

Individual or group. (28 Responses)
 Name (17 Responses)
 Organization (17 Responses)
 Group Name (11 Responses)
 Lead Contact (11 Responses)

IF YOU WISH TO EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR ANOTHER ENTITY'S COMMENTS WITHOUT ENTERING ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, YOU MAY DO SO HERE. (1 Responses)

Comments (28 Responses)
 Question 1 (27 Responses)
 Question 1 Comments (27 Responses)
 Question 2 (24 Responses)
 Question 2 Comments (27 Responses)
 Question 3 (0 Responses)
 Question 3 Comments (27 Responses)
 Question 4 (0 Responses)
 Question 4 Comments (27 Responses)
 Question 5 (0 Responses)
 Question 5 Comments (27 Responses)
 Question 6 (0 Responses)
 Question 6 Comments (27 Responses)

Group
Caithness Shepherds Flat, LLC
Jeffrey Delgado
Yes
Yes
Caithness Shepherds Flat Wind Farm (CSF), located in Oregon, supports the SAR as written and believes the scope should address dispersed generation resources with collector systems only. In the development of CSF's NERC compliance program, it became apparent that some GO/GOP applicable Reliability Standards were written with fossil fuel facilities in mind, and not generation resources such as wind. The VAR-002 standard for example, requiring reactive and voltage control of individual generators and notification of the TOP when there is a change in status, would appear to be irrelevant to the TOP, but rather the aggregate MW output at the point of interconnection should be what is relevant. CSF's wind farm consists of several hundred wind turbines, all < 3 MW in nameplate capacity. The TOP does not need to be notified about individual turbine voltage status, as any loss of voltage control of an individual turbine will not be detected by the TOP. The relevant factor is in the voltage at the point of interconnection which is controlled by a "Wind Farm Management System" WFMS voltage control system. Change in status of the WFMS would be of interest to the TOP, so the standard should allow for this variance.
Yes
No
No
No
Group
Arizona Public Service Company
Janet Smith, Regulatory Affairs Supervisor
Yes
No

Scope should be expanded to include all small generators regardless of types. There is no specific reason to not include all. Generally, there is little reliability benefits to BES by applying NERC standards to small generators regardless of the type.
Yes
No
No
No
Group
SPP Standards Review Group
Robert Rhodes
Yes
No
We believe that this evaluation should be extended to all small generation regardless of type because the impact on the BES would be the same regardless of the source or prime mover of the generation.
While we may agree with the list of standards as presented in the SAR we would encourage the SAR drafting team to not limit itself to just those particular standards. For example, once a drafting team is established and work begins on the project, we don't want the project to be limited by the scope as currently defined in the SAR. We need to factor in some flexibility to go beyond this specific list to capture all those standards/requirements/definitions which may be impacted in this review.
Not at this time.
Although we are not aware of any specific federal regulatory requirements, the drafting team needs to keep in mind that there may be state regulatory requirements established for dispersed generation that may need to be considered in this project.
Regarding the July 2016 deadline, the drafting team needs to be sure that this effort is complete in time for the industry to be ready by July 2016. We need to be sure that as the deadline approaches, compliance preparations aren't made and then un-made as a result of a modification to an existing standard which is impacted by this effort. In the 1st line of the 1st paragraph of the Industry Need section under SAR Information, we suggest replacing 'application' with 'applicability'. In the 5th line of the 1st paragraph of the Brief Description section under SAR Information, replace 'real time' with 'Real-time', the NERC Glossary term. In the 1st line of the FAC-008-3 paragraph under SAR Information, hyphenate step-up. In the next to last line of the General review of IROs, MODs, PRCs, TOPs paragraph, change 'unneeded' to 'unnecessary'.
Group
Northeast Power Coordinating Council
Guy Zito
Yes
Yes.
No.
Yes. It must be considered that the operating system in Quebec follows chapter R-6.01 An Act Respecting the Regie de L'Energie, which details: (1) an owner or operator of a facility with a capacity of 44 kV or more connected to an electric power transmission system; (2) an owner or operator of an electric power transmission system; (3) an owner or operator of a production facility with a capacity of 50 megavolt amperes (MVA) or more connected to an electric power transmission system; (4) a distributor with a peak capacity of over 25 megawatts (MW), whose facilities are connected to an electric power transmission system; and (5) a person who uses an electric power transmission system under an electric power transmission service agreement with the electric power carrier or with any other carrier in Québec.

