

Meeting Notes

Protection System Maintenance & Testing SDT — Project 2007-17

June 17–18, 2008
Atlanta, GA

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

Charles Rogers, Chairman, brought the meeting to order at 8 a.m. EST on June 17, 2008. The attendees were:

Members:

- Charles Rogers (Chair)
- John Anderson
- Bob Bentert
- Merle (Rick) Ashton
- Richard Ferner
- Carol A. Gerou
- Roger D. Green (day 1)
- John Kruse
- Mark Peterson
- Leonard G. Swanson, Jr.
- John A. Zipp
- Phil Winston
- Russell C Hardison
- Al Calafiore, NERC Coordinator

Guests:

- Sam Francis
- Jeff Laninga
- Allen Morinec
- Sam Ciccone

Thirteen members and 4 guests were present

2. Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Al Calafiore and Charles Roger reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and there were no questions raised.

3. Standards Comments and Revisions

Discussion continued on line by line wording of the combined document. Review Table 1 continues with everyone requested to provide suggestions or corrections

The team has decided to do a FAQ draft; i.e. a collection of questions, and answers as developed, that the PSMSDT believes could be helpful to those implementing a new NERC standard for protection system maintenance.

The team discussed adding the following to the FAQ:

- FAQ to provide information, tell, or describe where DME (disturbance monitoring equipment) functions maintenance will be found. Someone (maybe Rich Ferner) on the PSMTSDT indicated that the DMESDT may, depending on the comments in response to questions with a posting of their standard, develop a SAR to add DME M&T to the scope of our standard.

Discussion also took place on need for FAQ on battery testing. The issue is still under discussion. Additional FAQ items were discussed during this meeting and the team is urged to propose answers to currently unanswered questions.

Discussion took place on different relay types, particularly analog, as opposed to digital with microprocessors that do continuous monitoring and determine if there is a problem and provide alarms or information. The SDT did not fully respond to the concerns, and will need to have additional discussion.

A question came up on replacing or upgrading some elements as part of maintenance — should verification of settings etc. on replaced elements (same as commissioning) be required in this standard? Or is it covered in other standards? This issue is still outstanding.

On the question on if to add Distribution Providers in the standard, it was decided that where applicable, the requirements will address Distribution Providers that own protection systems that impact the BES.

There was further discussion on the issue carried over from previous meetings on “Should there be an allowance or extension of the maintenance period due to such events as natural disasters.” The discussion included the use of self reporting of failure to meet schedule (due to the extenuating circumstances) and include a mitigation plan and also the fact that the Regions and NERC will know of the “events” on the system and will make allowances.

The proposed solution for this issue is to put a discussion about “non-compliance due to storms or other extenuating circumstances” in the FAQ and will include responses received from compliance. Note that compliance said it will take all circumstances

into account and in cases, such as described above, may not levy fines. However, it will still remain a reportable event but not to be considered a “black mark” on individual entities such as in the case of repeat offenders. The team will further consider this if necessary to respond to industry comments. A specific question about this on the posting may be worth considering.

An issue that emerged in the April SDT meeting and is still unresolved is how to treat a situation where an entity after following an RCM program for sometime discovers some concerns that would significantly reduce its maintenance cycle, and that entity would switch to a time based program if it has a longer cycle, (presumably to avoid higher cost of the shorter cycle requirements discovered by the RCM program. The team will further consider this issue as part of detailed discussions of RCM at a future meeting (probably July).

4. Action Items

Team members are being asked to bring back comments and input from their peers on the current draft of the standard.

Team members are being asked to review the FAQ and provide, in marked-up form, answers to any questions that you feel you can address. Also, please review any answers that already exist and make any modifications to those that you feel inclined to do. Please provide these to the chairperson, and he will merge them into a master document.

Also, continue to review the draft standard and provide any markups that are appropriate. Please provide these to the chairman, and he will merge them into a master document.

Outstanding assignments made to small teams to bring back their findings to the entire team for consideration. Assignments are:

- Develop improved verification activities for the DC Control Circuit Verification.
- Develop an improved description of the verification activities for the communication circuit testing.
- Develop appropriate verification activities for Station Battery Capacity Testing

The discussion on how to assure that the provisions of the SAR, any FERC directives that apply to this project and any assessments or other recommendations (such as from the SPCTF if any apply) are considered. Also how do we make sure that we have captured all of the requirements from the 4 previous standards? Al developed an Excel spread sheet which he will update and provide to the Chairman.

5. Next Steps

The next meeting will be on July 29 (8 a.m.–5 p.m. EDT), and July 30 (1–5 p.m.) in Minneapolis MN, at the Great River Energy Headquarters located at 12300 Elm Creek Boulevard in Maple Grove, MN 55369

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m. on June 18, 2008.