

Notes

Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT — Project 2006-02

December 9, 2009 | 2:30-4:30 p.m. EST

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions

A meeting was held in the FERC Office in Washington, DC on Wednesday, December 9, 2009 with FERC staff to discuss Project 2006-02: Assess Transmission Future Needs. The meeting was requested by FERC staff to review and discuss certain proposed changes to TPL-001-1 by the ATFNSDT and discuss the associated FERC Commission Directives from Order 693.

Meeting and conference call participants were:

ATFNSDT: Darrin Church (TVA), Bill Harm (PJM), Doug Hohlbaugh – Vice Chair (First Energy), Bob Jones (Southern), Brian Keel (SRP), Tom Mielnik (Mid-American), John Odom – Chair (FRCC), Bernie Pasternack (AEP), Chifong Thomas (PG&E), Dana Walters (National Grid)

ATFNSDT Observers: Tom Gentile (Quanta), Hari Singh (Xcel), Steve Rueckert (WECC)

Industry Guest: John Andree (ITC)

NERC staff: Gerry Adamski, Ed Dobrowolski – Coordinator, Laurel Heacock, Dave Taylor

FERC staff: Eugene Blick, Ted Franks, Chris Mak, Frank Macedo, Keith O’Neal, Ibrahim Oweis, Bob Snow

The meeting was called to order at 1430 EST.

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

No questions were raised on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Agenda and Objectives — John Odom and Eugene Blick

Eugene Blick recognized the ATFNSDT's efforts and hard work to date. Eugene briefly summarized FERC's Agenda.

John Odom provided a status update and indicated the SDT's intention to move the draft 5 version of the proposed TPL-001-1 to an initial industry ballot.

2. Discuss FERC Order 693 Directives

a. P 1691 — Goal and Planning Horizon

FERC staff struck this item from the agenda.

b. P 1754 & 1755 — Peer Review with Neighboring Entities

FERC staff asked the SDT for a summary of their response to this directive. The SDT pointed to Requirement R3, part 3.4.1 for steady state and Requirement R4, part 4.4.1 for Stability where Contingency lists are developed that must include adjacent Systems.

Requirement R3, part 3.4.1 - The Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall coordinate with adjacent Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners to ensure that Contingencies on adjacent Systems which may impact their Systems are included in the Contingency list.

Requirement R4, part 4.4.1 - Each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall coordinate with adjacent Planning Coordinators and Transmission Planners to ensure that Contingencies on adjacent Systems which may impact their Systems are included in the Contingency list.

In addition, the SDT developed Requirement R8 to handle the distribution and sharing of Planning Assessments and inputs from adjacent entities.

Requirement R8 - Each Planning Coordinator and Transmission Planner shall distribute its Planning Assessment results to adjacent Planning Coordinators, adjacent Transmission Planners, and any functional entity that has a reliability related need and that functional entity submits a written request for the information.

Requirement R8, part 8.1 - If a recipient of the Planning Assessment results provides documented comments on the results, the respective Planning Coordinator or Transmission Planner shall provide a documented response to that recipient within 90 calendar days of receipt of those comments.

FERC staff pointed out that Order 693 used the term 'neighbor' while the proposed Reliability Standard uses 'adjacent' and asked for an explanation as to

why the Order 693 terminology wasn't employed. The SDT responded that 'adjacent' was actually a more encompassing term as it would pick up embedded cooperatives, municipals, etc., and thus was more stringent than the Order 693 terminology. Additionally, the term 'adjacent' clarifies the intent to cover Transmission Systems that interconnect to the entity System whereas neighbor is vague and could include Systems in the vicinity of an entity's System, but not directly connected. The SDT emphasized that the standard requires the Transmission Planner and Planning Coordinator to distribute the Planning Assessment to additional "neighbors" who show a "reliability related need" who have requested information in writing and required a documented response to their comments.

FERC staff next asked about the distribution of results versus the 'peer review' cited in Order 693. The SDT responded that distribution could actually be a better approach as an entity could always decline an offer to participate in a peer review even if they should have participated. The distribution approach means that they will receive the Planning Assessment regardless. Due to the continuing cycle of Planning Assessments, comments from other entities at the end of a planning cycle will be utilized at the beginning of the next cycle as the planner moves forward in time. This approach tells entities what to do without stating how to do it but still makes certain that the goal is achieved. The SDT views this as an equally effective approach to the directives in Order 693.

