

Notes

Project 2010-17 Definition of Bulk Electric System

July 19-21, 2011 | 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. MT
Meeting Location: WECC - Salt Lake City, UT

Administration

1. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. MT on Tuesday, July 19, 2011 at the WECC offices in Salt Lake City, UT. Meeting participants were:

Members		
Jennifer Dering, NYPA	Brian Evans-Mongeon, Utility Services	Phil Fedora, NPCC
Ajay Garg, Hydro One	Pete Heidrich, FRCC, Chair	John Hughes, ELCON
Barry Lawson, NRECA, Vice Chair	Joel Mickey, ERCOT	Jeff Mitchell, RFC
Jerry Murray, OR PUC	Rich Salgo, Sierra Pacific	Jennifer Sterling, Exelon
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC Coordinator		
Observers		
Patrick Boughan, FERC	Frank Cain, Lee County EC	Paul Cummings, City of Redding
Richard Dearman, TVA	Carter Edge, SERC	Jeff Gindling, Duke
Bill Harm, PJM	Jonathan Hayes, SWPP	Marcus Lotto, SCE
John Martinsen, Snohomish	Susan Morris, FERC	Michelle Mizumori, WECC
Alain Pageau, HQ	Ken Shortt, Pacificorp	Tim Soles, Occidental
Phil Tatro, NERC		

2. NERC Antitrust Guidelines and Conference Call Warning – Ed Dobrowolski

The NERC Antitrust Guidelines and conference call warnings were delivered.

3. Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives – Pete Heidrich

An item was added to the agenda for Carter Edge to supply an update from the Rules of Procedure team.

The objective of this meeting was to finalize the draft exception form.

Agenda

1. Discussion of Issue Raised by Tom Duffy on Exclusion E3

“Another issue comes to mind as I review the document. Under the E3 (LN) Exclusion, the sub clauses (a, b, and c) list exclusions and then (separated by a colon), elaborate on what is meant by each exclusion. The b exclusion states:

'Power flows only into the LN: The LN does not transfer energy originating outside the LN for delivery through the LN'

I believe this will result in a great deal of confusion. If the requirement is that power only flows into the LN, then power flow through the LN is precluded since power must flow out of the LN to allow power flow through the LN. In this event, the second sentence is unnecessary. If power flow through the LN is not allowed but power generated within the LN is allowed to flow out of the LN, then the second clause is sufficient and the first clause is incorrect and should be removed. I believe the consensus of the group was that power generated within the LN was not allowed to flow out of the LN (which by the way is inconsistent with the allowance of power flow out under the E1 'Radial System' Exclusion), therefore, we probably need to remove the second clause to avoid any confusion.” – **Tom Duffy**

The Standard Drafting Team (SDT) acknowledges Mr. Duffy’s concern; however the SDT feels that the inclusion of both statements provides clarity on two separate issues.

- a) Power originating within the LN must serve load within the LN and not be transferred out of the LN.
- b) The LN cannot be utilized as a parallel path for transferring power.

2. Discussion of Issue Raised by Jerry Murray

“Two commenters expressed concerns that Exclusion E2 (using net capacity) and the new Inclusion I2 (using gross aggregate nameplate capacity) are inconsistent. The SDT agrees that Exclusion E2 should over-ride this Inclusion. The SDT has added the language, ‘Except as overridden by Exclusion E2,’ at the beginning of this inclusion’s language.” – **Jerry Murray**

The SDT agreed that there was a problem and corrected it by deleting the reference to Inclusions I2 and I4 in Exclusion E2 and replacing it with 75 MVA.

The SDT also re-iterated its intent that in general the application of definition should follow the practice below:

- a) Apply the core definition by establishing the 100 kV 'bright-line'.
- b) Further identify BES Elements with the 'Inclusion' statements.
- c) Identify Elements that can be exempted by applying the 'Exclusion' statements.

3. Report from Technical Justification Sub-team – Jennifer Dering

Jennifer led the SDT through the outline provided by the sub-team.

The SDT raised several points about the material:

- a) The emphasis of the paper must be reliability
- b) The main thrust should be the units between 20 MVA and 75 MVA

The sub-team is looking at a November delivery for the final document but the position should be validated well before that.

Unofficial sample data for one region shows that 99.5% of all generation would be included at the 20 MVA level. 2.5% of generation would be excluded at the 75 MVA threshold. Preliminary analysis shows that all units under 75 MVA could be lost at the same time, replaced by available external generation and no overloads would occur at the 500 kV or 230 kV levels. There would be no SOL or IROL violations either. This analysis was completed using an 80/20 forecast.

