

# Meeting Notes Project 2007-11 – Disturbance Monitoring Standard Drafting Team

June 4 - 6, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. ET June 7, 2013 | 8:00 a.m. – Noon ET

## **Administrative**

1. Introductions - chair remarks

The meeting was brought to order by Lee Pedowicz, chair at 8:00 a.m. Eastern on Tuesday, June 4, 2013. Participants were introduced and those in attendance were:

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)			
			6/4	6/5	6/6	6/7
Lee Pedowicz (Chair)	NPCC	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Frank Ashrafi	SCE	Member			/	
Alan D. Baker	FPL	Member	W	W	W	W
Daniel J. Hansen	NRG	Member				- X
Tim Kucey	PSEG Fossil LLC	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
H. Steven Myers	ERCOT	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Jack Soehren	ITC Holdings	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Vladimir Stanisic	AESI Inc.	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Ryan Quint	ВРА	Member	IP	IP	IP	IP
Juan Villar	FERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Bob Cummings	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	
Barb Nutter (Standard Developer)	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	IP
Natara Bierria	NERC	Observer	IP	IP	IP	
Robert Grabovickic	National Grid	Observer	W	W	W	W

Name	Company	Member/ Observer	In-person (IP) or Conference Call/Web (W)			
			6/4	6/5	6/6	6/7
Chuck Jensen	Seminole El. Coop.	Observer			W	W
Guy Zito	NPCC	Guest		IP		
Gary Krumple	Mid-American	Guest		IP		
Bill Edwards	NERC	Guest		IP		

Guests: Guy Zito - NPCC, Gary Krumple - Mid-American, and Bill Edwards - NERC.

Gary Krumple introduced himself as the PMOS liaison for the DM project and sat in with the group for a short time.

Bill Edwards introduced himself to group as the lawyer for Team Gugel. He informed the drafting team that he was kept up to date on the project by the developer and he was available when the team needed his guidance.

### 2. Determination of quorum

The rule for NERC Standard Drafting Team (SDT or Team) states that a quorum requires twothirds of the voting members of the SDT. Quorum was achieved as seven of the nine members were present.

#### 3. NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and Public Announcement

NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines and public announcement were reviewed by Barb Nutter. There were no questions raised. The participants were reminded of the NERC Antitrust Guidelines each morning.

- 4. <u>Standards Development Process-Participant Conduct Policy</u> and <u>Email Listserv Policy</u>
  Barb Nutter provided hard copies of the Standards Development Process-Participant Conduct and Email Listserv policies and provided a high level overview of the new policies. There were no questions.
- 5. **Review team roster –** No changes to the roster.
- 6. Review meeting agenda and its objectives

Barb Nutter reviewed the agenda and the objectives for the meeting.



#### **Notes**

#### 1. Webinar feedback

a. Lee Pedowicz informed the group of the positive feedback that he received concerning the webinar.

# 2. Cost Effective Analysis Process (CEAP)

a. Guy Zito joined the meeting June 6 and presented ideas to the team to assist with promoting the standard (in a way that would help the industry to understand the intent). The CEAP Report is a separate activity that would get presented separately. The team agreed to allow DM as a test project for CEAP. Guy received approval from the Standards Committee to apply CEAP to the DM project. Guy and Lee will develop the CEAP questions and review with the group. This will be posted in conjunction with the initial 45 day comment period.

## 3. Informal Request for Information

a. The team made revisions to the announcement, informal request for information report, and spreadsheet. The request was posted for a 30 day period from June 5 to July 5. The purpose of receiving this information from TO's and GO's is to help further refine using the short circuit MVA as a location criteria.

# 4. Respond to comments on Revised SAR

a. The comment report was sent to the team for review. Ryan Quint provided a summary response for question 2 for the team to review. Assignments for the remaining questions were handed out.

