

Meeting Notes

Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT – Project 2006-02

July 29–30, 2008 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT

National Grid
25 Research Drive
Westborough, MA

1. Administrative Items

a. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair called the meeting to order at the facilities of National Grid in Westborough, MA at 8 a.m. on Tuesday, July 29, 2008. Meeting participants were:

Darrin Church	Bill Harm	Doug Hohlbaugh	Brain Keel
Ron Mazur	Bob Millard, Vice Chair	John Odom, Chair	Bernie Pasternack
Bob Pierce	Chifong Thomas	Jim Useldinger	Dana Walters
Bob Williams	Tom Gentile, Observer	Julius Horvath, Observer	Ray Kershaw, Observer
Chuck Lawrence, Observer	Bob Snow, Observer	Yury Tsimberg, Observer	Guy Zito, Observer
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC			

Ron Mazur, Manitoba Hydro, was welcomed as a new member. Julius Horvath, LCRA, has applied for membership and his nomination will be considered at the next Standards Committee Meeting.

b. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Ed Dobrowolski

There were no questions on the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

c. Agenda and Objectives — John Odom

This meeting was set up to catch up on various items that were delayed from the second posting.

2. Overview of Violation Severity Levels (VSL) — Doug Hohlbaugh

Doug was a member of the VSLSDT and presented a summary of how teams are supposed to address VSLs. His presentation was sent out through the mail server. He referenced Project 2007-23 (VSLSDT) and the VSL Guideline document dated January 4, 2008 for additional information.

Note: The sample text shown includes the words ‘minor’, ‘most’, and ‘significant’. These words are for illustration only and can’t be used in actual standards.

A concern was raised that re-formatting the standard solely to accommodate VSL concerns may lead to confusion within the industry.

3. Review Results of NERC Survey of More Stringent Criteria

FRCC staff produced a summary of the survey results dated March 25, 2008. This document was used as a basis for the discussion.

There were several common themes that were presented for discussion:

- Generation outages are often considered with another single contingency without load loss (treated as a single contingency).
 - The SDT feels that this has already been included in the revised TPL-001-1 with Category P3 ((g-1)+(n-1)).
- Load loss cap, such as 300 MW.
 - The SDT did not set a numeric cap on Load loss but is requiring a reporting feature so that information can be gathered to set a realistic number in the future.
- No adjustment allowed between (n-1) and the next Contingency.
 - This appeared to be based on specific local conditions, especially in high load density locations. No action taken.
- Loss of major Load center.
 - As per FERC Order 693, this does not have to be handled in this revision of the standards.
- Treated specific multiple Contingencies as a single (n-1) Contingency.
 - The loss of 2 or more circuits on a single tower which is really an (n-2) condition is handled as a single event in P7.1. The SDT decided to leave this as is for both above and below 300 kV.

The SDT also evaluated another item raised in the NERC survey:

- For the EHV, do not allow use emergency ratings for (n-1).
 - The SDT decided that this situation was not widely used and will take no action at this time.

Review of the more stringent criteria brought up the topic of Resource Adequacy and delivering reserves. Resource Adequacy is seen as a states rights issue and is not necessarily a Transmission Planning issue. The SDT discussed Resource Adequacy, deliverability of planned resources and deliverability of reserves. The SDT decided not to take any further action on the topic of deliverability of resources or reserves at this time.

Some of the WECC report may have been missed. John will investigate this matter to see what happened and to recover the missing information.

Action Item — John will look into the apparent missing WECC more stringent criteria information.

4. Discussion of Conditional Firm Transfer

a. EOP-002 Interpretation — Doug Hohlbaugh

Doug presented an overview of the recent EOP-002 interpretation. The Power Point material was distributed via the mail server.

It seems as if designated network resources (DNR) must be included in TPL and that the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) should not include tripping DNR.

The interpretation hasn't passed final vote but the SDT needs to monitor this item for future revisions of TPL-001-1.

b. Practical Examples — Bob Pierce

Bob's presentation was sent out via the mail server.

After much discussion, the SDT decided that conditional firm transfer is an issue that that must be addressed in TPL but it would wait until the interpretation is finalized to take further action.

5. Develop Requirements for Assessment Case

Does the SDT need to be more prescriptive with a starting point (assessment case) or does the existing language cover what is needed? Who is the final authority? The SDT felt that no major changes were required but that there were 3 points that need to be investigated:

- More clarity is required in the terminology for peak Load.
- If a planner finds something in a sensitivity case, they just can't ignore it; something needs to be done.
- The standard text needs to address stressing transfers.

