BAL-003-1 Frequency Response & Frequency Bias Setting Standard

Attachment B

Process for Adjusting Bias Setting Floor

Language highlighted in yellow is passive, ambiguous, or unclear.

Interconnection frequency performance is improved the closer all Balancing Authorities' (BAs') natural Frequency Response is to Frequency Bias Setting (Cohn, 1966).

The BA calculates its natural Frequency Response based on the events in FRS Form 1. FRS Form 1 calculates the BA's recommended Frequency Bias Setting. The BA will set its Frequency Bias Setting will be to the greater of (in absolute value):

- Natural Frequency Response
- Interconnection Floor (initially 1% of peak in BAL-003-0).

Similar to CPS and its associated limits to the process forto modifyingy minimum Frequency Bias Settings to better meet reliability needs. The ERO may adjust the Frequency Bias Setting floor may be adjusted by the ERO in collaboration with the NERC Operating Committee (OC) in accordance with this Attachment B.

The <u>ERO will post the</u> minimum Frequency Bias Setting values will be posted on the ERO website along with other balancing standard limits.

The initial minimum Frequency Bias Settings floor values are outlined in the following table.

| Interconnection | Minimum Frequency Bias Setting (in MW/0.1Hz) |
|-----------------|--|
| Eastern | 0.8% of peak load or generation |
| Western | 0.8% of peak load or generation |
| Texas | 0.8% of peak load or generation |
| HQ | 0.8% of peak load or generation |

Table 1. Initial Frequency Bias Setting Floors

The ERO and the NERC OC's Resources Subcommittee will annually review Frequency Bias Setting data submitted by BAs. If the total natural Frequency Response and minimum Frequency Bias Setting in an Interconnection are both; more than 0.2 percentage points (of peak load expressed in MW/0.1Hz), the ERONERC and the Resources Subcommittee will reduce adjust the respective Interconnection's floor by 0.1 percentage point until it is equal to the natural Frequency Response of the Interconnection to better match that Frequency Bias Setting and natural Frequency Response.

Comment [ML1]: Need to revise and replace passive language with more clear indications of who is responsible for each of the actions identified in the document.

Comment [ML2]: This is distraction here since this is associated with a standard that doesn't touch CPS

Comment [ML3]: need a view from legal/compliance - should we retain this reference to the tech committees or should this say "ERO" without reference to specific committees/subcommittees

Comment [ML4]: in what direction?

Comment [ML5]: what is the floor?

July 18, 2011 1