#### 5. **PRC-002-2** – (changes made to version dated May 29, 2013)

- a. Requirement R1 the team simplified the requirement wording and developed Attachment 1 in order to provide adequate information for the requirement.
- b. Requirement R3 the team agreed to remove SOE for the GO breaker for the following technical reason SOER when a breaker trips on a transmission element definitively identifies when the element was removed from service from the BES. When a GO breaker opens, however, it may have been some time since the generator was no longer providing input to the BES due to earlier loss of, for instance, its prime mover such as a steam turbine, or a gas turbine. Bob Cummings noted that Events Analysis can be done without SOER for GO breakers. There are other sources of information that can be used to determine when a generator is truly off the system.



# c. Requirement R8 -

- i. Changed 0.2pu to 0.4pu to account for unbalanced systems. Balanced systems generally set their residual overcurrent at 0.2pu.
- ii. Removed part 8.3 triggering on trip coil energization will result in missing the 2 cycles pre-trigger for a fault.
- d. Requirement R9 (R17 in version dated 6/10/13)-- the team revised the bullet list and changed the last bullet 'under-voltage...for a duration of 2 seconds to duration of 5 seconds to align with fault induced delayed voltage recovery.
- e. Requirement 10, part 10.2 Changed 1,000 MVA to 500 MVA Bob Cummings noted that 1000MVA was too high for Appendix E, category 4 and 5 events. Bob would have preferred 250MVA. The team discussed and agreed upon 500MVA. Tim Kucey noted this is fair for the generators because it is a definite number.
- f. Requirement R19 the team removed R19. R19 was removed because this performance based standard requires TO/GO to provide data within a certain amount of time. If TO/GO cannot provide data in the required time and accuracy they are in violation.
- g. Steve Myers suggested that requirements 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 could be moved to a guideline that could be created by the team and approved by the PC. The team discussed and decided that at this time it did not want to go in the direction of a guideline.
- h. Steve Myers questioned where 'fault study area' should be defined. The team discussed and decided it did not need to be defined because a fault study area is known to be peculiar to each Transmission Owner. The situation where a Transmission Owner had facilities that were not geographically adjacent was discussed, and the team decided that regardless of geography, it is still apparent that all fault study areas would be covered.

## 6. Technical Workshop/Conference

a. The team developed the first draft of the workshop/conference presentation. After discussing the workshop presentation, the team decided to lengthen the first day's presentation by 30 minutes to accommodate the material that is intended to be covered, and have enough time for discussion with the audience.

#### 7. Outreach

- a. Workshop/Conference
  - i. July 30 (1-5:30) and July 31 (8-12) in Tempe, AZ
  - ii. August 6 (1-5:30) and August 7 (8-12) in Atlanta



# 8. Next Steps

- a. Finalize consideration of comments
- b. Finalize workshop material
- c. Hold workshops

# 9. Assignments

a. Below are the assignments for responding to the revised SAR comments and updating the rationale boxes to the DM draft standard version dated June 10, 2013. Changes to the Rationale Boxes are due to Barb by June 20, 2013.

Revised SAR – assignments for responding to comments		
Questions		
1	Steve	
2	Ryan - completed	
3	Jack	
4	Tim	
5	Vlad	

Rationale box assignments - NEW		
Bob	Background	
Tim	R1, R2	
Dan	R18	
Jack	R3, R4, R7, R8, R17, R20	
Alan	R21	
Lee	R5, R6	
Ryan	R9 – R17	
Steve	R19	



- b. Vladimir Stanisic to draw up a diagram prior to the workshop for use at the workshop
- c. Chuck Jensen and Jack Soehren volunteered to do the analysis from the information request.

# 10. Future Meeting(s)

- a. July 15 to July 17, 2013 ITC Holdings Novi, MI
- b. July 30 to August 1, 2013 SRP/PERA Club Tempe, AZ
- c. August 6 to August 9, 2013 NERC Headquarters Atlanta
- d. October 22 to October 25, 2013 ERCOT, Austin, TX tentative dates

# 11. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM ET on Friday, June 7, 2013.