No.
Individual
Thomas Foltz
American Electric Power
Yes
AEP would prefer that the solution for applicability of dispersed generation at the turbine or generating unit level would be by adjusting the BES definition accordingly. Creating a new SAR, allowing this topic be discussed within the framework of the BES definition itself, would seem the most direct and efficient way of debating the topic. However, if that cannot be accomplished, AEP supports the effort of this SAR as an alternative (though less desirable) means to accomplish the same goal.
No
We believe it is preferable, at least initially, for the scope to remain limited to dispersed generation resources.
Every standard that involves the GO and/or GOP should be included in the scope of the SAR. This does not imply that all standards should be modified, but the SDT and commenters should be afforded the opportunity to consider the impacts of such changes. For example, PRC-024, PRC-001, CIP-002 through CIP-011, etc. should be considered.
No.
No.
No.
Individual
Shirley Mayadewi
Manitoba Hydro
Yes
Yes
No
No
Although we do not have any concerns with this SAR, we have the following suggestions to improve clarity. (1) Industry Need - remove the words "Bulk Electric System" from the second paragraph to leave only the acronym, BES because this is the second instance of BES in the document. (2) SAR Information - capitalize 'misoperation' because it appears in the Glossary of Terms.
Individual
Patricia Metro
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
No
NRECA does not believe this SAR is necessary. If entities with dispersed generation are registered as a Generator Owner (GO)/Generator Operator (GOP), it is the obligation of the registered entity to determine applicable standards and associated requirements and be able to explain how it complies accordingly. There is no need to modify the applicability of standards to specifically recognize dispersed generation as there is no recognizable reliability gap with the existing applicability of the standards included in this SAR.
No
See response to Question 1
See response to Question 1

Individual
David Jendras
Ameren
Yes
(1) The proposed SAR appears to advocate the GSU as the Element within these standards' applicability, which appears reasonable for a SAR. However, we believe that this conflicts with the BES Definition Phase 2 Reference figures. Our expectation is that the BES Definition would be included in the scope of this SAR.
Yes
Yes, we agree.
(1) Apply the Generator Site Boundary used in the BES Definition Reference (e.g. Figure I2-5) consistently for dispersed generation so that multiple GSU do not circumvent the 75MVA aggregate. (2) Develop a NERC Glossary definition for the term 'dispersed generation'.
Individual
Silvia Parada Mitchell
NextEra Energy
Agree
MidAmerican
Individual
Jonathan Meyer
Idaho Power
No
The BES definition in process has addressed the concerns raised in the SAR (in our opinion). Application of Standards applies to BES elements unless specifically excluded.
No
I see no need for a SAR.
No
N/A
N/A
Individual
Alice Ireland
Xcel Energy
Yes
We strongly support the objective of this SAR.
We believe that in addition to the approved standards mentioned in the SAR, NERC should communicate this issue directly to drafting teams working on active projects such as PRC-004-3 or PRC-027-1 to assure that they consider the applicability of their standard relative to dispersed generation and, if it is intended to include dispersed generation as in scope, to assure that correct terminology is used within their draft standard to avoid ambiguity and inconsistencies such as the SAR discusses for use of the term "main step up transformer" in FAC-008-3.

Individual

John Seelke

Public Service Enterprise Group

No

The SAR relies upon the phase 2 BES definition, as recently approved by the ballot body, but which has yet to be approved by the NERC Board or FERC. Under this definition, traditional generators at a site that exceed 75 MVA in aggregate as well as the all the equipment from terminals of each generator to the connection point with the BES are included in BES. Dispersed generators are treated differently. The individual dispersed generators are part of the BES if they are at a site where their aggregate nameplate capacity exceeds 75 MVA and they are connected to the BES; however, only equipment that delivers capacity from the point where those resources aggregate to greater than 75 MVA are included in the BES. Stated differently, traditional generators are contiguous with the BES, from the individual BES generators to their connection to the BES. Dispersed generators are not contiguous with the BES – the equipment that aggregate their output prior to it exceeding 75 MVA is excluded. These exclusions create a gap between dispersed BES generators and the BES they connect to. All generators should be treated comparably. The Eastern Interconnection Reliability Assessment Group (ERAG) manual supports our recommendation regarding inclusion equipment for dispersed generators. Wind farm modeling, as specified in the ERAG manual,

