

# FAC Alert Recommendation Webinar Participant Q&A

On September 22, 2011, NERC hosted a webinar to present the FAC Alert Recommendations. This document provides answers to many of the questions NERC has received.

1. If the analysis of a transmission line finds a clearance limitation that affects the transmission conductor rating but some other element in the facility (different from the conductor where the limitation was found) is the limiting element, does the finding need to be reported (even though the overall facility rating does not change)?

*If a discrepancy occurs because of a clearance limitation and it has been determined that the conductor rating should be reduced as a result, then the discrepancy should be reported. If the current line rating is determined by the limiting element and this rating is less than the clearance limitation rating, then it would not need to be reported if the limiting element establishes the line's permanent rating and not a temporary derate.*

2. a. Will the full webinar (audio and slides) be posted on the NERC website after today?  
b. It might be helpful to prepare a written FA Q&A list to post to the NERC website in addition to the copy of the presentation.  
c. Where can we download this draft spreadsheet?

*Only the slides and the Q & A will be posted on the NERC FAC Alert Webpage located at [FAC Alerts](#).*

3. If there is no change in the spreadsheet from July to December do we resubmit the same spreadsheet from July?

*No. We are requesting that all future reports be submitted in the new spreadsheet format. If you completed all of your high priority assessments and reported the status in the July report, then there is no need to report anything by the January 15, 2012 due date. However, if you did not complete all of the assessments of your high priority transmission lines, we are requesting you submit all assessments completed since the July 15th report using the revised spreadsheet discussed on the September 22nd webinar.*

4. The previous spreadsheet had locked cells and columns. Have they been unlocked?

*Due to the export process that NERC and the Regions will be performing after the data is prepared, the spreadsheet is still locked. We understand this may make the spreadsheet more difficult to use,*

*but issues resulting from the unlocked version being reformatted caused many delays and errors in the processing of the data and in some cases data had to be rebuilt.*

5. Recommend addition of a "comment" column for each tab so that users can explain the inevitable differences in interpretation that will arise.

*A comment column for "additional" clarifications needed for answers will be added to the spreadsheet.*

6. A definition of the discrepancies and remediation needs to be provided.

*The definition of a discrepancy is provided in the Assessment Plan Review Criteria which can be found on the [FAC Alerts](#) page. The project team felt that a definition for remediation was not necessary. The term describes the process or procedure the transmission owner is taking to alleviate the discrepancy.*

7. The categories should allow multiple choices.

*The project team provided drop down boxes for many of the input fields to simplify the data input process. If, for whatever reason, the response you are looking for is not included in the dropdown box menu, we have provided a field adjacent to the input field for you to explain "other" responses.*

8. a. Should the second submittal (due January 15, 2012) include what was completed and reported on the first submittal or just what was found since July 15th?

b. Do we re-input information from our previous report in the next report?

c. In the report due on January 15, 2012, is it to cover the lines not reported on the July report that were inspected from then to the end of the year, or should it be a summary of all lines inspected in 2011?

d. Is the spreadsheet meant to be accumulative as the report periods progress, or just show assessments done/completed for each report period?

e. Just so I'm clear, now not sure if multiple line entries being discussed as examples are assuming multiple reporting periods, or represent a single report. Again, just to be sure that each report will show in the discrepancy tab only those new discrepancies discovered since the prior report. Perhaps this explanation could be built into the data dictionary.

f. As far as only reporting the information since the last report, what if you didn't submit the July 2011 report on the proper form, i.e. we made our own. Do you still want just since July or all of the data?

g. Please confirm when you submit the information in the reporting period. I thought I heard you only include updates when remediated.

*The January 15th, 2012 report should only include the information from your assessments since the July 15th, 2011 report but NOT the information from the July 15th 2011 report. However, if the information provided for an assessment in the July 15<sup>th</sup> report was incomplete, please resubmit the assessment in its entirety.*

9. For the midyear report, how does an entity report lines that have been surveyed but are still being assessed?

*For transmission lines that have been assessed, but for which the discrepancy determination has not been completed, report the results of the assessment in the end-of-the year report. We would like to avoid double reporting.*

10. a. If there are multiple discrepancies on the line, do we put other and then explain how many of each there are?

b. What if the four discrepancies required different remediation?

c. Usually a discrepancy is only in one span so the # of miles associated with a discrepancy doesn't make sense.

d. You can't associate a certain number of miles of a circuit to a single discrepancy because it only affects one span.

*If multiple discrepancies exists on a particular circuit and the discrepancies are the result of one type of discrepancy (e.g., underbuild clearance problem), then you can put them all on the same row within the spreadsheet along with the total miles in the circuit, total number of discrepancies, and the type of discrepancy. If there are multiple types of discrepancies for a particular circuit, then put each type of discrepancy on a separate row in the spreadsheet with the corresponding number of miles that were inspected, and the type of each discrepancy.*

11. One column implies only discrepancies requiring derates are to be reported but if that is the case when would a derate not be done?

*Only report discrepancies which have resulted in a derate of the transmission line.*

12. a. If you used LiDAR and followed it up with a ground inspection, how should this be recorded in the Inspection Type column?

b. What should be done if a circuit was assessed with LiDAR/PLSCAD and field inspections? Where LiDAR/PLSCAD identifies possible suspect points, then field inspections are done to determine if a problem exists or not, at the suspect points.

*Whichever inspection method first determined that there was a discrepancy should be reported in the Inspection Type column. The second method is considered as confirming the original inspection.*

13. Can you please add "100" as an option in the drop down menu in the "Rated kV" column on both the "Discrepancy Lines" and "No Discrepancy" tabs?

