

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT — Protection 2007-17

February 10-11, 2009

Georgia Power Company

Atlanta, Georgia

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EST on February 11, 2009. The following were present for the meeting:

- Charles Rogers
- Russell C. Hardison
- Carol A. Gerou
- Robert Bentert
- Dave Harper
- Mark Peterson
- John B. Anderson
- Phil Winston
- John Kruse
- Rick Ashton
- Richard Ferner
- Eric A. Udren

Guests:

- Bill Shultz
- Sam Francis
- Rick Terrill
- Rick Shamblin

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

The team continued going over the entire standard line by line rewording and revised as necessary. Line by line discussion was conducted on Table 1. The team eliminated one level of monitoring. There are three levels: Unmonitored (Level 1), Partially Monitored (Level 2), and Fully Monitored (Level 3).

The team eliminated "Category" column from table 1 as it seemed confusing.

It was determined that many of the maintenance activities seem to be "how" instead of "what" and will be moved from the table to FAQs. This is also true for most of the notes to Table 1.

Issues from this meeting:

Issue - for a TBM program should the entity record and analyze the "findings", and "modify" the program if required. Resolution-- There is a requirement (R8.1) to develop correcting action plan.

This issue was addressed in the standard and where appropriate an FAQ was added or is being developed.

Issues from previous meetings and resolutions:

Not all of the issues were addressed for lack of time. The team is considering how to handle the list of issues being carried over and new ones added as they emerge. The following is a list of the issues including disposition for those that have been addressed:

On the issue of taking out the word "Testing" from the title of the standard, 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. Make sure the team asks a question on the comment form about keeping "Testing" in the title .if most stakeholders agree with you the SDT can change the title. (from Maureen) e-mail 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** that compliance said it will take all circumstances into account and in cases such as described above and 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 we'll 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 2008 SDT meeting and is still unresolved is how to treat situation where an entity after following an RCM programs for sometime

discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle, and 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.

During the December conference calls, it was realized that a TBM, following precisely the Table 1 intervals, may permit some entities to increase their intervals from those that they have previously determined as necessary to achieve their performance goals. This issue will be discussed, and determine if it is really the case, determine if an entity needs to have a basis to extend their current intervals to the Table 1 intervals, and determine if the Table 1 intervals, particularly for level-1 monitoring, should be decreased, and therefore possibly direct more entities to a PBM." This was discussed within this meeting; the SDT overall realized that an entity, if moving directly to a TBM as established in the Table, could do so without any additional basis; that is, the basis is the intervals in Table 1 itself. The SDT agreed that to require an additional technical basis would be in contravention of the principle of "maximum allowable intervals" as established in the table. The SDT subsequently discussed decreasing the Table 1a intervals to address this and declined to do so. The SDT felt that those entities that had shorter intervals are likely among the more diligent entities, had determined that those intervals are necessary to maintain their desired level of reliability, and would continue to do so; that is, they are likely to already be using a sort of PBM. The SDT also observed that, in the event of slipping performance, misoperations may increase, which would require analysis and mitigation per PRC-004.

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/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 additional discussion. The team wants to keep this item in the agenda as a reminder that although there is an FAQ, need to make sure that the subject is adequately covered.** The resolution rests with the level of monitoring definition and the FAQ. With the elimination of one level of monitoring, this issue largely goes away. The level of monitoring eliminated what was largely the first level of monitoring above "unmonitored", which was where these types of devices primarily fell; now, the intermediate level of monitoring requires that relays have monitoring similar to the previous third-level (of four) of monitoring.

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 reminder.** Believe some aspects covered in PRC-001, Sam Francis and Al Calafiore will double check with the PRC-001 team and provide answer; some aspects are covered in an FAQ.

4. Action Items

Assignments from this meeting:

Members volunteered for specific assignments, these are summarized in an E-mail from Charles Rogers.

1. Charlie will flesh out initial proposed Measures and VSL's before sending the draft standards out (this was reflected in the documents sent out on the day following the meeting).
2. Sam Francis will develop a FAQ on "Why do we need to do a physical inspection of the battery rack".
3. Sam Francis will review the Battery FAQ's and incorporate the old Table 1 note related to batteries into a FAQ.
4. We (un-assigned; someone please do it) need to clarify within the FAQs what we mean in the Level 1 (Unmonitored) 3-month inspection of Comm Circuits.
5. For the SPS testing (in all monitoring levels), everything after the first sentence is "how". We (any volunteers?) need to move this to the FAQ with appropriate descriptions.
6. Sam Francis will develop an addressing the quality of DC alarms for Level 2.
7. Rick Ashton will review the FAQ and Reference Document and make changes as necessary to align with our elimination of one level of monitoring.
8. Rick Ashton and Rusty Hardison will develop a "flow chart" for the standard itself for inclusion in the FAQ.

5. Next Steps

The next meeting has been scheduled for March 10-11, 2009, in Fort Worth TX.

We scheduled a 4-hour conference call has been scheduled for March 2, 2009 at 8 a.m.-noon EST to discuss Measures.

A 1.5 day meeting has been tentatively scheduled in Atlanta, starting at 1 p.m. on April 20 continuing thru 5 p.m. on April 21. The meeting will be confirmed in FW.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m. on February 11, 2009.