

Meeting Notes Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

January 15, 2008 | 11 a.m.–3 p.m.
Conference Call Number: 1-732-694-2061
Conference Code: 1208011508
WebEx: <https://nerc.webex.com/nerc/j.php?ED=101604192>
Meeting Number: 716 888 803
Meeting Password: standards

Administrative Items

1) Introductions and Quorum

The conference call was brought to order at 11 a.m. EST by the Chair. Meeting attendees were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh
Bob Jones	Brian Keel	Tom Mielnik
Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Paul Rocha	Chifong Thomas
Yury Tsimberg	Dana Walters	Bob Williams
Jim Useldinger	Ray Kershaw, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer
Chuck Lawrence, ATC — Guest	Charles Long, Entergy — Guest	Cynthia Pointer, FERC — Guest
Kevin Thundiyil, FERC — Guest		

The NERC TIS dialed in as a group and participated in the conference call:

Baj Agrawal, APS	Mark Byrd, Progress Energy — Carolinas	Dale Burmester, Exelon
Carlos Candelaria, FPL	Ken Donohoo, Oncor	Dmitry Kosterev, BPA
Hai Le, NPCC	Rod Lenfest, Sea Breeze Pacific RTS	Patti Metro, NRECA
Eric Mortenson, Exelon	Branden Sudduth, WECC	David Till, TVA
Wes Woitt, ERCOT	Bob Yinger, SCE	Bob Cummings, NERC

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 objective of the conference call was to continue the discussion of the proposed responses to the industry comments for the first posting of TPL-001-1.

4) Review and Finalize Sub-team Responses to Comments

a. Team #1: Question 20–30 — John (lead), Doug, Tom, Dana, and Chifong

Chifong has taken over as the team lead to free up John to focus on the over-all work effort. Three conference calls have been scheduled to allow this team to catch up and will they will forward their work product to the SDT prior to the mid-February Houston meeting.

The team is trying to address the 300kV and higher straight bus issues.

Bob Pierce questioned whether or not the SDT has considered the single bus issue from an ATC standpoint. If the straight bus is considered as a single contingency, it will affect how transfer capability is calculated.

Tom Mielnik questioned whether or not a bus fault should be categorized as a single event. He felt it's a less likely event than other single contingencies, specifically lines and generators and if included will have a significant impact on ATC.

John Odom asked TIS to consider if the bus fault is a common or rare event and to consider the appropriate level of importance for this type of event (single or multiple contingency). For P2, should a bus fault be included (in the 300kV and higher group)?

A question was raised as to whether the SDT is focusing on what is the appropriate substation design. John Odom replied that the SDT is not trying to drive a particular substation design protocol. The SDT is trying to arrive at the appropriate level of impact on load loss and interruption of transfers for a particular equipment loss.

b. Team #2: Question 31–40 — Bernie (lead), Bob J., Brian, Jim, and Ray

Question 31: Will characterize that there is a need to keep the stability tables separate. Chifong indicated that we need to keep the contingencies consistent between the tables.

Question 32: Will keep tables separate. The sub-team has modified definitions and requirements for clarity.

Question 33: The question was somewhat mis-worded. It was not intended to be a requirement, merely an option.

Question 34: There was a lot of concern on how to do this. The language in the requirement has been modified to be a bit less prescriptive and TIS is being asked to put together some information to provide additional insight on this topic for industry use. Bob Pierce thinks that the wording is still too prescriptive and pointing to a “requirement”. Chifong questioned how you would demonstrate “as appropriate”. TIS has a presentation planned for today that may shed some light on this topic and will share it with the group. Paul Rocha suggested that TIS offer some suggested language for this requirement. TIS indicated they would provide the information requested.

Question 35–Q40: SPS — should they be allowed for generation tripping for single contingency?

Bernie indicated that the sub-team has put the actual responses for some of this on hold until they get some support from the larger SDT as to the direction that they feel we should go in responding and ultimately changing the standard.

Brian and Chifong have been working on proposed wording changes and once they get WECC support, they will make it available to the rest of the SDT.

What level of “grandfathering” is appropriate for SPS installations? The sub-team is proposing no new SPS installations for single contingency events. There are concerns for economic impacts; specifically from the market folks (generators). There was a proposal to allow use on a temporary basis, so long as an exit strategy is in place for a permanent fix (i.e., new transmission).