(<https://first.org/reliability/easterninterconnectionreliabilityassessmentgroup/mmwg/Documents/MMWG%20Procedure%20Manual%20V10.pdf>) requires a high level of detail – see p. 30, item 6, which states: “Wind Farms - Include all 34.5 kV collector bus(es) and the main facility step-up transformer(s) from 34.5 kV to transmission voltage, as well as one 0.600 kV (or whatever the wind generator nominal voltage is) level bus off each collector bus with a lumped generator and lumped GSU representing the aggregate of the wind turbines attached to that collector bus and their GSUs.” Thus, the ERAG manual requires modeling of non-BES Elements under phase 2 BES definition – see the BES Webinar slides nos. 5-7.

(http://www.nerc.com/pa/Stand/WebinarLibrary/bes_phase2_third_posting_20131010_webinar_final.pdf) Setting aside our phase 2 definition concerns, the SAR does not make a coherent technical case for any standards changes. As an example, the justification for a change in PRC-005-2 has contradicting statements: “Manufacturers of dispersed generation turbines and solar panels recommend against specific testing and maintenance regimes for protection and control equipment at the dispersed generation turbine and panel level. In fact it is counterproductive to implement protection and control at the individual turbine, solar panel, or unit level. Instead this is best done at an aggregated level.” In the first sentence, it appears that manufacturers install protection and control equipment at the “dispersed generation turbine and panel level,” yet the next sentence states that “it is counterproductive to implement protection and control at the individual turbine, solar panel, or unit level.” Which is it? During the balloting of PRC-005-2, no comments were submitted to the drafting team regarding the changes proposed in the SAR for PRC-005-2. Yet only a year after the final ballot on PRC-005-2, the SAR proposes changes to PRC-005-2 (and other standards) because the phase 2 definition, according to the SAR, would result in BES equipment at “dispersed generation facilities that if included under certain Reliability Standards may result in a detriment to reliability or be technically unsound and not useful to the support of the reliable operation of the BES.” We believe that dispersed generators will have less equipment, not more, under the proposed BES definition because of the excluded equipment under that definition. Finally, there has been no justification put forth that would justify different treatment of dispersed generation from traditional generation. See our remarks in questions 2 and 6 below.

No

As stated previously, “small generators” (traditional versus dispersed) are not treated comparably in the phase 2 definition – traditional BES generators must be contiguous with the BES but dispersed generators need not be. While we would welcome changes that provide for comparable treatment for small generators, regardless of type, the unequal treatment embedded in the phase 2 definition must be corrected before those changes are considered.

