Comment Report

Project Name: 2013-03 Geomagnetic Disturbance Mitigation White Papers

Comment Period Start Date: 5/12/2016
Comment Period End Date: 6/13/2016

Associated Ballots:

There were 14 sets of responses, including comments from approximately 14 different people from approximately 14 companies representing 8 of the Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

Questions

1. The SDT has corrected Figure 1 and revised related sections in the Screening Criterion white paper. The SDT has also made related revisions to other Project 2013-03 white papers. Do you agree with the revisions? If not, please provide specific recommendation(s) and technical justification.

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
ACES Power Marketing	Brian Van Gheem			ACES Standards Collaborators	Bob Solomon	Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1	RF
					Ginger Mercier	Prairie Power, Inc.	1,3	SERC
					Michael Brytowski	Great River Energy	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Shari Heino	Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.	1,5	Texas RE
					Bill Hutchison	Southern Illinois Power Cooperative	1	SERC
				Mark Ringhausen	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	3,4	SERC	
					Chip Koloini	Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc.	5	SPP RE
					Ellen Watkins	Sunflower Electric Power Corporation	1	SPP RE
					Ryan Strom	Buckeye Power, Inc.	4	RF
					Scott Brame	North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation	3,4,5	SERC
					Kevin Lyons	Central Iowa Power Cooperative	1	MRO
Duke Energy	Colby Bellville	Bellville 1,3,5,6	FRCC,RF,SERC	Duke Energy	Doug Hils	Duke Energy	1	RF
					Lee Schuster	Duke Energy	3	FRCC
					Dale Goodwine	Duke Energy	5	SERC
					Greg Cecil	Duke Energy	6	RF

Southern Company - Southern Company Services, Inc.	Katherine Prewitt	1		Southern Company	Scott Moore	Alabama Power Company	3	SERC		
					Bill Shultz	Southern Company Generation	5	SERC		
					Jennifer Sykes	Southern Company Generation and Energy Marketing	6	SERC		
Northeast	Ruida Shu	1,2,3,4,5,6,7	NPCC	RSC	Paul Malozewski	Hydro One.	1	NPCC		
Power Coordinating Council					Guy Zito	Northeast Power Coordinating Council	NA - Not Applicable	NPCC		
					Rob Vance	New Brunswick Power	1	NPCC		
					Mark J. Kenny	Eversource Energy	1	NPCC		
					Gregory A. Campoli	NY-ISO	2	NPCC		
					Randy MacDonald	New Brunswick Power	2	NPCC		
					Wayne Sipperly	New York Power Authority	4	NPCC		
					David Ramkalawan	Ontario Power Generation	4	NPCC		
					Glen Smith	Entergy Services	4	NPCC		
					Brian Robinson	Utility Services	5	NPCC		
							Bruce Metruck	New York Power Authority	6	NPCC
						Alan Adamson	New York State Reliability Council	7	NPCC	
					Edward Bedder	Orange & Rockland Utilities	1	NPCC		
				David Burke	UI	3	NPCC			

					Michele Tondalo	UI	1	NPCC
					Kathleen Goodman	ISO-NE	2	NPCC
					Sylvain Clermont	Hydro Quebec	1	NPCC
					Si Truc Phan	Hydro Quebec	2	NPCC
					Helen Lainis	IESO	2	NPCC
					Brian Shanahan	National Grid	1	NPCC
					Michael Jones	National Grid	3	NPCC
					Michael Forte	Con-Edison	1	NPCC
					Kelly Silver	Con-Edison	3	NPCC
				Peter Yost	Con-Edison	4	NPCC	
					Sean Bodkin	Dominion	4	NPCC
					Silvia Parada Mitchell	NextEra Energy	4	NPCC
					Brian O'Boyle	Con-Edison	5	NPCC
	Shannon Mickens		SPP RE	SPP Standards Review Group	Shannon Mickens	Southwest Power Pool Inc.	2	SPP RE
					Jason Smith	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	SPP RE
					Kim VanBrimer	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	SPP RE
					kevin Giles	Westar Energy	1,3,5,6	SPP RE
					Jonathan Hayes	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	SPP RE
					J.Scott Williams	City Utilities of Springfield	1,4	SPP RE

