

Meeting Notes

Project 2010-13.2 Phase 2 of Relay Loadability: Generation Standard Drafting Team

September 19, 2012
Conference Call

Administrative

1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by Charlie Rogers, chair, at 1:05 p.m. ET Wednesday, September 19, 2012. He also provided an outline of today's meeting goals.

Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Charlie Rogers	Consumers Energy	Chair
Jeff Billo	ERCOT	Member
S. Bryan Burch	Southern Company	Member
Steven Hataway	Florida Power and Light Company	Member
Mike Jensen	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	Member
Xiaodong Sun	Ontario Power Generation, Inc.	Member
Sudhir Thakur	Exelon Nuclear	Member
Joe Uchiyama	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Member
Benson Vuong	Salt River Project	Member
David Youngblood	Luminant Energy	Member

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Ken Hubona	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Daniel Woldemariam	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	FERC Staff
Scott Barfield-McGinnis (Project Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff
Phil Tatro (Technical Advisor)	North American Electric Reliability Corporation	NERC Staff

2. Determination of Quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or team) states that a quorum requires two-thirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as nine of the eleven total members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by the advisor. There were no questions raised.

4. Review of the Roster

There were no changes or revisions.

Agenda

1. Review of Meeting Notes from Previous Meetings

The chair suggested tabling the meeting notes and focusing on the standard as the goal is to get the standard to quality review and its initial formal comment period. The project advisor concurred and that a future meeting could be scheduled to address meeting notes.

2. Open Business from Last Meeting (On-going)

- a. Team – Work on developing additional technical basis for asynchronous ratings (Option 4) during the first formal comment period
- b. Team – Work on developing the additional technical basis for the margins used in each of the options found in Table 1 of the attachment. The basis may be covered in the introduction or individually in each option. The chair noted that, based on time, this option might be covered in this meeting.

The team will continue working the above action items contemporaneously with the posting of the standard.

3. Discussion of the RBS Draft Standard

The team began discussions around Options 13, 14, and 15 of Table 1. The concerns were the location of the relay and how it may potentially conflict with the current PRC-023-2 standard for transmission system relay loadability. One member noted that the application of Options 13, 14, or 15 in Table 1 is for the most common situation. The NERC staff technical advisor noted the requirement must cover generator loadability. That is, not where the relay is applied – the ability to see the loading of the generator when connected to the system. This issue is the location of the voltage transformers (VT) on the high-side of the generator step-up (GSU) transformer relative to the current transformers (CT) found on the low-side of the GSU is an atypical configuration. A suggestion was made to document the criteria in the standard and allow stakeholder comments to provide additional insight to the issue. The team consensus was to refrain from specifying a particular configuration and allow comments to reveal the differences. The team also reached consensus that it may need to address minor variations between the draft PRC-025-1 standard and the current standard PRC-023-2 when more information is available through the comment process.

The team moved to the Guidance and Technical Basis for Options 13, 14, and 15. The same concerns were raised about the typical configuration of the relays installed for this type of generator step-up transformer relay. Again, the team agreed to allow comments to reveal the differences. The chair asked the project advisor to seek NERC staff guidance on the team's concern about the potential differences in PRC-023-1 and the draft PRC-025-1.

4. Discussion of Questions for the Comment Period

Team considered an additional question to ask industry for feedback concerning whether there is sufficient differentiation of the conditions between Options 1, 2, and 3 with Options 13, 14, and 15, respectively; however, later decided against having a question that would be similar to another question and potentially create duplication in the response to comment process.

5. Action Items

Project Advisor – Seek NERC staff opinion on the potential differences in PRC-023-1 and the draft PRC-025-1.

6. Review of the Schedule

The project advisor reviewed the schedule to note the risks if the team did not make its initial posting by October 2012. If so, the team would miss the window to meet prior to the Thanksgiving holidays.

7. Next Steps

The next step will be a 30-day formal comment period.

8. Future meeting(s)

The week of November 12, 2012 (Note: Monday is Veteran's Day). The meeting will be Tuesday, November 13, 2012 from 8:00 a.m. MT through Friday, November 16, 2012 at noon MT (3.5 days).

9. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:54 p.m. ET on September 19, 2012.