No comments
No comments
No comments
Section 303 of the NERC ROP addresses "Relationship between Reliability Standards and Competition." Item 1 states: "Competition — A Reliability Standard shall not give any market participant an unfair competitive advantage." By not treating all generators comparably, the SAR violates item 1. Based upon this and our prior comments, we recommend that the SAR be rejected by the Standards Committee.
Individual
Barbara Kedrowski
Wisconsin Electric Power Company
No
The SAR needs to include applicability to CIP-002-5, proposed for the identification of BES Cyber Assets and BES Cyber Systems. If individual wind turbines are included in the BES, those cyber assets which support their operation (monitoring and control functions local to each turbine) would become BES Cyber Systems subject to some level of compliance requirements of the CIP v5 standards. The SAR needs to include all the CIP version 5 standards, including CIP-010 and CIP-011. Additionally, these standards need to be listed: PRC-001/027 – Coordination for distributed resources needs to be accomplished with the collector system of the distributed resource, not with the transmission system. The collector system needs to be coordinated with the transmission system, however, the BES definition specifically excludes collector system equipment at less than 75 MVA from being included in the BES. PRC-024 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to document the relay data for one unit and then use it for many. PRC-019 – Voltage control for some types of dispersed generating facilities is accomplished by a controller that is able to adjust either generating unit controls or discrete reactive components to provide transmission system voltage adjustment. The PRC-019 standard should be modified to allow coordination with this type of control for dispersed generation facilities under the requirements of the standard. MOD 012/032 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to provide an example model of one resource and then use it for many. MOD 025 & 026 and 027 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to validate one unit and then use the results for many.
Response from Q1: The SAR needs to include applicability to CIP-002-5, proposed for the identification of BES Cyber Assets and BES Cyber Systems. If individual wind turbines are included in the BES, those cyber assets which support their operation (monitoring and control functions local to each turbine) would become BES Cyber Systems subject to some level of compliance requirements of the CIP v5 standards. The SAR needs to include all the CIP version 5 standards, including CIP-010 and CIP-011. Additionally, these standards need to be listed: PRC-001/027 – Coordination for distributed resources needs to be accomplished with the collector system of the distributed resource, not with the transmission system. The collector system needs to be coordinated with the transmission system, however, the BES definition specifically excludes collector system equipment at less than 75 MVA from being included in the BES. PRC-024 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to document the relay data for one unit and then use it for many. PRC-019 – Voltage control for some types of dispersed generating facilities is accomplished by a controller that is able to adjust either generating unit controls or discrete reactive components to provide transmission system voltage adjustment. The PRC-019 standard should be modified to allow coordination with this type of control for dispersed generation facilities under the requirements of the standard. MOD 012/032 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to provide an example model of one resource and then use it for many. MOD 025 & 026 and 027 – In most cases most distributed resources are many identical units. It would seem reasonable to validate one unit and then use the results for many.

Group
MRO NERC Standards Review Forum
Russel Mountjoy
Yes
The SAR indicates several standards that should be considered for modification for dispersed generating units. It also provides for examination of other standards that may need to be similarly modified to accommodate the unique aspects of dispersed generation. In addition the SAR provides an explanation of which types of generation are to be reviewed in this project and this explanation is appropriate to define the scope of the project.
Yes
The SAR does not specify what types of generation should be included for analysis as "dispersed generation resources. It only refers to those that are a part of a facility that aggregates to 75 MVA or more. As written the SAR is not limited to any particular type of small generation. Under the SAR all types could and should be considered for revision.
The SAR provides a list of several specific standards application to Generator Owners and/or Generator Operators that would be reviewed as part of the project. In addition it proposes a review of several project families (IRO,MOD, PRC and TOP) that would be examined. The specific list is recommended as proposed in the SAR and with the flexibility to review other standards the list as indicated is appropriate. Consideration should be given to an addition to the Attachment in CIP-002 to add an item that would exclude components below the 75MVA aggregation point. The reasoning would be parallel to the other standards addressed in the SAR where the aggregation point would be identified as the point at which the standard would apply. For CIP the result would be that the components below the aggregation point would not have to be addressed, i.e. they would not be high, medium, or low.
The SAR includes the objective to complete the changes and obtain regulatory approval prior to the completion of the implementation of the BES definition. It is essential that this schedule is met so that dispersed generation owners and operators can plan and implement their compliance programs without having to temporarily implement requirements that will be superseded by this project.
Individual
Chris Scanlon
Exelon
Yes
The SAR indicates several standards that should be considered for modification for dispersed generating units. It also provides for examination of other standards that may need to be similarly modified to accommodate the unique aspects of dispersed generation. In addition the SAR provides an explanation of which types of generation are to be reviewed in this project and this explanation is appropriate to define the scope of the project.
Yes
Yes, the SAR should focus on generation resources that are part of a facility that aggregates dispersed resources at 75 MVA or more. We believe the intent is to exclude individual units from certain requirements when those units do not meet the reporting criteria but are part of a facility that aggregates those units at the BES voltage level. We note that the question may lead to confusion. As written the use of "or" appears to be implying there is a choice between "dispersed generation" as used in the first clause of the question and some generation "types" (undefined but commonly understood to refer to fuel source) as used in the second clause. We do not believe the SAR should exclude generation based on fuel type.
The SAR provides a list of several specific standards application to Generator Owners and/or Generator Operators that would be reviewed as part of the project. In addition it proposes a review of several project families (IRO,MOD, PRC and TOP) that would be examined. The specific list is

recommended as proposed in the SAR and with the flexibility to review other standards the list as indicated is appropriate.

