

**Joint Meeting of the
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (NYSRC)
Reliability Rules Subcommittee (RRS)/
Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee (RCMS)
NYSERDA, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany
Thursday, April 2, 2015**

Minutes of RRS Meeting No. 188

RRS Members and Alternates:

Roger Clayton, Electric Power Resources (Chairman)
Larry Hochberg, NYPA (Vice Chairman) (phone)
Martin Paszek-, Con Edison
Brian Shanahan, National Grid
Roy Pflleiderer, National Grid (phone)
Zoraini Rodriguez, PSEG
Abhilash Gari, NYPA (phone)
Brian Gordon, NYSEG (Secretary)

Non-Voting Participants:

Al Adamson, NYSRC Consultant ([phone](#))
Jim Grant, NYISO
Mark Capano, NYISO
Greg Drake, NYISO
Kevin DePugh, NYISO
Chris Sharp, NYISO
Paul Gioia, Counsel

RRS Meeting # 188 was called to order by Mr. Clayton at 9:30

1. Introduction

1.1. Executive Session

None requested.

1.2. Requests for Additional Agenda Items

Additional agenda item 3.1.8 is reserved for the discussion of the newly posted PRR [127](#).

2. Approval of Minutes / Action Items

2.1 Approval of RRS Minutes #187

RRS reviewed minutes from the last meeting and comments included consistent usage of fonts, capitalization of Market Participants, and correction of sentence structure. The minutes were approved with those changes.

2.2 RRS Action Items List

Action Item 186-5: Add PRR 121 description with the action item. The discussion will happen today but the action item status should change to April 30.

Action Item 186-11: Action item is a standing one and is to be removed from RRS actions item and moved to the RCMS action item list.

Action Item 186-13: Action item is a standing one.

Action Item 187-1: Action item is to be completed but the answer from NPCC was that the Directory 1 is still in progress and new draft will not be sent to late summer.

Action Item 187-2: Action item is to be discussed later and the status will be changed to complete.

Action Item 187-3: Action item is to be changed to complete.

Action Item 187-4: Action item deadline is to be changed to the next meeting of April 30.

Action Item 187-5: Action item deadline is to be changed to the next meeting of April 30.

Action Item 187-6: Action item has been completed and EC has approved the use of materially in the definition.

3. NYSRC Reliability Rules Development

PRR 120, 121, and 122 is being prepared and in anticipation for the approval of NPCC Directory 1 this summer.

3.1 Outstanding PRR List

3.1.1 PRR 120

RRS discussed the need to table this until NPCC Directory 1 is completed; however, changes will occur with these as new information is learned. Mr. Adamson commented on three items. Requirement R 1.2 will not need to have the ~~#N-1-1~~ information added as requested at the last meeting because it is included in ~~NPCC Directory 1~~ table-Table B-1 and therefore is not needed to be repeated in the rules (it is in the introduction). Mr. Adamson stated that the NYISO mentioned that more specific or stringent Table B-2 ~~table~~ is the same or similar to Table B-1 but our performance statements are more specific in some cases than ~~table-Table B-1~~. The RRS has requested that Mr. Grant

coordinate a NYISO review of [Table B-2](#) to see what elements should be removed (**Action Item 188-1**). This will complete the Mr. Adamson action item. Mr. Pfeleiderer observed that in ~~table~~ [Table B-1](#) number two there is a performance requirement [which](#) indicates that resources [should be](#) available within 10 minutes of notification. The introduction discussion is more specific so it should be reflected in the table. Mr. Adamson will review this observation and make changes in the PRR to address the resource available in 10 minutes. (**Action Item 188-2**). The Directory definitions terms are to be italics at some point but it was stated that the NPCC defined terms should have an equivalent reliability rule defined terms if required. Mr. Hochberg mentioned that the contingency event [number 8](#) which identified the loss of any element without a fault for a SPS breaker is missing. Mr. Adamson mentioned that it is found in the performance requirements. It is more stringent than NPCC so it should be added in the [Table](#) section 2 by adding another note 9. Mr. Adamson will investigate and add item G (**Action Item 188-3**). NPCC has this confusion as well and may change in their future NPCC Directory 1 revision.

