

Meeting Notes Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

January 25, 2008 | noon–2:30 p.m.
Conference Number: 1-732-694-2061
Conference Code: 12080125081
WebEx: <https://nerc.webex.com/nerc/j.php?ED=102032232>
Meeting Number: 713 217 183
Password: standards

Administrative Items

1) Introductions and Quorum

The call was brought to order by the Chair at noon EST. Call participants were:

Darrin Church	Doug Hohlbaugh	Bob Jones
Brian Keel	Tom Mielnik	Bob Millard, Vice Chair
John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack	Bob Pierce
Chifong Thomas	Jim Useldinger	Tom Gentile, Observer
Ray Kershaw, Observer	Hari Singh, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer
Vahid Madani, WECC — Guest	Cynthia Pointer, FERC — Guest	Steve Rueckert, WECC — Guest
Jonathan Sykes, SRP — Guest		

2) NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

There were no questions raised as to the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

3) Meeting Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

The objectives of this conference call were to discuss the use of SPS in TPL-001-1 and to continue the discussion of question 43 responses.

4) Discuss Use of SPS/RAS in TPL-001-1

Options include:

- SPS that applies to Eastern Interconnection, ERCOT and those that apply to WECC.
- Single standard for all with WECC variance, if required.

Proposed changes to the roadmap for these approaches were discussed.

As TPL-001-1 is currently written, SPS is allowed for less probable contingencies. The new approach would be to define the specific contingencies for which SPS is allowed and should be much cleaner. The proposal made by the sub-team was to allow SPS/RAS for generation tripping for lower probability single contingencies and to have a different criterion in the WECC than the Eastern and ERCOT interconnections. Expectations would be that the next draft to be posted to the industry would then bring us closer to the industry comments in most cases.

Tom Mielnik commented that MRO must approve the operating procedure describing the runback. WECC technical committees must also approve runback schemes if they affect interconnected reliability.

John Odom noted that the 1st draft allowed generation runback with SPS/RAS for single contingencies so to exclude runback now would be contrary to what was posted, without comments to support the change. Yury brought up the fact that the latest draft lowers the standard because it allows load loss for low-probability single events. The SDT agreed to remove the references to load from R3.5 and R3.6 and address load loss through the performance tables.

Generation tripping is currently allowed for lower probability single contingencies. The SDT needs to make a distinction between manual vs. automatic tripping due to the issue of staying within ratings. The SDT agreed to make separate categories for automatic tripping vs. manual runback or tripping for single contingencies. Does a further distinction between stability related vs. thermal related runback schemes need to be made? There are procedural rules in place in WECC for technical review of SPS and manual runback. A committee identifies problems but doesn't recommend solutions. The owner must come back with proposals to solve identified problems.

John stated that the goal is to come up with something for a continent wide standard if at all possible. If the SDT can't accomplish that, then we need to come up with a standard with interconnection wide differences (see later action item, plan to bifurcate standard on SPS).

PRC-012 was discussed as it points back to the TPL standards. Because PRC-012 will be reviewed again, we can recommend some considerations that PRC-012 should have as a result of TPL changes. Bob Pierce felt that we should defer to regions to specify PRC-012 requirements to cover SPS.

Bernie mentioned a potential unintended consequence of allowing SPS/RAS for single contingencies is that in those areas of the country that do not use SPS, they could be forced to because of our standard, i.e., an unintentional lowering of the bar.

Bob Pierce and Tom Mielnik noted that SPS for single contingencies are currently being used without reliability consequences. Preventing them may not improve reliability.

- Team members were asked if they could support the language allowing the use of SPS/RAS for lower probability single contingencies. The team remains split on this issue and will make a decision on what is posted in draft 2 at the Houston meeting.

Brian Keel's draft of a WECC proposal will be sent out today to the team. It has not been reviewed by everyone in WECC but has been supported by those who have seen it.

A discussion followed that reconfigurations without generation tripping could be automated with an SPS. The SDT agreed that this would be allowed.

5) Next Meetings — All

- a. Face-to-face meeting in Houston, Texas on Monday, February 11, 2008 from 1:30–5 p.m. CST; Tuesday, February 12, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. CST; Wednesday, February 13, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon CST. The meeting announcement has been sent out to the mail server. Please be prepared to attend the entire meeting.
- b. Face-to-face meeting in Tampa, Florida on Monday, March 3, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EST; Tuesday, March 4, 2008 from 8 a.m.–noon EST. Details will be supplied at a later date.

6) Action Items and Schedule

- Section R3.5 and R3.6 of the proposed Draft 2 of TPL-001-1 will be changed to just refer to generation tripping/runback. Load will be handled in the performance tables.
- Brian will send out the draft WECC proposal.
- The roadmap will have to change to include bifurcated language and this will be the basis of the response to comments.

7) Adjourn

The Chair adjourned the call at 2:30 p.m. EST.