

Conference Call Notes for Project 2006–02 Assess Transmission Future Needs SDT

1. Introductions

A conference call between members of FERC staff and representatives of Project 2006–02: ATFNSDT was held on Friday, June 19, 2009. The call was started at 10:00 a.m. EDT and call participants were:

FERC: Bob Snow, Ibrahim Oweis

SDT: John Odom, Chair

NERC: Ed Dobrowolski, Staff Coordinator

2. Discuss Roadmap Changes Emanating from the March FERC Staff Meeting

a. R1 – Tie back to CAP

The steps taken to incorporate a feedback loop from CAP and assure the best modeling data is utilized are good as you need a good model to obtain a valid assessment. However, staff indicated that data obtained from MOD standards may not have been validated. One approach that the SDT could take would be to place a statement in the Implementation Plan indicating that they believe that the data from MOD is valid and that the SDT would like to see a step introduced in the next revision of the MOD standards for validating the data. An issue should be lodged in the official NERC issues database in this regard.

AI – Modify the Implementation Plan with a statement on the assumed validity of MOD data and the assumption that the future revision of MOD will include a validation step.

AI – Enter an issue in the NERC issues database for the next revision of the MOD standards so that model data is validated.

b. R1.1.1 – Protection Systems

The SDT position on outages of Protection Systems is that the time period is too short to be concerned with in the planning horizon. FERC staff was not entirely comfortable with this position as they felt it was necessary to have a requirement

mandating that you can perform maintenance on any and all equipment at some point in time. However, after further review of the requirements, the new Requirement R6 specifically covers the intention of FERC staff and this item was closed.

c. R1.1.6 – Generation tripping ceiling

This item is on the agenda for the next ATFNSDT conference call.

d. R2.1.3 – Clarification of sensitivity studies

FERC staff felt that this item had come a long way from the initial statements. Staff felt that in the future specific metrics might be required and that controllable Loads and DSM might be a mandatory requirement. However, for now, the requirements are satisfactory and this item is closed.

e. R2.1.3.6 – Wording

The various statements all now have consistent wording and all of the items from the NOPR are included. This item is closed.

f. R2.1.4 – Spare strategy

FERC staff is okay with the new wording in general but feels that it should be expanded to assure that performance is maintained. Since this is a sub-requirement of Requirement R2.1 and Requirement R2.1 is spelled out in Requirement R3, this may be covered but the SDT needs to double check this.

AI – Check to see if performance is maintained for the spare strategy.

g. R2.2 and R2.2.1 – Clarification of Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon Assessment

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

h. R2.3 – Clarification of short circuit analysis

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

i. R2.4.3 – Utilization of sensitivity studies

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

j. R2.5 – Generation additions for the Long-Term Transmission Planning Horizon

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

k. R2.6.2 (now R2.7.2) – Performance deficiencies in sensitivity studies

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

l. R3.3.3 – Relay loadability in Stability correspondence

FERC staff had some problems with the use of ‘consider’ as it left open the possibility of an entity finding a problem but then not having to do anything about it. A similar concern was voiced about Requirement R3.3.2. While the SDT felt that the use of ‘simulate’ was not really appropriate in those two instances. Some change to the wording is required to make these requirements stronger.

AI – Reword Requirements 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 to remove ‘consider’ and the make the wording stronger.

m. R3.4 & R4.4 – Regional planning

This item is on the agenda for the next ATFNSDT conference call.

n. R4.3 – High speed reclosing effects

The new wording is okay but it may not go far enough. The present wording assumes only disconnections. What about reconnections?

AI – Review Requirement R4.3 to see if wording is needed for reconnections as well as disconnections.

o. R4.3.3 – Impact of transient swings

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

p. R5 (now R6) – Planned maintenance outages

The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

q. R8 – Regional coordination

This item is on the agenda for the next ATFNSDT conference call.

r. TBD – Transient voltage recovery (now R5)

FERC staff felt the present wording was acceptable but raised a question as to whether a similar requirement was needed for angular stability. The SDT felt that this was covered in footnote 1a but FERC staff disagreed. Also, the criteria defined in footnote 1b may need to be pulled out to a requirement (either Requirement R5 or Requirement R7).

AI – Review the need for a requirement similar to Requirement R5 on transient voltage recovery for angular Stability.

AI – Determine whether the criteria defined in footnote 1b needs to be pulled out to a requirement (either Requirement R5 or Requirement R7).

s. Header note ‘b’ – Supplemental Load

See the Davenport meeting notes for details. The changes made here are acceptable. This item is closed.

t. P5 – relevance to old category ‘b’ for R1.3.10

The PacifiCorp interpretation ruling may solve this problem. However, that issue may not be resolved prior to this project being ready for posting. Currently, P5 in the performance table agrees with the proposed interpretation. No further action is anticipated on this issue at this time.

u. Footnote 6 – GSU omission

This change made it into the 3rd posting of the revised standard. The changes made are acceptable. This item is closed.

v. Bulleted lists

FERC staff is okay with the use of bullets as shown in the cumulative list of changes anticipated for the fourth posting. This item is closed.

3. Next Steps – John Odom

All of the identified action items will be placed on the SDT agenda for future discussion.

4. Action Items – Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this call and will be placed on the SDT agenda for future discussion:

- Modify the Implementation Plan with a statement on the assumed validity of MOD data and the assumption that the future revision of MOD will include a validation step.
- Enter an issue in the NERC issues database for the next revision of the MOD standards so that model data is validated.
- Check to see if performance is maintained for the spare strategy.
- Reword Requirements 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 to remove ‘consider’ and the make the wording stronger.
- Review Requirement R4.3 to see if wording is needed for reconnections as well as disconnections.
- Review the need for a requirement similar to Requirement R5 on transient voltage recovery for angular Stability.
- Review the need for the criteria defined in footnote 1b to be pulled out to a requirement (either Requirement R5 or Requirement R7).

5. Adjourn

The call was adjourned at 12:15 p.m. EDT.