3.1.2 PRR 121 ([B-R1, Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements](#))

RRS discussed the need to table this until NPCC Directory 1 is completed; however, changes will occur as new information is learned. Mr. Adamson commented that ~~some~~ the transmission assessment TPL 1-4 NERC requirements ~~are is~~ not in Directory 1. The PRR was based on Directory 1 but not NERC requirements. It is to be noted for the minutes that Mr. Adamson ~~121~~ referenced a potential inconsistency between NPCC and NERC requirements. Mr. Adamson to propose changes to the guidelines that was referenced in the PRR (**Action Item 188-4**)

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Widow/Orphan control

3.1.3 PRR 122 ([B-R2, Transmission Planning Assessments](#))

RRS discussed the need to table this until NPCC Directory 1 is completed; however, changes will occur as new information is learned. Mr. Adamson removed old R.2 based on last month's discussion. Mr. Hochberg has the same comment on number 8 for the loss of any element is the same issue as was raised during today's PRR 120 discussion.

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Widow/Orphan control

3.1.4. PRR 123 ([Re-label Rules - Example: Rule A-R1 > Rule A-1](#))

This item to be tabled for next month.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Widow/Orphan control

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

3.1.5. PRR 124 ([Re-label Rule Section A Titles, Reliability Rule > Purpose](#))

3.1.6. PRR 125 ([RR Exception #21](#))

Mr. Adamson and Mr. Clayton discussed this and determined that these changes do not require a [new PRR change](#) because they will not result in reliability rule changes. [Instead, the proposed changes should appear directly on the "Exceptions to the Reliability Rules" document. It was noted that it is a formatting or procedural issue.](#) RRS will act on

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Widow/Orphan control

to the EC. Mr. Paszek proceeded to discuss the proposed PRR 125. NYSRC RR Exception # 21 lists Con Edison feeders that have their STE rate limited by either a disconnect switch or a wave trap. Con Ed has identified feeders whose STE rating is no longer limited by either a disconnect switch or a wave trap. ~~operational aspect changes of~~ these changes need to be submitted to the EC by the NYISO or any member of the EC. RRS has performed the informal and initial review. This will be forwarded to the EC. The EC will discuss and will remand it to NYISO for review and then to the RRS. PRR 125 will be removed but the information will be made as an exception request. Mr. Adamson will send a revised word version (new rule references) to Mr. ~~Paseek Paszek~~ so can submit the body of changes with explanations to Mr. Clayton in an email. Mr. Clayton will include in a packet to the EC. (Action Item 188-5)

3.1.6.PRR 126 (RR Exceptions #7 & #17)

This is to be treated the same as PRR125. As it is, the NYSRC RR&CM Exceptions #7 and #17 to the Reliability Rules are exempt from C-R1 ONLY. Section C sets forth Reliability Rules for establishing operating transmission capabilities, post contingency operation, outage coordination, and other aspects of transmission operation. As the TOs and the NYISO plan the system assuming that these exceptions are also available to Transmission Planners (otherwise there would be a violation), the proposal is to change the table cell that links the exception to the NYSRC reliability rule so it reads: B-R1 and C-R1. Theses changes for operations should also apply to the planning rules as well. It was mention during this discussion that the old rule reference nomenclature should change into the new rule reference nomenclature and it needs to be globaly changed for all exceptions. Mr. Clayton will retire both PRR 125 and PRR 126 (Action Item 188-6)