No

No

The SAR includes the objective to complete the changes and obtain regulatory approval prior to the completion of the implementation of the BES definition. It is essential that this schedule is met so that dispersed generation owners and operators can plan and implement their compliance programs without having to temporarily implement requirements that will be superseded by this project.

Individual

David Greyerbiehl

Consumers Energy Company

Yes

Yes

Yes

The SAR is required at a minimum, but a change to the BES definition is more appropriate. From the comments below submitted during the BES, the BES definition should at minimum be modified to provide consistency between generating resources (12) and dispersed power producing resources (14). Generating resources are required to be 20MVA in order to be considered an BES element, while dispersed power producing resources have no size consideration as long as they meet the net total MVA. Consumers Energy has completed studies with an operating wind farms and the loss of individual resources makes no impact the BES. The addition of individual resources does not make improve reliability as they have no effect on the system. The SAR intention is to modify the individual standards to define the requirements for all the additional BES elements that are being added that are not presently addressed in the standards or are against the manufacturers recommendations. While this approach can be used, and is required if the BES definition is not changed. A better method would be to include dispersed power producing resources at a point in which the total affects the BES and not as individual units. Previous Comments on BES definition: The inclusion and the clarification of the inclusion seem to contradict each other. The highlight portion above seems to indicate inclusion only from the point of aggregation of 75MVA or above. This, in most Wind Park cases would include a collector bus but probably not individual wind turbines. However I4 seems to indicate that the case of a Wind Park that has a total aggregation of 75 MVA, all associated equipment including every individual wild turbine would be included. There is inconsistency. If and when Distributed Generation gains saturation is it our intent that whole neighborhoods or industrial parks be considered BES resources? Technical justification should be needed to include resources in the BES, not the other way around. Is there a real expectation that a single collector circuit containing ten, 1.2MW wind turbines can cause cascading or uncontrollable outages of the surrounding system? It is extremely doubtful. We can support the inclusion of equipment where the aggregation of 75 MVA or more connects to the Bulk Electric System at voltages of 100kv or greater. There is a clear indication here that a single contingency can remove the total of the capacity from the system where with this definition as proposed, that is simply not the case.

No

No

Group

ISO/RTO Council Standards Review Committee

Greg Campoli

Yes

Yes

Small generators that do not meet the individual 20 MVA criteria and are not part of the aggregated 75 MVA group that meets the BES inclusion criteria are not regarded BES facilities and therefore do not need to be addressed by this SAR. The scope therefore does not need to be expanded to all small generators.
Yes
No
No
No
Individual
Gary Kruempel
MidAmerican Energy Company
These comments were developed by NextERA (contact Brian Murhpy), MidAmerican, and Exelon
Yes
The SAR indicates several standards that should be considered for modification for dispersed generating units. It also provides for examination of other standards that may need to be similarly modified to accommodate the unique aspects of dispersed generation. In addition the SAR provides an explanation of which types of generation are to be reviewed in this project and this explanation is appropriate to define the scope of the project.
Yes
The SAR does not specify what types of generation should be included for analysis as "dispersed generation resources. It only refers to those that are a part of a facility that aggregates to 75 MVA or more. As written the SAR is not limited to any particular type of small generation. Under the SAR all types could and should be considered for revision.
The SAR provides a list of several specific standards application to Generator Owners and/or Generator Operators that would be reviewed as part of the project. In addition it proposes a review of several project families (IRO,MOD, PRC and TOP) that would be examined. The specific list is recommended as proposed in the SAR and with the flexibility to review other standards the list as indicated is appropriate Consideration should be given to an addition to the Attachment in CIP-002 to add an item that would exclude components below the 75MVA aggregation point. The reasoning would be parallel to the other standards addressed in the SAR where the aggregation point would be identified as the point at which the standard would apply. For CIP the result would be that the components below the aggregation point would not have to be addressed, i.e. they would not be high, medium, or low.
No
No
The SAR includes the objective to complete the changes and obtain regulatory approval prior to the completion of the implementation of the BES definition. It is essential that this schedule is met so that dispersed generation owners and operators can plan and implement their compliance programs without having to temporarily implement requirements that will be superseded by this project.
Individual
Bill Fowler
City of Tallahassee (TAL)
Yes
Should the 75MVA be differentiated for Solar PV and other generating units that have both a DC and AC rating?
Yes
Dispersed generation should include intermittent power sources such as wind and solar, but also non-intermittent such as WTE, biogas and biomass generation sources.
yes
No. The City of Tallahassee is not aware of other business practices to be included.
No. The City of Tallahassee is not aware of such.