Action Item — John will develop a plan for addressing the SDT points brought out in the assessment case discussion. The plan will be presented at the Chattanooga meeting.

6. Review Sub-team Proposal to Address Issues Related to Protection System — Brian Keel

Jonathon Sykes, SRP, SPSTF Vice Chair, participated in the sub-team discussions.

The sub-team recommended no changes due to TPL-001-0, Requirement R1.3.10 as it is fully covered in TPL-001-1, Requirement R3.2.

The concepts in TPL-001-0, Requirement R1.3.12 were not carried over to TPL-001-1 and will need to be added. For steady state, TPL-001-1, Requirement R3.3 will need to be altered. For stability, TPL-001-1, Requirement R5.3 will need to be updated. The actual wording in TPL-001-0, Requirement R1.3.12 should be looked at to see if it can be made clearer as to what exactly was intended.

Both independence and redundancy need to be addressed. However, the SDT decided that malfunctioning control devices do not need to be covered in the standard.

'Protection System equipment' should be added to TPL-001-1, Requirement R11.

In the table, P5 should include 'non-redundant' phrasing.

The sub-team will work on these changes and will also look to add examples of control devices.

Action Item — The Protection System sub-team will address the changes discussed at the MA meeting as well as developing examples for control devices.

When the Protection System sub-team is done with their work, John will send the material to the SPSTF so that they can vet the changes and determine if they need to include any of the recommendations in their work.

Action Item — John will send the final recommendations of the Protection System sub-team to the Chair of the SPSTF so that they can vet the changes and determine if any of the recommendations affect the work of the SPSTF.

7. Roadmap Re-Organization — Bob Millard and John Odom

John and Bob worked on a high level overview of a possible re-organization of the standard. The work was distributed through the mail server.

The goal was to strictly re-format and not to introduce any new requirements. After considerable discussion, the SDT felt that the suggested re-format might cause too much confusion within the industry. The thought of the SDT was that the idea of trying to promote additional clarity and flow might be accomplished with less drastic measures. The idea of providing headers in front of the requirements (or set of requirements) was floated and will be looked at.

For now, no re-organization will be done until the SDT looks at a draft of the VSL for TPL-001-1, Requirement R2. If this VSL proves to be too complex, then the SDT will re-think the concept of re-formatting. A sub-team of Doug, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile will work on the VSL draft. They will also provide a draft measure for the requirement.

Action Item — Doug, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile will work on developing a draft measure and VSL for TPL-001-1, Requirement R2.

8. Review Implementation Plan — Bernie Pasternack

This item was not discussed due to time constraints.

9. Next Meetings — All

- a. Face-to-face meeting in Chattanooga, TN on Tuesday, August 26, 2008 from 8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT and Wednesday, August 27, 2008 from 8 a.m.–3:30 p.m. EDT. The afternoon of the first day may be used for an industry wide web cast. Darrin will investigate if TVA can support such an endeavor. This would only be done if the posting is at least a week prior to the meeting date.
- b. Conference call on Thursday, September 25, 2008. Details will be provided. This call is assuming that the roadmap will be posted no later than mid-August and that comments will have been returned shortly before the call. The call would be used as a general high level overview and for assignment of sub-teams to address the comments.
- c. Face-to-face meeting in October for 2.5 days at a location and date to be determined. The most probable date is the week of October 13th. The meeting would be used by sub-teams to address comments.

10. Action Items and Schedule — Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this meeting:

- John will look into the apparent missing WECC more stringent criteria information.

- John will develop a plan for addressing the SDT points brought out in the assessment case discussion. The plan will be presented at the Chattanooga meeting.
- The Protection System sub-team will address the changes discussed at the MA meeting as well as developing examples for control devices.
- John will send the final recommendations of the Protection System sub-team to the Chair of the SPSTF so that they can vet the changes and determine if any of the recommendations affect the work of the SPSTF.
- Doug, Bob Millard, and Tom Gentile will work on developing a draft measure and VSL for TPL-001-1, Requirement R2.

The project fell behind the adopted schedule for the second posting due to the delays in answering question 43. It was pointed out that the SDT agreed to shorter timeframes for answering comments for the second and third postings and that the schedule is getting tighter.

11. Adjourn

The Chair thanked National Grid for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m. on Wednesday, July 30, 2008.