

Meeting Notes

Project 2008-2.2 Phase 2 UVLS: Misoperations Standard Drafting Team

May 11, 2015

Conference Call

Administrative

1. Introductions

The meeting was brought to order by Mr. Vassallo, at 1:05 p.m. ET, Monday, May 11, 2015. He welcomed everyone and praised the good work with the latest versions of PRC-004-5 and PRC-010-2 passing ballot. Those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer
Greg Vassallo	Bonneville Power Administration	Chair
José Conto	Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.	Member
Bill Harm	PJM	Member
Charles-Eric Langlois	Hydro-Québec	Member
Hari Singh	Xcel Energy	Member
Matthew H. Tackett	MISO	Member
Scott Barfield- McGinnis	North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC)	Observer
Curtis Crews	Texas Reliability Entity	Observer
David Penny	Texas Reliability Entity	Observer

2. Determination of Quorum

NERC standard drafting meetings require two-thirds of the members to meet quorum when a particular matter requires a vote. Quorum was achieved; six of the nine members were present.

3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public disclaimer were presented by Mr. Barfield. There were no questions.

4. Review Roster

Mr. Barfield reviewed the roster with the team.

Agenda

1. Discussion of Texas RE Concern

Mr. Crews provided background on the Texas Reliability Entity (Texas RE) concern. Based upon the way the PRC-010-2 (*Under Voltage Load Shedding*) Application Guidelines, the guidance might lead an entity not to properly classify their UVLS systems appropriately. For example, Figure 1 is analogous with the Lower Rio Grande Valley transmission system, which has a UVLS system that is currently under PRC-010-0 (*Technical Assessment of the Design and Effectiveness of Undervoltage Load Shedding Program*). Texas RE is concerned that the interpretation of the Application Guidelines implicitly illustrates that the Lower Rio Grande Valley configuration is a UVLS and not a “UVLS Program” because it would not impact the BES by leading to voltage instability, voltage collapse, or Cascading. The Lower Rio Grande Valley system is 150-200 by 50 miles in size and about 2,700 MW.

Mr. Harm noted that the standard drafting team (SDT) attempted during standard development how to characterize a local UVLS system or UVLS Program on a continent-wide basis. The SDT did not reach consensus during that earlier development. Mr. Crews noted that losing the Lower Rio Grande Valley would result in a load and generation loss that is twice the single largest contingency. Mr. Crews also noted that the loss of the Lower Rio Grande Valley is analogous to the San Diego event for the Interconnection.

Mr. Langlois reiterated Mr. Harm’s comments that the standard was not intended to include all UVLS, including those described in Figure 1 of the Application Guidelines (e.g., within BES subsystems). He was concerned that changing the standard now would be a substantive change. Mr. Crews responded that he would be remiss if he did not bring it to the attention of - NERC and the SDT.

Mr. Singh explained that the SDT considered specifying a megawatt threshold to define a UVLS Program boundary. He also asked Mr. Barfield what would be required to make changes to the Application Guidelines, if the SDT is agreeable to the Texas RE proposal. Mr. Barfield updated the attendees on Section 11 of the Standards Process Manual (NERC Rules of Procedure, Appendix 3A). In short, Section 11 allows the SDT to make minor clarifications to the Application Guidelines and post the revisions for a 30-day period upon Standards Committee authorizations.

Mr. Harm believes that the proposed changes as submitted by Texas RE changes the spirit and intent of what the SDT wrote and balloted. He noted the SDT approach was supported by FERC staff during development. Mr. Barfield restated that the focus is on the concern that Texas RE has raised, which pertains to the Application Guidelines potentially undermining current UVLS Programs.

Mr. Vassallo recapped that the standard was intended to be flexible and provide a description of how to consider each situation. He also noted that the SDT appears to be reluctant to make specific changes proposed by Texas RE to the Application Guidelines of the standard. Mr. Langlois added that the standard was communicated to the entire industry through webinars, postings, and balloting. He did not see a way to capture the specific Texas RE concern. Mr. Crews understands the position of the SDT with regard to the proposed changes. Mr. Crews noted that he was concerned that compliance is dictating reliability because his experience is that certain entities will do only what the standard says. The SDT did not agree.

Mr. Singh believed that replacing the references to “BES subsystem” with “local network” would ameliorate most of the Texas RE concerns. Mr. Crews agreed that would help. Mr. Langlois noted that local networks were considered in early development. The term is used differently by various entities and the SDT decided to not use that term and settled on “BES subsystem.” The word “contained” is also problematic and describes the Lower Rio Grande Valley system. Mr. Vassallo injected that it appears the SDT does not want to change the Application Guidelines based on the discussion.

Mr. Langlois commented that making any changes at this point undermine the work and discussions that led the SDT to the UVLS Program definition and approach to the standard. Mr. Harm agreed and also believed that any changes would be a shift from the original intent. Mr. Crews reiterated that he remains concerned that FERC would not agree the loss of the Lower Rio Grande Valley transmission system is not important.

2. Review of the schedule

Not reviewed.

3. Action items or assignments

None.

4. Next steps

None.

5. Future meeting(s)

None.

6. Adjourn

The conference call adjourned Monday, May 11, 2015 at 3:02 p.m. Eastern.