This background information will be included in the issues matrix that will be filed with the Commission.

c. P 1795 — Magnitude and Duration of Consequential Load Loss

FERC staff asked the SDT why this directive was not addressed in the proposed Reliability Standard as they felt that while this may be an administrative item it was an important issue with regard to the robustness of the bulk power system. The SDT pointed out that the directive was to "consider" the need for a ceiling on Load and duration and if it "is appropriate" to develop the ceiling through the standards development process. It was indicated that the SDT was divided on the reliability need for this item and that the vetting with industry was the best course of action. The SDT indicated that they had addressed this directive in various stages of the project. Originally, the SDT debated the appropriateness and the need for a ceiling and determined that a single ceiling was not appropriate for the continent-wide standard. After that decision was made, the SDT added requirements covering the reporting of the magnitude and duration of Consequential Load Loss. In earlier postings, industry overwhelmingly protested the inclusion of what were seen as administrative tasks in a Reliability Standard without a true reliability need. These comments were initially more voluminous on the topic of duration than magnitude so the SDT attempted a compromise position. The duration element of the requirement was deleted and a revised

requirement covering only magnitude was crafted and posted for comment. Again, the SDT was overwhelmed by industry comments pushing back about the inclusion of an administrative task in a Reliability Standard. At this point, the SDT discussed the matter at length and decided to delete the requirement in its entirety. The SDT believes that it did address the directive to “consider developing a ceiling” as directed in Order 693 as can be seen by the attempt to include the requirements in the Reliability Standard. The SDT has definitely considered the directive and made positive attempts to draft a suitable requirement. Therefore, the SDT considers that it has fulfilled its obligation in this regard.

This history will be included in the issues matrix that will be filed as part of this project.

3. **Backup and Redundant Protection Systems**

There is an interpretation filed with the Commission on this topic so FERC staff can not comment on these matters at this time.

4. **Generation Runback or Tripping**

This item was in regard to paragraph 1787 in Order 693. FERC staff was concerned that the directive was not being addressed due to the proposed deletion of Requirement R3, part 3.6. However, the SDT pointed out that this directive is addressed in Requirement R3, part 3.3.2 for steady-state and Requirement R4, part 4.3.2 for Stability.

Requirement R3, part 3.3.2 - Trip generators where simulations show generator bus voltages or high side of the GSU voltages are less than known or assumed minimum generator steady state or ride through voltage limitations. Include in the assessment any assumptions made.

Requirement R4, part 4.3.2 - Trip generators where simulations show generator bus voltages or high side of the GSU voltages are less than known or assumed generator low voltage ride through capability. Include in the assessment any assumptions made.

The deletion of Requirement R3, part 3.6 was further discussed and the SDT pointed out that the administrative burden without reliability need is the reason that Requirement R3, part 3.6 was deleted; This deletion does not affect the issues raised in the directive which are addressed in the cited requirements.

FERC staff raised an additional question not related to the directive concerning the possibility of having a generation rich case that could mask the effects of losing a generator which could be an entity’s largest single Contingency. Their feeling was that without Requirement R3, part 3.6, there would be no reporting mechanism for how much manual System adjustment involving generation tripping or runback is being made. The SDT feels that for planning assessments that this issue is not a

reliability concern and the concern raised about tripping more generation than the largest single Contingency is covered by requirements in other standards.

5. **Loss of an Element/Breaker/Line Section without a Fault (P2-1)**

FERC staff noted that the existing Reliability Standard uses the term ‘Element’ while the proposed standard uses ‘line section’. FERC staff felt that this was less inclusive than the current standard. The SDT interpreted the use of ‘Element’ to be essentially dealing with the loss of continuity and the approach taken was to identify the Elements and model how one would outage them. When one looks at the different facilities included in Elements, the SDT decided that line section was the one Element item that needed to be singled out. Bridging back to the loss of continuity approach, if one is looking at transformers, an open-ended situation is actually a less severe situation. For generators, open-ended isn’t a matter of concern. This leaves line and the SDT felt that line section best described the situation and open-ended was the worst possible case to study.

6. **Miscellaneous Items**

FERC staff asked about the inclusion of the term ‘Delayed Fault Clearing’ for event P5. The SDT stated that the capitalization was intentional in order to incorporate the existing defined term in the Glossary and was done in response to industry comments requesting additional clarification for this event. The SDT is looking at a Protection System as a complete system and is not looking for a planner to be responsible for single points of component failure within a Protection System. All matters concerning the components of a Protection System or redundancy in Protection Systems are being left to Project 2007-06: System Protection Coordination.

7. **Next Steps**

The SDT will review today’s discussion to determine if any action needs to be taken prior to submitting the project documents to NERC staff for pre-ballot.

8. **Action Items — Ed Dobrowolski**

The only action item developed during this meeting was for the SDT to review today’s discussion to determine any needed actions before submitting the project to NERC staff.

9. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1600 EST.