

Meeting Notes

Project 2007-11 – Disturbance Monitoring Standard Drafting Team

July 30, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – 11:30 MT

July 31, 2013 | 1:30 p.m. – 5:00 MT

August 1, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – Noon MT

Administrative

1. Introductions – Chair remarks

The meeting was brought to order by Lee Pedowicz, Chair at 8:00 a.m. Mountain Time on Tuesday, July 30, 2013. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)		
			7/30	7/31	8/1
Lee Pedowicz (Chair)	NPCC	Member	IP	IP	IP
Frank Ashrafi	SCE	Member	IP	IP	IP
Alan D. Baker	Florida Power and Light	Member			
Daniel J. Hansen	NRG	Member	IP	IP	IP
Tim Kucey	PSEG Fossil LLC	Member	IP	IP	IP
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member	IP	IP	IP
Jack Soehren	ITC Holdings	Member	IP	IP	IP
Vladimir Stanisic	AESI Inc.	Member	IP	IP	IP
Ryan Quint	BPA	Member	IP	IP	IP
Barb Nutter	NERC(Standard Developer)	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Bob Cummings	NERC	Observer	IP (afternoon)	IP	IP
Juan Villar	FERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Natara Bierria	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Neil Burbure	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	
Guy Zito	NPCC	Observer	IP	IP	

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)		
			7/30	7/31	8/1
Zea Flores	WECC	Observer	IP	IP	IP
Louis-Martin Leduc	Hydro-Quebec	Observer	IP	IP	
Howard Gugel	NERC	Observer	IP (afternoon)	IP	

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 eight of the nine members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement were reviewed by Barb Nutter. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded of the NERC Antitrust Guidelines each morning.

4. [Standards Development Process-Participant Conduct Policy](#) and [Email Listserv Policy](#)

Barb Nutter reminded the group of the Standards Development Process-Participant Conduct and Email Listserv policies.

5. Review Team roster – No changes to the roster.

6. Review meeting agenda and its objectives

Barb Nutter reviewed the agenda and the objectives for the meeting.

Notes

1. **The Team spent the morning of Tuesday, July 30 preparing for the technical conference.**
2. **Day 1** of the technical conference was held Tuesday, July 30 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. Mountain Time and **Day 2** of the technical conference was held Wednesday, July 31 from 8:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Mountain Time.
 - a. There were 12 attendees both days of the conference. The conference was well-received and the attendees provided valuable feedback.
 - b. Team members spent time during the breaks and after the meeting to talk with attendees.
3. **The Team discussed the conference and reviewed the conference notes**
 - a. Revisions were made to the Standard in response to the comments.
 - b. Corresponding redline changes made to the Atlanta conference.
 - c. It was noted at the conference that there was a conflict between Requirements R4 and R6. The Team discussed and deleted Requirement R4.
 - d. GSU is excluded from FR and SOER.
 - e. Requirement R6 does not apply to GSU.
 - f. The Team agreed that the Median Method does a good job of capturing data.
4. **The following proposed methodologies were discussed**
 - a. Reliability Assurer in place of the RC and PC.
 - i. Jack Wiseman responded that the Reliability Assurer is not currently a registered function according to the RoP Appendix 5B.
 - b. Modified Median Method – higher level of MVA.
 - c. Specify in certain regional areas that the Responsible Entity would have to be a functional entity.
5. **Lee asked the question if the GO's need to be included**
 - a. A new Requirement was added per Tim to add clarity and include the GO. Team had a lengthy discussion around having a separate Requirement for the GO. The reason for the discussion was to explore as clean a way to include GO applicable Requirements with the residual locations than those determined by the RE. Therefore, the Team decided not to have separate Requirements because any location where the GO would be required to have DDR is a potential concurrent requirement for TO DDR at that location. Resolution – TO will do DDR “looking back” on the lines interconnecting units. Per Bob, whoever owns the interconnection would be responsible for providing recording.
 - b. Dan thinks that the way we are writing the Standard would add some difficulty and issues for the person implementing it. Steve agreed. Dan’s major issue as an Engineer is

that he wants to put what is needed on the lines that have value, not the ones that do not.

c. The definition for Generating Plant was revised to remove ambiguity. Dan is concerned about the current definition (there was lots of discussion on this issue). Ryan thinks a unit size should be added to the definition. The Team decided to remove the definition because the current definition does not include all generating plants. Bob would like the aggregate of 500MVA. The problem is the term could be misused in certain situations where generator protection is concerned. – *After the meeting the Team decided not to remove the definition of Generating Plant prior to the Atlanta conference.*

d. Ryan says we do not want GSU's necessarily (Bob will have to give some technical justification) included.

e. PRC-018 – R3 – Team discussed and decided it was not needed in PRC-002-2. Bob feels it should be in RoP Section 800. He will address this with legal.

1. Next Steps

- a. August conference.
- b. Posting draft Standard and supporting documents.

2. Assignments

- a. Barb to update Atlanta presentations and Standard with redline changes.
- b. Barb to send the list of Atlanta attendees to drafting Team.

3. Future Meeting(s)

- a. August 6 to August 9, 2013 - NERC Headquarters – Atlanta
 - i. Drafting Team meeting and conference
- b. October 22 to October 25, 2013 – ERCOT – Austin, Texas – Tentative dates

4. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m. Mountain Time.