem found during a mis-operation investigation would be addressed; essentially, that it is an out-of-schedule test to investigate, with the result of the testing. Others may, of course, contribute as well.
3. Rick Ashton and Sam Francis are to develop a requirement excluding batteries from PBM for our consideration.
4. Rick Ashton will develop a FAQ on including sudden pressure (63) and temperature (49) relays which TRIP into the Protection System Maintenance Program. Phil Winston — I know that Georgia Power connects these relays only to alarm, but some people do trip with them.
5. Rick Ashton will augment Note 1 to Table 1 to discuss calibration failures.
6. Mark Peterson will develop a FAQ discussing whether Countable Events includes software errors, etc.
7. Everyone is to review the draft Standard and the draft FAQ and provide any additional comments, markups, etc.
8. The issue and discussion on how to assure that the provisions of the SAR, any FERC directives that apply to this project and any assessments or other recommendations (such as from the SPCTF if any apply) are considered. Also how do we make sure that we have captured all of the requirements from the four previous standards? Al Calafiore developed an Excel spread sheet and will update and provide it to the Chairman.

Assignments are due to Charles Rogers by October 15th so that they can be merged all together for our October meeting.

5. Outstanding Assignments

The team discussed the outstanding assignments that were made to small teams to bring back their findings to the entire team for consideration. Assignment areas included:

Retain for future reference (also see item 4 above):

- a. Develop improved verification activities for the DC Control Circuit Verification.
- b. Develop an improved description of the verification activities for the communication circuit testing. Rick Ashton working on it.
- c. Develop appropriate verification activities for Station Battery Capacity Testing. Rick Ashton working on this as well.

6. Next Steps

The next meeting will be in Golden, Colorado (outside Denver). John Anderson of Exel Energy will host

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m. on September 4, 2008.