John asked about a generator that is an energy only unit and is willing to be tripped post-contingency? Dana replied that this issue shows how prolific the use of SPS installations can become. What is the SDT’s long-term object for the standard? What is the SDT trying to drive with this standard?

Bernie responded that the SDT should be: 1) Concerned about LOLE considering the loss of generators due to SPS; 2) Concerned about the ability to go before a siting commission and trying to justify building anything new if a SPS is always available as an alternative.

John requested that TIS weigh-in on the use of SPS for dropping generation for single contingency. The SDT needs to clearly state if SPS are allowed and whether to allow “grandfathering” of existing installations or require a transition period to remove existing installations.

c. Team #3: Question 12–19 — Bob M. (lead), Yury, Bob W., and Bill

Bob Millard indicated that the SDT needs to be more specific on the use of sensitivity studies in the corrective action plans. The sub-team has prepared a chart on how these would be used and they will convert the chart into proposed requirement wording. They are leaning towards requiring that the sensitivity studies adjust your corrective plan. There is some concern over this approach if a decision was made to do nothing in a correction plan when sensitivity has shown a problem. John Odom felt we would be relying on the transparency aspects of the standard (sharing with neighbors) to provide peer pressure.

Yury presented the “chart” to the TIS group. Box 4 was not intended to be an exhaustive list. It was suggested that the SDT needs to list input from transmission operators somewhere and that the sensitivity studies would likely be the best place to capture this input. Bob Cummings suggested that we look at the reliability concepts document to ensure that the SDT covers any other important aspects that may have been missed.

d. Team #4: Question 1—11 and 41–42 — Paul (lead), Bob P., and Darrin

On prior calls all but three questions were resolved.

Question 2 still needs some work.

Question 9 and 10 need some work and may not line up with the approach used by Bernie’s sub-team.

John asked that everyone review the definitions so that they can be finalized in Houston.

There was some discussion on the SPS and BES definitions. The SDT decided that the BES definition is better left to industry to debate the topic and not something for the SDT to debate. Bob Cummings (TIS Group) indicated that there is some work underway that should provide a clearer definition of SPS prior to going to ballot on the TPL standard.

5) Review FAC-010 vs. TPL-001-1 for Consistency

There was no discussion of this item due to time constraints.

6) Next Steps — John Odom

- a.** Review plan (shown below) developed in Houston and chart progress.
- b.** Make assignments and set deadlines.

Each sub-team is required to complete the assigned responses to comments (questions 1–42) and the question 43 assignments that were deemed best handled by their team.

1. Responses by Sub-team to Questions 1–42
 - a. Develop initial responses. Progress — see item #2 above
 - b. Draft standard changes
 - c. Full team review & approval of initial responses
2. Responses for Question 43
 - a. See what responses can be cut and pasted from item #1. (CenterPoint — complete)
 - b. Assign remaining comments to sub-team

Team 1 — Paul — Pages 1–6

Team 2 — Bob M — Pages 7–12

Team 3 — Chifong — Pages 13–18

Team 4 — Bernie — Pages 19–25

If an unassigned question 43 does not fall directly to your sub-team then you must re-assign to one of the other three sub-teams by the end of business on January 23, 2008 otherwise your sub-team keeps the comment. If there is a “general” response that cuts across the entire standard, then your sub-team keeps the comment and is responsible for responding.

- I. Develop initial responses.
- II. Draft standard changes.
- III. Full team review & approval of initial responses.

3. Correlation of Responses
4. Revisions to Standard Resulting from Responses
 - a. Structural changes?
5. Review Comments for Consistency with Revised Standard
6. Factor in the Data Collected by NERC on More Stringent Entity Planning Criteria
7. Develop Implementation Plan
 - a. Wait on Measures, VRF, Time Horizons, and Compliance (VSL)
8. Develop Second Question Set
9. Submit to NERC Staff for Posting

7) Next Meetings

- a. A conference call and WebEx was scheduled for January 25th from noon–2 p.m. EST.

- b. 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.

8) Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

- Ed will explore how to best present the proposed ‘tutorial’ within the NERC structure in order to minimize costs and travel while maximizing impact for all involved. Complete — it looks as if the PC meeting will be the way to go. Tentative plans for a presentation associated with the June meeting have been set up.
- Bob Snow volunteered to research whether any of the existing SPS/RAS schemes are covered in approved tariffs.
- Ed will follow up with WECC on the subject of variances. Complete – awaiting response from WECC.

9) Adjourn

The call was adjourned by the Chair at 3 p.m. EST.