

## Meeting Notes

### Underfrequency Load Shedding SDT — Project 2007-01

January 13, 2009 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Central Time

January 14, 2009 | 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Central Time

ERCOT Office

Austin, TX

#### 1. Administrative

##### a) Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon welcomed the members and guests of the Standard Drafting Team for Project 2007-01 Underfrequency Load Shedding (see Roster — **Attachment 1a**).

- Philip Tatro — National Grid (Chair)
- Paul Attaway — Georgia Transmission Corporation
- Brian Bartos — Bandera Electric Cooperative
- Larry E. Brusseau — Midwest Reliability Organization (on phone)
- Jonathan Glidewell — Southern Company Transmission Co. (on phone)
- Gerald Keenan — Bonneville Power Administration
- Robert W. Millard — ReliabilityFirst Corporation
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Mak Nagle — Southwest Power Pool
- Robert J. O'Keefe — American Electric Power
- Robert Williams — Florida Municipal Power Agency
- Brian Evans Mongeon — Utility Services, LLC
- Stephanie Monzon — NERC

##### Observers

- Dan Schoenecker — MRO
- Scott Sells — FERC Staff

##### b) NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines provided in **Attachment 1b**. It is NERC's policy and practice to obey the antitrust laws and to avoid all conduct that unreasonably restrains competition. This policy requires the avoidance of any conduct that violates, or that might

appear to violate, the antitrust laws. Among other things, the antitrust laws forbid any agreement between or among competitors regarding prices, availability of service, product design, terms of sale, division of markets, allocation of customers or any other activity that unreasonably restrains competition. It is the responsibility of every NERC participant and employee who may in any way affect NERC's compliance with the antitrust laws to carry out this commitment.

## **2. Overall Approach**

The team reviewed Option 4 — Continent Wide Standard with (optional) Regional Standards that was discussed with NERC staff in December 2008.

- Larry B. brought up a concern with the proposed approach. How would you enforce that the PC's join together to design the UFLS program?
- Bob M. indicated that this is not unlike other standards that apply to groups of FM entities such as reserve sharing groups. The PC's would have to demonstrate that they have joined a group and have come to consensus. The Measure would have to be written very clearly.

## **3. Draft Standard (Performance Characteristics)**

The team worked on placing the performance characteristics into a standard format. Mak re-sent Dave Taylor's September draft of the standard and the team used that as a starting point. Along the way the team also revised some of the performance characteristics in the draft standard.

- Purpose: the team decided to postpone reviewing the purpose until the team completes a full review of the draft standard
- Applicability:
  - The team discussed potential issues with the applicability. In particular, Brian M. indicated that the applicability to the Transmission Owners and Distribution providers as it reads now in the standard is unclear. Do they own the UFLS equipment?
  - Responsible entity who owns equipment with the customer load connected to it should be who this applies to according to Bob M.
  - Distribution providers own facilities connected to the end user and the Transmission Owner own facilities at a voltage level and the differences are only that contained in the glossary of terms. While this may be confusing and muddy the lines as to the differences (and who this standard should apply to) the glossary of terms only indicates that the DP is connected to the end user (operates the facilities connected to the end user).
  - The team agreed that the standard needs to be 100% clear as to who it applies to.

- Bob Millard looked into the Registration Criteria and added to the discussion that according to the criteria the TO's are considered DP if they are connected to load regardless of voltage level.
- Brian brought up an issue that needs further discussion and the team will revisit. The issue is with the responsibility of the TO and the DP in load shedding. The DP can handle load shedding by choice if worked out with the TO. The TO's can perform or conduct the loadshedding. Other standards (including the SERC standard propose language that clarifies this issue by saying that the TO's can elect to have the DP's shed load if agreed to).
- The team reviewed the requirements.
  - The team began by discussing the concept that the Planning Coordinators must join a group which needs to be incorporated into the standard to ensure that the PC's are working together.
  - The team made some modifications to the standard and completed a first pass.
- Dan S. suggested that adding to Requirement R1 to require the PC's to use a regional standard development process to develop the program would add clarity to the standard and ensure that the process used to develop the program is an open process.
- Stephanie suggested that this is a concern because this is the "how" and above and beyond the "what" although there are clear benefits to using the regional standards development processes. This is also a benefit because it ensures that the DPs and TOs responsible for installing this equipment have a voice in the development of the UFLS program.

### **Second Pass at the Standard:**

Day 2 — the team reviewed requirement by requirement the standard to pull out any requirements that may belong in a regional standard.

Requirement R1 and R2 are the basis of the continent wide standard and will remain

Requirement R2 contained the following language as an alternate to the "group" language in the case that NERC staff thinks it is not appropriate for the standard:

**(in collaboration with the all the Planning Coordinators within the Regions)**

Requirement R3 — the team suggested that when the standard is posted we include a question about the methodology and if it is appropriate and what should be included?

Requirement R3 — The methodology shall include the selection process to identify those islands for which the performance characteristics of Requirement R6 shall apply.

The team worked through requirements but acknowledged that a follow-up conference call would be needed to complete a full review of the standard.

**4. Revision of Response to Comments**

The team did not perform second pass of the response to comments. The team put together a plan consisting of conference calls and in person meetings to accomplish finalizing the response to comments.

**5. Generator Verification Update from Bob Millard (Review of FERC Staff Meeting)**

Bob Millard provided the team with an update on the Generator Verification project. He indicated that they are very close to posting for comment and met with FERC staff.

**6. Project Schedule**

Stephanie Monzon did not review the project schedule at the meeting but will be updating it based on the meeting dates the team agreed on.

**7. Action Items**

Stephanie Monzon updated the actions that were open at the end of the September, 2008 meeting of the drafting team:

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
The remaining questions for the comment report: Question 6: Phil T. and Jonathan Question 7: Gary K. Question 8: Larry B. and Bob M. Question 9: Rob O.	<b>Completed</b>	See first column
Stephanie will compile the draft responses and send out to the SDT prior to the next meeting (October 22–23).	<b>Completed</b>	Stephanie
Stephanie will draft the first draft of Option 3 and distribute to a sub group for review. Stephanie will use the description of Option 3 to facilitate her initial discussion with Gerry Adamski and Dave Cook. Stephanie will be expecting Dana, Rob, Phil, and Bob to weigh in on the draft description.	<b>Completed</b>	
Stephanie will follow up with the team via email regarding her initial discussion with NERC Management on the feasibility of Option 3.	<b>Completed</b>	

**8. Next Steps**

The group identified the next steps and put together a schedule for the next several weeks.

## 9. UFLS Meeting Schedule for 2009

Date	Location	Comments
March 31–April 1, 2009	Atlanta	SERC to host (Jonathan confirmed)  <b>Rescheduled to April (see below)</b>
February 11, 2009 — noon–5 p.m. Lunch February 12, 2009 — 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Lunch February 13, 2009 — 8 a.m.–noon	Austin, TX ERCOT Offices	ERCOT to host — confirmed with Steve
January 30, 2009 — 1–3 p.m. EST	Conference Call	Complete 1/13/09 agenda
April 29–30, 2009 8 a.m.–5 p.m. 8 a.m.–5 p.m.	Atlanta	Jonathan to confirm Southern Co.’s availability
February 27, 2009 — 1–3 p.m. EST	Conference Call	Follow up to the in person meeting in Austin

## 10. Adjourn