No.
Group
ACES Standards Collaborators
Ben Engelby
Yes
We find this SAR timely and necessary to avoid confusion in the application of the revised definition of the Bulk Electric System.
No
No, we do not agree that the scope of the SAR should be limited. The scope of the SAR should be to review standards applicable to GO/GOP and to limit the applicability based on the revised definition of the BES. Small generation regardless of type should be included in this review.
We agree with the list of standards to be reviewed. We would like to see flexibility in the scope of standards to be reviewed in the event that another standard is added during the standards development phase.
No.
No.
No other concerns.
Group
Duke Energy
Michael Lowman
Yes
Yes
(1) Duke Energy agrees that the scope of the SAR should be limited to Disperse Generation only.
(1) PRC-004-WECC-1 should also be included in this SAR with the same justification provided for the NERC Standard PRC-004-2
(1) Duke Energy is concerned that Dispersed Generation will have to be compliant with the BES definition Phase 1 prior to the Implementation of this Project and the implementation of Phase 2 of the BES definition. (2) Financial implications to registered entities should be considered and included in the Industry Need section of the SAR such as additional human resources required to maintain compliance if the standards are not revised for the applicability of dispersed generation resources at the point of aggregation to 75 MVA or greater.
Group
DTE Electric
Kathleen Black
Yes
Yes
Yes As stated in the background information, any relevant standard should be revised as necessary to insure that it is being applied at the point of aggregation.
No
No
No
Individual

Scott Langston
City of Tallahassee
Yes
Should the 75MVA be differentiated for Solar PV and other generating units that have both a DC and AC rating?
Yes
Dispersed generation should include intermittent power sources such as wind and solar, but also non-intermittent such as WTE, biogas and biomass generation sources.
Yes
No
No
No
Individual
Carla L. Holly
BP Wind Energy North America Inc.
Yes
Yes
The scope of the SAR should be limited to considering revisions necessary to address the unique technical and reliability aspects of dispersed generation resources as dispersed generation resources are unique and have operational characteristics that are not similar to most conventional generators, including generators that are considered to be classified as small.
Yes. We agree with the list of standards to be reviewed; however, we suggest more clarification about which specific IRO, MOD, PRC, and TOP standards would be considered as the SAR currently lists these categories generically.
No.
No.
No.
Individual
Karen Webb
City of Tallahassee
Yes
Should the 75MVA be differentiated for Solar PV and other generating units that have both a DC and AC rating?
Yes
Dispersed generation should include intermittent power sources such as wind and solar, but also non-intermittent such as waste-to-energy, biogas, and biomass generation sources.
Group
Southern Company: Southern Company Service, Inc.; Alabama Power Company; Georgia Power Company; Gulf Power Company; Mississippi Power Company; Southern Company Generation; Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing
Wayne Johnson