	evised related sections in the Screening Criterion white paper. The SDT has also made related papers. Do you agree with the revisions? If not, please provide specific recommendation(s) and						
Brian Van Gheem - 6 - NA - Not Applicable, Group Name ACES Standards Collaborators							
Answer	No						
Document Name							
Comment							
clarification on why 75 A per phase was che assessment of applicable BES power transfer. However, based on these clarifications, we 007-1 reliability standard. The SDT should development process. From these clarifications phase value identified in the last draft revisit the information identified within the Screeni selection for the GIC value. We recommend the SDT develop a SAR, as remove the maximum effective GIC value resimpact assessment for its solely and jointly	We commend the SDT for revising the Screening Criterion and associated Project 2013-03 white papers. These revisions provide additional clarification on why 75 A per phase was chosen as the maximum effective geomagnetically-induced currents (GIC) value for the thermal impact assessment of applicable BES power transformers. However, based on these clarifications, we believe this after-the-fact exercise to maintain accuracy misses the opportunity to revise the proposed TPL-007-1 reliability standard. The SDT should have justified its actions to revise these documents through the issuance of a SAR, as part of the standards development process. From these clarifications, it's further obvious that the 75 A per phase, while a step in the right direction away from the 15 A per phase value identified in the last draft revision of the standard, still misses the intent of why an overly conservative GIC value was chosen. Based on the information identified within the Screening Criterion and following the revised Table 2, it seems 130 A per phase is a better and more accurate selection for the GIC value. We recommend the SDT develop a SAR, as part of the standards development process, with the intent to revise Requirement R6 of the standard and remove the maximum effective GIC value reference entirely. We suggest rephrasing the requirement to "each TO and GO shall conduct a thermal impact assessment for its solely and jointly owned applicable BES power transformers based on information provided in Requirement R5. The thermal impact assessment shall consist of [sub-requirements]." These documents could then be updated as part of the standards development process.						
Likes 0							
Dislikes 0							
Response							
Andrew Pusztai - 1							
Answer	Yes						
Document Name							
Comment							
ATC is fine with the changes to the GMD	white papers and have no comments.						
Likes 0							
Dislikes 0							
Response							

homas Foltz - 3,5						
Answer	Yes					
Document Name						
Comment						
"Screening Criterion for Transformer Thern the research conducted in Finland by ABB?	ons themselves, we do have a question regarding Figure 5 (formally Figure 4) in the document entitled nal Impact Assessment". In short, what data source was used for this particular chart? Was it perhaps from If so, the plot does not appear to correlate correctly with this study's data. If this chart is <i>not</i> associated a source used. In general, we would suggest that data sources be explicitly cited for all charts in the					
Likes 0						
Dislikes 0						
Response						
Larisa Loyferman - 1 - Texas RE						
Answer	Yes					
	100					
Document Name						
Document Name Comment						
Comment CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Asserceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the me	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assereceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the mecommends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at CenterPoint Energy greatly appreciates the	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assereceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the mecommends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at CenterPoint Energy greatly appreciates the	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assoreceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the me commends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assoreceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the mecommends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at CenterPoint Energy greatly appreciates the Likes 0 Dislikes 0	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assorated from the 2003 GMD Halloween storeceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween storexperts. The Company believes that the mecommends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at CenterPoint Energy greatly appreciates the Likes 0 Dislikes 0 Response	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					
CenterPoint Energy agrees with the revision Criterion White Paper, Thermal Impact Assoreceived from the 2003 GMD Halloween sto experts. The Company believes that the mecommends them for their open, thorough, a consistency of aligning all the documents at CenterPoint Energy greatly appreciates the Likes 0 Dislikes 0	ns. CenterPoint Energy does not see any major impact with the SDT's proposed changes to the Screening essment, and Benchmark GMD Event White Paper. The changes were made based on the actual data orm, which clarified data shown by Figure 1. The SDT consisted of widely-recognized, knowledgeable embers of the SDT are the most qualified to make justified adjustments to the white papers. The Company and deliberative process, as well as careful consideration of the full range of technical issues and on the the same time.					

Responding on behalf of the Exelon Utilities	s and Generation companies.
include in these revisions any reference to the Geomagnetic Disturbances. At a minimum Paper as the source of IEEE guidance on conference of transformers to GIC, evaluation specifications and monitoring. The IEEE Guidance on the IEEE Guidance of transformers to GIC, evaluation specifications and monitoring.	the Project 2013-03 white papers; we believe, however, that the drafting team missed the opportunity to the recently approved IEEE Std C57.163, <i>Guide for Establishing Power Transformer Capability while under</i> this IEEE Guide should be referenced on page 4 of the <i>Transformer Thermal Impact Assessment White</i> conducting a detailed thermal impact assessment. The IEEE Guide also gives detailed information on thermal of transformer susceptibility to the effects of GIC, and recommendations regarding transformer uide was developed in an open and collaborative process by more than 150 transformer experts composed of around the globe. Exelon recommends future revisions of the Project 2013-03 white papers should make a
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Ruida Shu - 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 - NPCC, Group I	Name RSC
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
The figure on page 3 of the Screening Crite 1? Is just the figure shown on page 4 Figure	erion for Transformer Thermal Impact Assessment does not have a description. Should it be part of Figure re 1?
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Shannon Mickens - 2 - SPP RE, Group N	ame SPP Standards Review Group
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
	acts with the drafting teams proposed changes to the three (3) White Papers. We commend them on the at the same time. Thank you for all your efforts.
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

Comment

Katherine Prewitt - 1, Group Name South	ern Company
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Nick Vtyurin - 1,3,5,6 - MRO	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
RoLynda Shumpert - 1,3,5,6 - SERC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Colby Bellville - 1,3,5,6 - FRCC,SERC,RF	, Group Name Duke Energy
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	

Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
sean erickson - 1,6	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Rachel Coyne - 10	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Chris Gowder - 3,4,5,6 - FRCC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	