

Notes

Under-frequency Load Shedding SDT — Project 2007-01

August 12, 2010 | 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

1. Administrative

Roll Call

Stephanie Monzon welcomed the members and guests of the Standard Drafting Team for Project 2007-01 Underfrequency Load Shedding

- **Robert J. O'Keefe** — American Electric Power (Chair)
- **Jonathan Glidewell** — Southern Company Transmission Co. (Vice Chair)
- Brian Bartos — Bandera Electric Cooperative
- Gary Keenan — Northwest Power Pool Corporation
- Steven Myers — Electric Reliability Council of Texas, Inc.
- Brian Evans Mongeon — Utility Services
- Tony Rodrigues — PacifiCorp
- Si Truc Phan — TransEnergie
- Scott Berry — Indiana Municipal Power Agency
- Frank Gaffney – Florida Municipal Power Agency
- Stephanie Monzon — NERC
- Philip Tatro — NERC

Observers

Shawn Jacobs OGE (SPP)
Scott Sells FERC Staff
Steve Wadas
Tony Jablonski RFC

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines

Stephanie Monzon reviewed the NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines.

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.

Participants are reminded that this conference call is public. The access number was posted on the NERC website and widely distributed. Speakers on the call should keep in mind that the listening audience may include members of the press and representatives of various governmental authorities, in addition to the expected participation by industry stakeholders.

2. **Process Check / Overview – Stephanie Monzon**

Stephanie provided an overview of the process next steps. Stephanie discussed WECC's plan to draft a Variance to include in the next version of the standard. Stephanie added that she will request a deviation to the process to allow the standard to be reballoted instead of being posted for comment and initial ballot. The team is expected to complete its work by the next NERC BOT meeting in November (3rd). As a result, the team will have to work between now and then to address the remaining issues, incorporate the WECC variance and reballot the standard. If the standard does not pass the 3rd ballot the team will have time to reballot (a fourth ballot) if the SC authorizes the deviation to the process.

3. **Review of Remaining Open Items from First Ballot – All**

- Xcel Energy: **Wants term “island” in NERC Glossary.**
 - Response provided in the consideration of comments: The SDT believes that the term island is readily understand even though it is not the same as the dictionary definition. Rob's preference is to not define a term for “island” – does the team agree? Xcel is the only entity that requested the term be defined. The team members supported Rob's position. The team will not define “island”.
- ATC / Manitoba Hydro / MRO: **“...other affected Planning Coordinators” too vague**
 - Suggested text: Each Planning Coordinator shall coordinate with all other Planning Coordinators, portions of whose footprint falls within an identified island, on UFLS design assessment results before design assessment completion for those islands that span two or more Planning Coordinator footprints.
 - Rob will propose language for discussion at the next conference call – **August 17th.**
- Some Regional Entity footprints are very un-amenable to being studied as islands and some modification of boundaries is necessary. (can be fixed by a footnote)

- There are some regions that have non-contiguous boundaries. The revised wording would go into Requirement R2 part 2.3. Rob is working on wording for the team to review by the next conference call **August 17th**.
- What to do about what a PC would do with non-registered small DPs.
 - The PC would have to account for the smaller DPs that are not registered in the UFLS design. This may mean that the other registered entities may have to shed more load as a result. The PCs cannot force these smaller DPs to shed load as they are not registered entities. The Region; however, can register these smaller entities and if the PC determines that it would be a necessity they could coordinate with the Region to work it out.
- MidAmerican wants 2 years each for R11 event assessment and R12 design assessment with exception requests allowed. MH, MRO wants more time also, suggests link to event investigation team schedule.
 - Rob reported that there were only a few entities that requested this extension. The general consensus is to not change the requirement from one year.

4. **Review of Second Ballot Comments – Rob and Jonathan**

Rob and Jonathan divided the ballot comments and will present the team with the list of concerns expressed by the industry during the second ballot.

Jonathan reviewed the issues from the WECC and the SERC entities. There were several issues that have been resolved and there are some issues with the VSLs that need to be addressed. Jonathan will draft responses to the comments. If a comment requires a change to the standard Jonathan will revise the standard and review it with the team on **August 17th**.

Rob will work on the list of issues by **August 17th**.

5. **Modified Standard — Combined Graphs — Phil Tatro**

The SDT agreed during the meeting at IMPA to combine the over and under frequency curves in the attachments. Phil took that action item to modify the standard to combine the curves and make conforming changes to the requirements to correctly reference only one attachment.

Phil reviewed the combined curves and the associated changes to the Requirements. The group agreed to the combined curves and to the minimal changes to the requirements. To determine y-axis on both sides of the graph.

The team discussed the Variance graphs. Si Truc provided the combined curves for the Variance. Si Truc will have to determine if changes to the Variance curves are required along with set-points, etc. The team agreed that if Quebec entities are ok with the variance as written then perhaps the variance should be left alone but this is Si Truc's call.

6. Review “Annual” – All

Rob will look at Requirement R6 to propose language to address his concerns about the timing element of the Requirement. **By August 17**

7. Review Requirement R13 – All

Rob will look at Requirement R13- his two concerns are that part 13.1 is now a duplicate of R11 and the occurrence of the word “coordinate” in part 13.2 is ambiguous. **By August 17**

8. Action Items /Action Plan (possibly a Webinar) – All

The team did not discuss an action plan in part because the results of the SC discussion will determine the schedule for the next several weeks. The team will discuss the action plan on the 17th. In the meanwhile, Stephanie will schedule two-three web-conferences in the month of September in anticipation of remaining drafting work.

Action Items:	Status:	Assigned To:
See action plan		

9. Next Steps – Review 2010 Schedule

Date	Location	Comments
July 20-22, 2010	IMPA	Review Comments Third Posting Revise Standard
August 12, 2010 1-4pm eastern	Web-conference	Second Ballot Comments
August 17, 2010 1-3pm eastern	Web-conference	Second Ballot Comments
October 7-8, 2010 8-5pm eastern 8am – noon	In Person Meeting	Baltimore, MD (Inner Harbor)

10. Adjourn