Yes
No
We believe the scope should include consideration of changes to standards applicability for all small generation. In particular, individual generators < 75 MVA should be exempted from model validation requirements unless transmission planning studies demonstrate such individual generators are critical to BES reliability. This would significantly reduce the compliance burdens being imposed on many GOs and GOPs and improve the focus on generators that are critical to reliability.
No. Need to also add those included in the Generator Verification Standard suite, including PRC-019, PRC-024, MOD-025, MOD-026, MOD-027. We are concerned with how certain standard requirements such as VAR-002 R3 can be applied to facilities with multiple "mini" units operating in parallel. For example, in the case of small turbine-generators one or more units operating in manual regulator mode would not have the same impact to the BES as a single large unit. Similar issues exist when some of the other listed standard requirements are applied such as model validation of excitation systems and governors (MOD-026 & MOD-027, as noted above).
No
No
No
Individual
Peter A. Heidrich
Florida Reliability Coordinating Council, Inc.
No
The SAR should not be limited to dispersed power producing resources only. A significant issue that will prove to derail this project is the potential inequitable treatment of generation. The scope should include all small generators regardless of fuel source or prime mover force. The scope should further identify small package style units that are typically considered 'run to fail' units. Provisions with in the 'Applicability' of the appropriate Reliability Standards that take into account these types of units would significantly reduce the compliance obligations for units that simply are replaced (in whole)when a failure occurs.
No
The scope should include all small generators regardless of fuel source or prime mover force. The scope should further identify small package style units that are typically considered 'run to fail' units. The reliability benefit of a generating facility is based on the MVA output of the unit, not on the fuel source or the prime mover force. Within a generating facility that aggregates to >75 MVA, there is no difference in the reliability benefit of a single wind turbine or a single gas fired turbine with the same MVA nameplate rating.
No
No
Group
Bonneville Power Administration
Andrea Jessup
Yes
No
(a) BPA feels that the term "dispersed generation resource" is typically associated with facilities that produce electric power through cogeneration and through renewable resources — such as biomass, solar, hydro, wind, municipal waste, tidal, wave, geothermal, and energy storage. It doesn't matter which type of resource is used to generate power; what matters is the aggregated output at the

point of interconnection, which may have an effect on the electric power system. IEEE Standard 1001-1988 (IEEE Guide for Interfacing Dispersed Storage and Generation Facilities with Electric Utility Systems) and IEEE Standard 1547 (IEEE Standard for Interconnecting distributed Resources with Electric Power Systems) provide information regarding the technical aspects of dispersed generation resources. (b) BPA feels that for PRC-005 & PRC-023, the SAR needs to include individual turbine equipment dynamic response, such that the aggregate collector system provides the required relay response, not just the protective devices from the point of aggregation. It serves no reliability purpose if each turbine internally trips for a system event that requires continuation of the generation in a coordinated manner. (c) BPA feels that FAC-008 requires documentation from the generator to the high side of the main step-up transformer. For dispersed generation, this is the transformer at the main collector transformer. The SAR needs to consider including documentation for the collector system capability. BPA has found that when reactive current was not considered in earlier projects, overloads on some collectors were possible, which limited response to system events. (d) BPA has been requiring a collector system study provided by the generator owner to determine the reactive losses of the generation project and to ensure that reactive requirements are met. BPA has recently developed a collector system performance requirement to demonstrate compliance with reactive capability requirements. BPA recommends that this be added to the scope of the SAR to ensure that the generation in aggregate responds as required for a BES generation project.

No. BPA feels that a review of PRC-024 (Generator Frequency and Voltage Protective Relay Settings) needs to be included in the scope of this SAR. Aggregated dispersed generation must be able to ride-through faults and system disturbances the same as other generation resources.

No.

No.

Yes. IRO, MODs TOPs should be reported in aggregate. Outage coordination requirements for non-dispatchable generation should be eased as the certainty of the generation is never precisely known. BPA feels focusing compliance activities at the point of aggregation to 75 MVA is acceptable; however, there are a couple areas where we need to be cautious. One area of concern is the issue of back feed. Regardless of the size of the dispersed generation resource, proper precautions must be in place to ensure that it does not unintentionally or unexpectedly feed back into the BES. This is a matter of safety for personnel who might be doing construction or maintenance activities on the BES. BPA's other area of concern is the ability of the dispersed resources to ride through faults and system disturbances. BPA's concern here is similar to the concern BPA had when large amounts of wind generation began to be integrated into the grid. Specifically, BPA is concerned that the settings on protection schemes might be set such that large numbers of them would drop off during an event. This would be the equivalent of a large, high-speed spike in load, which could make the event far worse.