

Notes

Project 2010-17 Definition of Bulk Electric System

June 7-9, 2011 | 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. PT

Meeting Location: Hyatt Regency San Francisco Airport
1333 Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, California 94010

Administration

1. Introduction and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. PDT on Tuesday, June 7, 2011 at the Hyatt Regency San Francisco Airport in Burlingame, CA. Meeting participants were:

Members		
Jennifer Dering, NYPA	Brian Evans-Mungeon, Utility Services	Phil Fedora, NPCC
Ajay Garg, Hydro One	Pete Heidrich, FRCC, Chair	John Hughes, ELCON
Barry Lawson, NRECA, Vice Chair	Joel Mickey, ERCOT	Jerry Murray, OR PUC
Rich Salgo, Sierra Pacific	Jennifer Sterling, Exelon	Jonathan Sykes, PG&E
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		
Observers		
Paul Cummings, City of Redding	Richard Dearman, TVA	Tom Duffy, Central Hudson
Joe Fina, Snohomish	Bill Harm, PJM	Jonathan Hayes, SWPP
Ken Lotterhos, Navigant	Marcus Lotto, SCE	Alain Pageau, HQTE
Charles Rogers, Consumers	Tim Soles, Occidental	Phil Tatro, NERC
David Thompson, TVA		

2. NERC Anti-trust Guidelines and Conference Call Warning – Ed Dobrowolski

The NERC Anti-trust Guidelines were read and engendered no questions. The open conference call warning was delivered.

3. Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives – Pete Heidrich

Item #1 of the agenda was amended to include an update on the MRC.

The goal of this meeting was to identify any changes needed to the definition due to industry comments and to provide those with drafting assignments the information they needed to complete their draft responses.

Agenda

1. Update on Webinar and MRC – Pete Heidrich

The webinar was deemed a success in all comments received in terms of getting the message out. Over 800 individuals participated over the web and more than 300 on the phone. The recording of the webinar has been posted to the project web page.

On May 10 and 11, Pete and Barry participated in the MRC/BOT meetings. Comments received were all supportive of the work to date.

Barry is also a member of the MRC ALR/BES TF which was formed to assist with policy issues for the definition project. No issues have been identified to date.

2. Discuss Industry Comments

Assignments for draft responses to specific questions were made as follows:

- Q1 – Jennifer Sterling
- Q2 – Jeff Mitchell
- Q3 – Jennifer Dering
- Q4 – Jerry Murray
- Q5 – Phil Fedora
- Q6 – Joel Mickey
- Q7 – Jonathan Sykes
- Q8 – John Hughes
- Q9 – Rich Salgo
- Q10 – Brian Evans-Mongeon
- Q11 – Barry Lawson
- Q12 – Ajay Garg
- Q13 – Pete Heidrich

Each of the assigned individuals led the SDT through the comments for their particular question.

Question 1

- There was some sentiment for including a specific declaration that local distribution facilities are not included. Since a specific question was asked on this issue (Q11), resolution of this topic was deferred pending the discussion on Q11.
- Some individuals were confused as to whether the inclusions and exclusions were part of the definition. This should be resolved with the re-ordering of the core definition.
- There was some confusion on Reactive Power. Again, this should be cleared up by the re-ordering of the core definition and with the addition of the new I5.
- Some respondents suggested using the BPS definition as the new BES definition. Since the BES is generally considered a subset of the BPS, this would not be appropriate.
- Some commenters objected to using the word 'Transmission' in the definition. The SDT feels that this word adds clarity and that since it is a defined term, that no confusion should be present.
- There were questions on why the SDT did not change or investigate a change to the 100 kV value. The SDT believes that this is a well established limit that has been in use for some time without any major problems and as such, no change was warranted. Furthermore, no one presented any justification for changing the value.
- The reference to the Rules of Procedure exception process was inadvertently left out of the posting. After SDT review of the text, it was determined that it really wasn't part of the definition and it was deleted.
- Comments on Cranking Path were deferred to the discussion on Q5 which directly addressed this issue.
- Several comments were made concerning legal issues with the work of the SDT. The SDT is working for and under the auspices of the NERC Standards Committee in responding to FERC Order 743. As such, the SDT was given a SAR to work from and that SAR is the basis for its work. Any concerns on legal issues should be addressed in other forums starting with the NERC Standards Committee.

Question 2 (Pete Heidrich filled in for Jeff Mitchell)

- Do autotransformers need to be explicitly spelled out? The SDT re-worded I1 to use terminals instead of windings based on industry comments. With this change, the SDT did not feel that autotransformers need to be spelled out.
- Several commenters suggested changing 'winding' to terminal' and the SDT agreed and made the change requested.

- With the new wording, GSUs and PARs do not need to be spelled out either.

Question 3

- Several commenters raised an issue with the continuity of the BES and corresponding registration concerns. The position of the SDT is that the definition and registration are decoupled and that they can't be overly concerned with registration. The SDT must do what is correct as far as crafting the definition and anything that happens downstream is out of its control. On the continuity, the SDT continues to feel that continuity for generator leads is a reliability concern. However, after discussion and review of comments, the SDT did change the text to read up to the high-side of the GSU.
- 20 MVA was called into question by numerous commenters. However, none of the commenters presented technical justification for a change. The SDT discussed the issue at length and decided that there was merit in raising the number to 75 MVA. The rationale was that if the BES could handle up to 75 MVA for multiple units at a single site, then it should be able to handle 75 MVA from a single unit. The SDT recognized that this represents a change from the status quo and Phil Fedora will research the potential impact of this change. Phil will report back in Philadelphia with the results of his research. It was also felt that a change to 75 MVA would encourage the development of alternative energy resources. With the agreement to change the single unit value to 75 MVA, the single unit concept was merged into the old I3 and the old I2 was eliminated.
- Due to comments received, 'unit' was changed to 'resource'.
- The SDT did not see the need to include power system stabilizers as suggested by a commenter.
- Some commenters wanted a definition of GSU but the SDT believes that this is a common term and is well understood by the industry.

