

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT — Protection 2007-17

March 10-11, 2009

Oncor Electric Delivery
Fort Worth, Texas

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EST on March 10, 2009. The following were present for the meeting:

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

Guests:

- Bill Shultz
- Sam Francis
- Rick Terrill
- Rafael Garcia
- Mel Stark
- Archie Rodia
- Mike Palusso

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 continued to clean up the standard and the table and to move comments and statements that told “how” instead of “what” into the FAQ document.

After completing the line-by-line review of the draft Standard, the team began a detailed review of the FAQ; they completed about 2/3 of that document.

Issues from this meeting:

No new issues surfaced at this meeting.

Issues from previous meetings and resolutions to be carried over for action:

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 considered 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. 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. This issue should be resolved by an expectation that the component will

be in the desired state when leaving it, as it applies to maintenance. If this is a commissioning issue, it's addressed by that FAQ – that commissioning is a construction activity, not a maintenance activity. We probably should place it on the April 30-May 1 agenda as an item to discuss within the DT.

4. Action Items

Assignments from this meeting

No specific assignments made, Charles will begin to draw up a preliminary implementation plan and posting questions. The team will get any relevant comments to Rick Ashton by COB on April 6, 2009 for the conference call.

5. Next Steps

We scheduled a 4-hour conference call for 1-5 p.m. EDT on April 8, 2009. To the degree that time allows, this conference call will serve to review the Supplementary Reference Document, develop an implementation plan, and develop a posting comment form.

The next meeting has been scheduled for April 30, 2009 (8 a.m.-5 p.m.) and May 1, 2009 (8 a.m.- noon), in Fort Worth TX. It is expected that the Standard will be finalized for a first posting at this meeting.

6. Adjourn

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