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0", Widow/Orphan control

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

3.1.7 New PRR 127 (C-R1, Establishing Operating Transfer Limits)

This PRR was received after seven day period for posting. RRS did not have any objections to include in this meeting agenda. Con Edison CONED has proposed a revision change to Table C-1. of rules. In operations, the current rule allows the use of 10-minute operating reserves to address loading above LTE rate on a cable resulting from a generation contingency. However, the current rule is silent on performing this same action when it is caused by a transmission contingency. This silence may have the consequence that following a literal reading of the rule an operator may have to shed load when it could have been avoided by making use of 10-minute reserves. The rationale of the change in Table C-1 is to remove this unintended operational restriction and in doing so enhance reliability. In B-1 and C-1 for loss of generation the 10 minute operating reserve can be used but not for loss of transmission. CONED does not want to shed load if resources are available to correct the problem. Mr. Grant reports that the NYISO thought it was a document discrepancy and that the NYISO is ~~agreeable~~acceptable to this change. Mr. Gordon questioned if the location of the reserves would be less of an issue for loss of generation than for the loss of transmission. Transmission owners are to review impact on their system and verify that operating reserves can always be counted on for the loss of transmission to operate cables up to STE so that operating reserve activation will reduce cable flow below LTE. (Action Item 188-7). Mr. Adamson mentioned a new PRR form will need to be used for new PRR requests and it will be sent

Formatted: Font: Calibri, Font color: Custom Color(63,63,63)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Widow/Orphan control

out the RRS for reference and use.

3.2. Bucket List

3.3 NYSRC BPS definition

Mr. Clayton introduced the straw man proposal at the EC. The EC was not in favor of the straw man proposal. EC reviewed the performance based test against a bright line criteria. The concern of the straw man proposal is that the facility listing that are subject to the NYSRC reliability rules may include not include all 230 kV facilities. It was noted that there is also the possibility that the performance based facility listing (A-10) may change periodically based on the updated results of the periodic performance test. After discussion at the EC, the consensus was that the concerns were not significant enough to move away from a performance based listing used for the comprehensive system planning process. It is to be noted that the NPCC A-10 process is not a definition as it is a process. The definition relates to the significant adverse impact from faults or disturbances outside local area. This includes stability and dynamic response but it also includes steady state conditions. The local area at NPCC is undefined. New England interprets all of New England as the local area. New York interprets the local area differently. NPCC A-10 definition facilities will be used as a basis for what facilities the NYSRC reliability rules are subject. Mr. DePugh mentioned the A-10 process defines the busses that constitute the BPS but go on further to state that it includes all facilities connected to those busses. ~~CONED-Con Edison~~ has issues with using the A-10 listing because it ~~will~~ could include ~~CONED-Con Edison~~ radial system(s) that have even been excluded in the BES bright line definition. ~~CONED-Con Edison~~ has provided an operating diagram example to show the impact of using A-10 listings. ~~It was noted that every 5 years there is a study review the A-10 list for updated the performance based test.~~ There was some discussion surrounding the concept of NPCC using an exception process for the A-10 list. The A-10 testing methodology is currently under TFSS review. The transmission owners and NYISO will review the NPCC A-10 criteria and glossary definitions to suggest any change proposals (**Action Item 188-8**).

3.4 RRC Manual V35 draft 2-18-15

Errata and ~~glossary editorial~~ changes were made. RRS has adopted the new version. Mr. Clayton will send to EC and recommend approval.

4. NPCC Directories

4.1 Directory 1 Discussion

Mr. Clayton mentioned that the introduction had ambiguous wording and some members wanted ~~only their area of contingencies applied only to BPS busses. Another issue was the Non-BPS affect on BPS should be included or not included.~~

5. NERC SARS/Organization Standards

5.1 NERC Standard Tracking

NPCC protection standards Directory 3 has been removed because it is covered in NERC standards.

6. Additional Agenda Items.

[6.1 Discussion on Policy 1 revision was tabled to allow further review with aim to present the final draft to the EC for review next month. ision is missing.](#)

7. Reports

8.1 NYSRC EC Meeting Report

Errata approval changes for EC. Mr. Gioia changes will be included into the draft. Market Participants is a defined term and will be capitalized. Transmission Owners will need to be capitalized as well. Specific mention of email accounts will be removed. BPS was covered. The term materially was added to the material benefit definition. Reported updates to DEC meeting

8.2 NYSRC ICS Meeting Report

There have been PJM model changes and there are other NPCC operating area changes as well.

Meeting Ended at 13:04

Next Meeting #189:

Next Meeting #189: Thursday, April 30, 2015; 9:30 am @ NYSERDA, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany