

***Joint Meeting of the
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (NYSRC)
Reliability Rules Subcommittee (RRS)/
Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee (RCMS)***

***RRS Meeting
Thursday, April 4, 2013***

Minutes of RRS Meeting #164

In Attendance:

RRS Members and Alternates:

Roger Clayton, Electric Power Resources (Chairman)
Pat Hession, LIPA (phone)
Henry Wysocki, Con Ed (phone)
Dan Head, Con Edison (phone)
Roy Pfleiderer, National Grid (phone)
Jeff May, Central Hudson (Secretary)
Brian Gordon, NYSEG
Larry Hochberg, NYPA

Non-Voting Participants:

Al Adamson, NYSRC Consultant
Paul Gioia, NYSRC Counsel
Jim Grant, NYISO
Ed Schrom, PSC (phone)

Guests:

Kristen Bluvas, NYISO Counsel
Abhilash Gari, NYPA (phone)
Zahid Qayyum, Con Ed
Zach Smith, NYISO
Kai Jiang, NYISO
Kevin DePew, NYISO

Agenda Items

1.0 Introduction

RRS Meeting #164 was called to order by Mr. Clayton at 9:30 AM.

1.1. Executive Session

No Executive Session was requested.

1.2. Requests for Additional Agenda Items

No requests for additional agenda items.

2. Approval of Minutes/Action Items

2.1 Approval of Minutes #163

The latest draft meeting minutes were reviewed. The following editorial changes were made:

Page 1: none

Page 2: minor spelling changes noted by J. May

Page 3: none

Page 4: none

Page 5: none

Page 6: none

The minutes were approved for issue after incorporation of the identified changes.

2.2 RRS Action Item List

AI 43-9 – No update

AI 83-8 – No update

AI 87-5 – No update

AI 114-1 – On Hold; no update

AI 124-5 – On Hold; no update

AI 139-1 – No update

AI 141-1 – No update

AI 155-4 – Mr. Smith provided an update on the status of NPCC Directory 1. The NPCC working group that is dealing with the Directory 1 updates held a conference call on Wednesday April 3rd; Mr. Smith has no idea as to the schedule for the completed update. Mr. Adamson indicated it is expected by the end of 2013. Mr. Smith stated that the existing Directory 1 remains in force and the NERC standards are more stringent until the Directory changes have been determined.

AI 158-1 – Mr. Qayyum provided an update to PRR 8; he indicated that RPWG surveyed member positions regarding the necessity and desire for this PRR and that the majority of TOs would like to retire it. However, RPWG will continue research and testing through the planning process. This PRR was initiated approximately 10 years ago and at a time

when the NYISO planning process was less robust. Mr. Smith commented that the NYISO is not seeing issues on the system as was the case when the rule was first proposed. The present planning process addresses all issues and is now more robust. The planning process is providing sensitivity cases for current transmission analysis.

Mr. Smith stated that the NYISO, as the sponsor for RPWG, is requesting to remove PRR 8 from consideration. This is not to preclude a future re-visit of this PRR in the event that a need arises. As an aside, there is a standing action item at NYSRC EC regarding a Power Factor Guideline. Mr. Smith asked if RRS would like periodic feedback on the issue, but RRS did not believe that would be necessary.

The discussion moved toward the topic of reactive reserves; Mr. Qayyum indicated that a more recent mechanism has been developed to identify future concerns & to evaluate and improve the current process. Mr. Smith added that this mechanism is exploratory only at this point and will remain as such until a reactive deficiency is identified. Mr. Clayton reminded RRS that NYSRC has a voltage profile requirement and that a reactive requirement is implicit.

When NYISO runs planning studies, they review voltage and thermal profiles throughout the system; typically, the studies indicate that UPNY/SENY is more thermally limiting than UPNY/ConEd and the voltage profile near the UPNY/ConEd interface is very good due to the capacitor banks at Millwood Substation.

Mr. Hochberg asked about the status of static vs. dynamic studies; the present reactive studies are static. Mr. Qayyum indicated that dynamic studies will be run in the future. Mr. Smith further detailed that the study process could be used to quantify benefits of future infrastructure enhancements.

Mr. Clayton asked RRS if there were any concerns with regarding to removing PRR 8 from the List of Potential Reliability Rule Changes; RRS voiced no objections. Mr. Clayton will remove it from the “List of Potential Reliability Rule Changes – Outstanding” [**Action Item 164-1**]. This action item shall be marked as complete.

AI 161-5 – On-going; Mr. Clayton expected more discussion on this topic under Agenda Item 4.1, Rules Enhancement Plan. Hence, this discussion will be left for later, and possibly not be resolved today.

AI 162-3 – completed; Agenda Item 4.1

AI 163-1 – completed; Agenda Item 4.1

AI 163-2 – completed; EC agreed to remove Exception 15. Mr. Adamson will request Carol Lynch to remove Exception #15 from all NYSRC documentation; the rules book & website [**Action Item 164-2**]. The NYISO documentation references the NYSRC website for all Exceptions.

3. NYSRC Reliability Rules Development

3.1 List of Potential Reliability Rules Changes

3.1.1: PRR 8: Reactive Load & Resource PF – R. Clayton

Mr. Clayton confirmed that this discussion was covered under Action Item 158-1.

3.1.2: PRR 113: SRP clarifications – R. Clayton

Mr. Clayton opened the discussion on PRR 113 by recalling that RRS reviewed and discussed the PowerPoint slides developed for presentation at the March EC meeting. The PowerPoint slides were presented and the NYSRC EC gave their approval to move forward with the concepts. Mr. Clayton and Mr. Adamson have been developing the template for PRR 113, which Mr. Clayton reviewed with RRS.

Mr. Gioia pointed out that there is no revision to the rule. He suggested that the rule should identify the standard that the measurements are striving to achieve. He asked that the measurement wording, “as prompt as reasonably possible” and “given the available resources” be added to the rule. Mr. Gioia will provide wording for the rule to address this suggestion [**Action Item 164-3**]. Mr. Adamson and Mr. Clayton will review and incorporate Mr. Gioia’s comments (as appropriate), then distribute the updated PRR to RRS [**Action Item 164-4**].

Mr. Gioia next commented that the former G-M1.6 wording be retained and he expressed some concern regarding the sequence of the proposed G-M1.6. After some discussion, it was agreed that the existing G-M1.6 wording can be removed and that the sequencing as written is acceptable.

Mr. Grant indicated that these PRR changes have not yet been reviewed by the NYISO technical experts. He expressed concern that the NYISO will be held responsible for critiquing Transmission Owner technical studies without having the in-house expertise to review and evaluate any TO study. Mr. Gioia indicated that the NYISO will not be expected to verify any TO study, but will be the only entity to have the authority to accept or deny a TO suggestion. Mr. Adamson indicated that the implementation plan reaches toward Mr. Grant’s concern. Various comments by Mr. Gioia, Mr. Gordon, & Mr. Adamson all suggest that the NYISO will be expected to pass judgment on the level of ‘reasonableness’ of a TO’s analysis and recommendations. Mr. Grant cited a few reasons why the NYISO could be concerned with making these determinations. He reiterated that the NYISO is not geared up to recreate or verify a Transmission Owner’s study. There was further discussion and clarification regarding the relationship of interconnection to system planning vs. black start to system operating. Regardless, Mr. Grant will seek the NYISO’s comment on the proposed rule [**Action Item 164-5**].

3.2 NPCC Rules Revision Update

No updates.

3.3 NERC SARS/Organization Standards

No updates.

4. Additional Agenda Items

4.1 Rules Enhancement Plan – A. Adamson

Mr. Clayton initiated the discussion by reviewing the draft write-up created by Mr. Adamson. He indicated that the draft white paper will be presented to the EC next week; the EC requested the white paper before proceeding. Mr. Clayton opened the floor for comments; Mr. Adamson provided an overview of the tasks listed on page 3. {Note that the task list has expanded to four since the 2/28 conference call.} Mr. Adamson indicated that two examples of implementation will be attached as an appendix to the report; a simple example from Section C and a more complicated example from Section F.

Mr. Clayton suggested that RRS should proceed with the REP based on the draft changes to Directory 1 in order to address EC members' requested examples of how RRS was going to proceed. An extensive discussion took place regarding NPCC's anticipated timetable (schedule), format, and content of Directory 1 and RRS's similar issues. Mr. Adamson heard that Directory 1 is expected to be completed by the end of 2013. He further commented that it would take approximately 6 months to make the first cut of NYSRC reliability rule reorganization. Mr. Clayton suggested that the timing of this task may work out such that the reorganized NYSRC rules will be ready for task 2 immediately prior to understanding where Directory 1 is headed.

The discussion continued with regard to overlap and continuity of NERC Standards, NPCC Criteria/Directories, and NYSRC Reliability Rules and the facilities to which they apply. RRS agreed that further discussion will be necessary on this topic as the Standards, BES definition, and Directory clarity unfold. A key issue is the different lists of elements for different criteria and/or rules. Entities must be careful to apply the right standards to the right elements.

Mr. Smith confirmed that all Transmission Owners will register as Transmission Planners for facilities that meet the definition of the BPS. NYISO/TO discussion continues regarding what the operational ownership will look like, including how compliance documentation will be handled. The division of labor and documentation is still being discussed. He indicated it is important to note that Operating and Planning standards are written differently. The divisional focus on the planning side is on the responsibility for Planning Studies and the focus on the Operations side is on the separation of facilities.

Mr. Clayton stated that the key issue for RRS is to identify to what facilities the NYSRC rules will apply. He will present the draft white paper to the EC and use it as a springboard for discussion amongst the EC members [**Action Item 164-6**]. Mr. Clayton recommended presenting the white paper without the examples attached; the presentation strategy will be discussed further off-line.

4.2 Review RR Glossary to determine need for clarifications regarding NYCA SRP

Mr. Clayton stated this agenda item will remain as a placeholder at the request of Mr. Hession. RRS will need to address this once we decide direction.

4.3 Exception #15 rescission

Mr. Clayton indicated this has been completed; refer to earlier discussion under Action Item 163-2.

5. Reports

5.1 NYSRC EC Meeting Report – R. Clayton

Mr. Clayton briefly identified the topics covered, such as the reactive study, exemption 15, and Hurricane Sandy Report. No other noteworthy discussion took place.

5.2 NYSRC ICS Meeting Report – A. Adamson

Mr. Adamson indicated that at April 3rd meeting the ICS is making revisions to the IRM model. A Policy 5 update is also on-going, which is used as a baseline for study assumptions in preparation for the next IRM study.

6. Next Meeting #165:

The next RRS/RCMS joint meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 2nd, 2013 at 9:30 AM in the NYSERDA offices located at 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY.

RRS meeting #164 was adjourned at 11:11 AM.