

Notes

Project 2010-17 – Definition of Bulk Electric System

August 18, 2011 | 1:00 – 5:00 p.m. ET
Conference Call

Administrative

1. Introductions and Quorum

The Chair brought the conference call to order at 1:00 p.m. ET on Thursday, August 18, 2011. The call participants were:

Members		
Jennifer Dering, NYPA	Phil Fedora, NPCC	Ajay Garg, Hydro One
Pete Heidrich, FRCC, Chair	John Hughes, ELCON	Barry Lawson, NRECA, Vice Chair
Jeff Mitchell, RFC	Jerry Murray, OR PUC	Rich Salgo, Sierra Pacific
Jason Snodgrass, GTC	Jennifer Sterling, Exelon	Jonathan Sykes, PG&E
Ed Dobrowolski, NERC		
Observers		
Ena Agbedia, FERC	Neil Burbure, FERC	Frank Cain, LCEC
Lam Chung, Manitoba Hydro	Mark Cole	Frank Cumpton, BG&E
Paul Cummings, Redding	Michelle D’Antuono, Occidental	Richard Dearman, TVA
Andy Dressel, NERC Legal	Tom Duffy, CH	Jeff Gindling, Duke
Bill Harm, PJM	Nick Henery, FERC	Ken Lotterhos, Navigant
John Martinsen, Snohomish	Susan Morris, FERC	Wilket Ng, Con Ed
David O’Connor, FERC	Nitin Sem, BG&E	Ken Shortt, Pacificorp
Tim Soles, Occidental	Bob Stroh, FERC	

2. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Conference Call Announcement – Ed Dobrowolski

The NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines were presented and the conference call announcement was delivered. No questions were raised.

3. Review Agenda and Meeting Objectives – Pete Heidrich

The agenda was approved as issued. The objective of the call was to finalize the documents needed for the second posting submittal.

Agenda

1. Finalize First Posting Response to Comments

a. Bulk Electric System (BES) Definition

Prior to reviewing the responses, the Standard Drafting Team (SDT) reviewed the definition itself. Changes were made to Inclusions I2 and I4.

In Inclusion I2, the SDT thought the existing wording presented a circular reference to the Electric Reliability Organization (ERO) Statement of Compliance Registry Criteria (SCRC) and that this could cause confusion in the industry. The wording was adjusted to provide clarity.

In Inclusion I4, the reference to the ERO SCRC was deleted and the 75 MVA threshold was returned. This is a new concept so it is not found currently in the ERO SCRC so the reference would have been problematic. The 75 MVA threshold is consistent with the ERO SCRC however.

The SDT members were concerned about submitting a new Standard Authorization Request (SAR) versus revising the present SAR. Logistically, the right path to take was a new SAR as it would be problematic to ask industry to approve a revised SAR at the same time they were voting on the output of the original SAR. A new SAR, posted for information only at this time, to show the industry the path that would be followed was consistent with the approach suggested by the NERC Standards Committee. The SDT was worried that a new SAR would mean a new SDT. As the existing SDT is committed to this project and wants to see it through to the end, they wanted to make certain that they wouldn't be dismissed at the end of Phase 1. Words were added to the response to show the intent of the SDT.

b. BES Technical Principles

The SDT accepted the responses as distributed.

2. Finalize Questions for Second Posting Comment Forms

a. BES Definition

The changes suggested in the last SDT meeting were accepted as is.

A reference to the tie to the ERO SCRC was added to question 3.

b. BES Technical Principles

The changes suggested in the last SDT meeting were accepted as is.

A line for description/comments was added to Transmission Q5 and Q6 similar to the other questions.

A question was raised as to whether it was correct to refer to the BES in the questions. It was stated that this might be a circular reference and cause confusion. The SDT did not make a change in this regard as the feeling was that at this point the BES was defined and there shouldn't be any confusion. This is not the same as using the term in its own definition.

There was some concern that industry might interpret the questions incorrectly by assuming that a single 'yes' or 'no' response could invalidate a request. That is not the intent of the SDT. The intent is that the entire document will be taken into consideration and that the answer to any individual question will just be one piece of the information leading to a decision. A statement will be added to the ERO Rules of Procedure draft to clearly state the intent of the SDT.

Action Item – Ken Lotterhos will forward a request to place a statement in the ERO Rules of Procedure clearing up any possible misconceptions about a single response invalidating a request for exception.

3. **Finalize Technical Justification for the Local Network (LN)**

Rich Salgo provided an overview of the changes made since the last SDT meeting:

- a. Added a bullet in the summary and a section to the text describing the tie to the 300 kV EHV limit in TPL-001-2
- b. Deleted the requirement by requirement analysis
- c. Deleted the PTDF example
- d. Added a new PTDF and LODF section to illustrate how the local network interacts with the BES
- e. Emphasized that power always flows in to the local network
- f. Added a real world example in the appendix with names changed to protect confidentiality – the LODF will be added to the appendix if the SDT approves the concept

The SDT approved the LODF concept and Rich will add it to the document. The SDT asked for several changes to the paper:

- a. The appendix should be incorporated in a single document with the text to facilitate comprehension of the industry
- b. The drawings in the appendix need a legend
- c. A clear delineation of the local network is needed

d. There should be a note that the arrows are proportional to the flow on the line

Action Item – Rich Salgo will revise the local network technical justification document with the SDT suggested changes by noon on Friday, August 19, 2011.

This document is solely for the purpose of justifying Exclusion E3. It is not asking anyone to perform studies or do any analysis. It is not part of the exception process although it could be used as a model for what needs to be submitted for those seeking inclusion/exclusion through that process.

4. **Finalize Revisions to SAR**

The SDT made changes to emphasize the phased nature of the project moving forward.

The new SAR will be posted for information only at this time. Once the revised definition gets through the pipeline, the new SAR will be formally posted and questions will be asked of industry.

5. **Next Steps – Pete Heidrich**

Submit the documents to NERC Quality Review. Ed Dobrowolski will clean up the documents for the second posting and submit to NERC Quality Review on Friday, August 19, 2011.

6. **Future Meetings**

- a. The scheduled face-to-face meeting for September 20-22, 2011 was cancelled
- b. A industry webinar is scheduled for September 28, 2011 from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. ET
- c. A face-to-face meeting is planned for November 8-10, 2011 to respond to comments. Dates based on proposed posting date. Location to be determined

7. **Action Items and Schedule – Ed Dobrowolski**

The following action items were developed during this call:

- a. Ken Lotterhos will forward a request to place a statement in the ERO Rules of Procedure clearing up any possible misconceptions about a single response invalidating a request for exception
- b. Rich Salgo will revise the local network technical justification document with the SDT suggested changes by noon on Friday, August 19, 2011
- c. Ed Dobrowolski will clean up the documents for the second posting and submit to NERC Quality Review

The project is on schedule at this time.

8. Adjourn

The Chair thanked the members and observers for their hard work in meeting the schedule and adjourned the call at 5:30 p.m.