*A 100kV option has been added to the spreadsheet.*

14. On inspection type, what is the difference between Field Inspection and Ground Survey?

*Field Inspection is most often performed by taking clearance measurements from the ground to the conductor. Ground survey typically uses some type of surveying tool (e.g., transit) to determine clearances. For further information, contact your Regional Entity Representative.*

15. How many spans were inspected on the July 15, 2011 report by the 278 owners that resulted in 200 discrepancies?

*The information is not available. The Project Team did not request the transmission owners to provide NERC or the Regions with the number of spans included in the number of miles of transmission lines or number of transmission line circuits assessed in the July 15, 2011 report.*

16. Will the spreadsheet have the flexibility to allow the columns to be expanded in width? For instance, the circuit name cell was not wide enough for us to insert the whole circuit name? What are your thoughts?

*The width of the cell is just for formatting purposes and does not limit the amount of text that may be inserted into a cell. The "Wrap Text" feature has been enabled to better portray the data within the spreadsheet but you may always look at the text in the formula bar in the cell.*

17. My definition of terrain is different from yours. Define what you believe the choices are in the drop down lists.

*Please refer to Merriam-Webster's' definition of terrain:*

*a) a geographic area (2) : a piece of land*

*b) the physical features of a tract of land*

*Uneven terrain is meant to capture any situation where the original terrain may have changed from the time the line was built to the present time. This could result from any number of possibilities such as dirt piles, mulch piles, wood chips being placed under the transmission line. Additionally, it could be*

*the result of erosion from one area washing sediment and soil to another area and buildup causing the clearance to be reduced.*

18. a. Should the "de-rate" in the remediation column say "permanent de-rate" to avoid confusion with a temporary de-rate while a discrepancy is being remediated?

b. What happens if the circuit derate is temporary?

c. In the case where the permanent remediation is the addition of a structure, it is likely that the line will be derated (for safety consideration) until the structure work can be completed. How do we show the temporary derate or do we ignore that as it is temporary and only enter the permanent solution?

*The Project Team understands that the immediate response to a discrepancy will most likely be to temporarily de-rate the line while some analysis is done to determine the long term solution. The Team is not looking for the temporary response but, rather, the long term solution and the associated completion date.*

19. In the remediation summary, there was no mention as to percent corrected via re-grading. Was that a very low percentage?

*Yes it was. Since the number was low compared to the top five remediation methods, we did not include it.*

20. An Entity's guidelines generally determine derating of lines. Does the spreadsheet address this?

*If the deviation between the design and as-built condition happens to not exceed the transmission owner's tolerance, then the deviation is not a discrepancy. The tolerance value mentioned here is directly tied to the transmission owner's guidelines and methodology. Therefore, the FAC Alert Recommendation does consider an owner's guidelines.*

21. a. If a medium or low priority facility wants to report (before the posted due dates) can they do that now? If all remediation is complete, is reporting obligation complete? How is reporting done, to whom do we email the spreadsheet?

b. If an Entity has High priority to report, but also worked Med, can the Entity report the medium?

*The revisions made to the reporting spreadsheet allows for transmission owners who have medium and low priority transmission lines to report their assessments of those lines in the January 15, 2012 report. If all remediation is completed, then the owner is finished with the FAC Alert. However, if the owner self-reported (for issues it believes that are possible standard violations) any discrepancies to*

*the Regions, these self-reports will be addressed but will be outside and independent from this FAC Alert Recommendation. Reports are to be submitted to the applicable Regional Entity Representative.*

22. Is it not the intent to report the discrepancies under one report and the remediation subsequently under another report?

*Please report the discrepancy and all known information on a single report. If the remediation is not completed by January 15, 2012 for a discrepancy occurring in 2011, input the known information in the reporting spreadsheet. For example, if a discrepancy has occurred and the remediation has started but has not been completed, then click on the dropdown choice "in progress", etc.*

23. It sounds like you may make additional revisions to the spreadsheet. When and where will it be available?

*There is a possibility that slight revisions will be made to the spreadsheet to incorporate recommendations and suggestions made during and after the September 22nd webinar. Any new reporting spreadsheet will be posted to the [FAC Alert Recommendation Webpage](#) as soon as possible and an email will be sent from NERC about the posting.*

24. a. If we report our analysis, but have not completed the mitigation, how do we report when mitigation has been completed if you don't want us to report the same section on the next six month report?

b. If we derate, then mitigate permanently, how do we report it without reporting the same section of line on the next six month report?

c. For an in progress status, would you want the information reported again when complete on the next set of reports?

d. With discussion of updating of derate fields, implies that subsequent reports will have to include lines reported previously, i.e., can't be just lines assessed since last report.

*Where a discrepancy was not completely mitigated by the July 15th reporting date and partial information (e.g., excluded remediation information) about the discrepancy was provided on July 15th, we request that the information be re-entered and include the completed information not available on July 15th. The project team will have to filter and extract certain data in the report to be sure these reports are not duplicated.*

25. What is the other derating column about?

*The "If a line was not de-rated, explain why" column was added so owners could explain why a derate did not occur.*

26. Do we just keep using the same spreadsheet that we've already started from report to report, so we just change previous fields to note status changes?

*The revisions made to the spreadsheet following the July 15, 2011 report period provides the ability to accumulate information from all assessments from July 15th to the end of the requested reporting periods for high, medium, and low priority assessments (January, 2014). For information to be provided in the January 15, 2012 report and thereafter, please use the revised spreadsheet and do not use the reporting spreadsheet submitted July 15, 2011.*