Action item – Phil Fedora will research all 8 regions to determine the impact of raising the generation resource value to 75 MVA. He will report back in Philadelphia.

Question 4

- No new items were included in the Q4 comments that weren't discussed as part of Q3. Jerry and Jennifer Dering will need to closely coordinate their response.

Question 5

- Cranking Paths were deleted. Cranking Paths are quite often part of the distribution system and are rarely used in actual restoration as they are described in restoration plans due to configuration issues on the day in question. Therefore, it was deemed unnecessary to include Cranking Paths in the definition.

Responses should emphasize however that Cranking Paths can always be brought in through the exception process on a case-by-case basis.

Question 6

- Some commenters complained about the continuity issue here as well but it isn't an issue here as it wasn't included.
- Are specific references needed to wind and solar? The wording was intentionally generic to allow for future unknown developments. With the re-wording of the old I5, any confusion should be eliminated.
- A number of commenters wanted a definition of collector system but with the re-wording it was no longer necessary to use this term.
- Power 'producing' was changed to power 'generating' to allow for PV cells, etc.
- Concerns similar to those expressed in Q3 and Q4 on the 75 MVA limit were raised by commenters. The 75 MVA limit here is now consistent with the limitation on all other generation. No one who questioned the value presented any evidence for changing it. Phil Fedora's research for Q3 and Q4 will be valid for this question as well.

Question 7

- The automatic interrupting device was deleted due to the many comments and the feeling of the SDT that it wasn't really necessary. Relaying and contractual agreements handle the protection problem that this wording was attempting to cover.
- Demarcation should have been clarified by the change in wording to E1.
- The SDT believes that the reference to the included generation is valid and it will remain in place.
- Confusion over 'normally open' should be clarified by the re-wording and the creation of the note on this issue.
- The SDT believes that E1 and E3 address different issues and they will remain separate items.
- Confusion over single source should be avoided going forward due to the change in the connection concept.
- The SDT acknowledges that there is an inconsistency between sub-parts 'b' and 'c' but believes this is a valid reliability need.

Question 8

- The 20/75 MVA issue was raised in this question as well but with the changes made during the meeting, E2 is consistent with the other generation items.

- There was a suggestion to delete 'retail' but this is an important concept and the SDT believes it must be retained.
- There should be no confusion with 'behind-the-meter'. If you have it, you know what it means and if you don't know what it means, then you don't have it.
- It was suggested that the dispersed power inclusion be deleted from E2 but this scenario could happen and it doesn't harm anything so it will be retained.
- E4 was added to handle Reactive Power concerns.
- The wording on Balancing Authority was moved to provide additional clarity.

Question 9

- 'Contiguous' was added to 'Group of Elements'.
- The word 'solely' was deleted from the opening paragraph due to comments.
- 'Location' is the right choice of words and it will not be changed.
- 'Distribution' will be deleted from the name to avoid confusion.
- It will now read at or above 100 kV.
- In sub-part 'a':
 - This part was deleted as it is covered in E1.
- In sub-part 'b':
 - Behind-the-meter shouldn't count and the appropriate change was made.
 - It will now read as gross nameplate rating for consistency.
 - Re-wording should provide consistency with E1 and E2.
- In sub-part 'c':
 - This item should only say 'what' needs to be done and not attempt to describe 'how' to accomplish it. Consequently, the words after the colon have been deleted.
- In sub-part 'd':
 - Parts 'd' and 'e' were combined as new sub-part 'c' and the reference to 'defined by the Regional Entity' deleted as unnecessary.
 - Parallel flows are not allowed.

Question 10

- The topic addressed in Question 10 will be deleted due to the changes made to E1. The concerns that brought about this question were eliminated by the deletion of the automatic interrupting device from E1.

3. Next Steps – Pete Heidrich

- a. Provide expectations for Philadelphia meeting.

At the Philadelphia meeting, assigned individuals for questions 1 through 10 will briefly review their draft responses. SDT members will then have one last opportunity for questions on these responses and the corresponding changes to the definition.

Individuals assigned to questions 11 through 13 will lead the SDT through the comments for their particular question and any changes they are suggesting to the definition as a result of those comments.

The remainder of the time will be spent on the technical criteria comments. SDT members will be expected to have read the comments and to be prepared to discuss them.

- b. Start discussions on affected standards (as time permits).

Time did not permit discussion of this item.

4. Future Meetings – All

- a. Face-to-face meeting for June 21 – 23, 2011 at Exelon in Philadelphia.
- b. Meeting with FERC staff – This may be done via a conference call due to the extensive meeting schedule for the SDT and the logistical problems this presents in terms of setting up a 1 day meeting. Details will follow.
- c. Face-to-face meeting for 3 days during the week of July 18, 2011. Location is still to be determined.

5. Action Items & Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The Following action items were developed during this meeting:

- Phil Fedora will research all 8 regions to determine the impact of raising the generation resource value to 75 MVA. He will report back in Philadelphia.
- SDT members are expected to complete their drafting assignments prior to the next meeting.
- SDT members are expected to have read the technical criteria comments prior to the next meeting.

The project is on schedule at this time but the volume of comments on the technical criteria and the time required to respond to them is of concern.

6. Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. PDT on Thursday, June 9, 2011.