Such analysis needs to be duplicated in other regions.

Members should send in comments to the sub-team.

Can the SDT post in the August/September timeframe without this document? Probably not. The sub-team will need to see what they can do to accelerate the schedule.

Action Item – Members should send comments on the 75 MVA technical justification outline to the sub-team as quickly as possible.

Action Item – The 75 MVA technical justification sub-team needs to see what they can do to accelerate the schedule for producing the position paper. Preliminary results should be available for the Washington meeting if at all possible.

4. Report from Technical Criteria Sub-team – Paul Cummings

The sub-team presented an exception form for review by the SDT.

There was a concern that the form created a complex process that might be onerous for small utilities. Several aspects of the form were revised to attempt to lighten any burden on small utilities while still creating a level playing field.

It has become apparent that it is not feasible to establish continent-wide values and/or limits due to differences in operational characteristics. The SDT has adopted a new approach that lays out what characteristics and studies would need to be supplied with the exception form without providing any hard numbers to guide the evaluation of the request. Engineering judgment will be utilized and using the form to dictate the type of supporting material that needs to be supplied plus having a common panel perform the evaluation should result in an open and transparent process.

Action Item – Members should do trial runs of the exception form process back home in their individual shops and report back to the SDT at the Washington meeting.

5. Discuss Industry Comments to Technical Principles

- a) Q1 – Paul Cummings (lead) & Rich Salgo
- b) Q2 – Jonathan Sykes (lead) & John Hughes
- c) Q3 – Frank Cain (lead) & Ajay Garg
- d) Q4 – Jason Snodgrass (lead) & Joel Mickey
- e) Q5 – Ken Lotterhos
- f) Q6 – Jennifer Sterling
- g) Q7 – Phil Fedora
- h) Q8 – Brian Evans-Mongeon
- i) Q9 – Jerry Murray
- j) Q10 – Jennifer Dering, Pete Heidrich, & Barry Lawson

Phil Fedora will lead the Q5 effort due to Ken's illness. He will consult with Ken as the situation allows.

Since the SDT asked specific questions and did not receive much in the way of specific suggestions and the approach has now taken a 180 degree turn, a generic comment can be supplied for those commenters who replied without supplying specifics. Only those commenters who did provide specific suggestions need to have specific individual responses from the SDT.

Generic responses were developed for this situation as well as for referring to the definition and Rules of Procedure process.

Action Item – Members should supply their draft responses to the technical criteria comments to the plus list no later than August 5, 2011.

6. Next Steps – Pete Heidrich

The definition and comment responses to the definition posting are to be supplied to NERC staff for quality review this week. Authors were polled to make sure that they were comfortable with the final draft of the consideration of comments. All members stated that were okay with submitting the document.

Pete reported that the NERC Standards Committee decided that the definition and criteria will be balloted separately, but at the same time.

The SDT reviewed spreadsheets that Pete had developed for possible affected standards and definitions. The SDT found no standards or definitions that used Bulk Electric System or BES that will need to be changed due to the revised definition.

Action Item – Pete will check the list of pending standards to see if there are any uses of the term.

Action Item – Pete will also review applicability to see if any changes are needed due to the new definition.

7. Future Meetings – All

- a) A face-to-face meeting at FERC in Washington, DC is scheduled for Monday, August 8, 2011, 1:00 - 5:00 p.m. ET. Details to follow.
- b) A face-to-face meeting at ELCON in Washington, DC is scheduled for Tuesday, August 9, 2011 starting at 8:00 a.m. ET through Thursday, August 11, 2011 at 5:00 p.m. ET. Details to follow.
- c) A face-to-face meeting has been tentatively scheduled for November 8-10, 2011 at a location to be determined. This meeting will be to develop responses to the second posting and ballot.

8. Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski

The following action items were developed during this meeting:

- a) Members should send comments on the 75 MVA technical justification outline to the sub-team as quickly as possible.
- b) The 75 MVA technical justification sub-team needs to see what they can do to accelerate the schedule for producing the position paper. Preliminary results should be available for the Washington meeting if at all possible.
- c) Members should do trial runs of the exception form process back home in their individual shops and report back to the SDT at the Washington meeting.
- d) Members should supply their draft responses to the technical criteria comments to the plus list no later than August 5, 2011.
- e) Pete will check the list of pending standards to see if there are any uses of the term.

- f) Pete will also review applicability to see if any changes are needed due to the new definition.

The project is on schedule but there are only 8 days of slack in the schedule. A successive ballot will require a request for an extension.

9. Adjourn

The Chair thanked WECC for their hospitality and adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m. MT on Thursday, July 21, 2011.