

**Meeting of the
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (NYSRC)
Reliability Rules Subcommittee (RRS)**

**Final Minutes of Meeting #130
RRS Meeting @ NYSERDA Offices
17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY
Thursday, April 1, 2010**

In Attendance:

Al Adamson	Consultant	Member
Larry Hochberg	NYPA	Member
Roger Clayton	Chairman	Member
Brian Gordon	NYSE&G (Phone)	Member
Henry Wysocki	ConEd (Secretary)	Member
Roy Pfleiderer	National Grid	Member
Robert Ganley	LIPA	Member
Zach Smith	NYISO	Guest
John Adams	NYISO	Guest
Paul Kiernan	NYISO	Member
Dean Ellis	Dynegy	Guest
George Smith	<u>Unaffiliated EC Member</u> (Phone)	Guest

Agenda Items

1.0 Introduction

Meeting 130 was called to order by Mr. Roger Clayton at 09:34.

1.1 Executive Session

No Executive Session was requested.

1.2 Requests for Additional Agenda Items

4.1 BPS.

4.2 RPWG scope and schedule.

4.3 Report on meeting with DEC.

4.4 Update on NYISO target voltage.

2.0 Meeting Minutes/Action Items

2.1 Approval of RRS Meeting #129 Minutes

The minutes of RRS Meeting #129 were approved with changes as final.

2.2 Action Items List

AI 43-1:

Mr. John Adams of the NYISO provided a brief update to the RRS. Work is still ongoing.

.AI 87-5:

Mr. Roy Pfleiderer provided the RRS with an update stating that the RPWG is investigating the methods used by New England and PJM to control reactive power flows and reserves.

AI 124-5:

All data has been received by all TOs.

3.0 NYSRC Reliability Rules (RR) Development

3.1 List of Potential RR Changes

RRS reviewed the list of potential rule changes.

PRR 103

Mr. Roger Clayton reported that PRR 103 was approved for posting by ~~the RCMS and~~ the EC. ~~This~~ EC approval was dependent on their suggested modifications being incorporated.

PRR 105 - NYISO Policy #1-5

The Exception Process flow chart, which was developed by the NYISO, was reviewed by the RRS. Mr. Paul Kiernan of the NYISO presented the flow chart to the RRS. During the presentation, changes were made to the flow chart based on discussions by the RRS. These changes made it clear that all EC members, and not just TOs, can request changes to the exceptions. The RRS also clarified the chart to show that for the annual review of exceptions the NYISO only consults with the owners of the exception. Mr. Pfleiderer then brought up the point that a generator could then ask for an exception which affects TO facilities. This had the potential of allowing a TO's assets to be at risk for another's benefit. Mr. Clayton suggested that Mr. Pfleiderer's concern be tabled for now. Mr. Adamson then questioned whether the RRS should review changes to exceptions prior to the OC review. Mr. Clayton answered by stating that the EC would have the option to request a review by the RRS for clarification during their review but that the OC would receive exceptions before the RRS.

Following the review of the flow chart, the suggested changes made to Policy #1 were discussed. Mr. Pfeiderer initiated a discussion as to whether removal of an exception should require a technical assessment. Mr. Pfeiderer, along with other RRS members, agreed an assessment wouldn't be necessary. Mr. Clayton disagreed, stating he believed an assessment was necessary. It was agreed that a footnote would be added to Policy #1 which would make a technical assessment for removal of an exception less comprehensive. Mr. Adamson agreed to incorporate ~~proposed~~some changes to the policy, ~~although~~but a RRS consensus on ~~these changes~~the draft by the RRS ~~has~~was not yet been reached.

PRR 105 was then reviewed by the RRS. Changes were made to the PRR to reflect the changes made to the flow chart. Mr. Clayton suggested that, based on the changes made to ~~p~~Policy #1, the PRR needs to be revised before further discussion can continue.

AI 130-1: Mr. Kiernan agreed as an action to revise the flow chart to incorporate the changes resulting from RRS discussions.

AI 130-2: Mr. Adamson agreed as an action item to ~~reviserewrite~~ Policy #1 and PRR 105 to incorporate the changes agreed to in the meeting.

3.2 NPCC Rules Revisions Updates

NPCC Update

Nothing to report.

3.3 NERC SARs/Organization Standards

NERC Standard Tracking

Nothing to report.

4.0 Additional Agenda Items

4.1 BES / BPS Impact on NYSRC RR

FERC has specified that all facilities rated at 100kV and above will be considered BES facilities with some exceptions. Facilities can be excluded from this classification on a case by case basis with the approval of FERC and NERC.

Mr. Zach Smith then addressed the RRS with a TPL-002 interpretation on how protection should be addressed. He stated that the TPL would now require a study to be done with a failure of primary protection considering only backup protection. In other words, FERC will require the TOs to ignore primary protection when analyzing contingencies. This would result in a failure to clear faults at the remote ends of transmission lines and have faults clear farther down the system. This would mean that for a single fault, more breakers and lines would trip to clear the fault. This implies that secondary protection systems will be required on all BES systems. Because of the cost of installation and maintenance, there is expected to be push back on this from TOs.

[RRS Draft Minutes Meeting 130 - aa rev.doc](#)~~RRS Draft Minutes Meeting~~
1303004012010

Mr. Clayton then added that revised reliability rules may have to be written since, as they are currently written, they would not be more stringent than the NERC rules. This could result in only local reliability rules. Mr. Clayton then asked Mr. Smith to make a presentation summarizing the NYISO position on the FERC order. Mr. Smith recommended that comments be made very soon on this issue since all comments are due by 5/10. The NYISO had additional concerns to this new definition of BES the first being TOs registering as Transmission Operators and also the extra work this designation of the BES would bring.

In summary, the RRS believed that this FERC designation would result in redundant protection, additional facilities under NYISO control, revision of reliability rules and an increase in compliance requirements.

4.2 RPWG scope and schedule.

Mr. Pfleiderer stated that the RPWG was focusing on load PF and VAR reserves (Zonal) and the correlation between this and interface limits. Mr. Clayton questioned if this approach can result in more stringent PF requirements. Nothing final has been decided as of yet.

4.3 Report on meeting with DEC.

During the March 23rd meeting with the DEC, Henry Chow and Pete Carney were in attendance. The DEC is being pushed by EPA to impose new constraints which can have a huge impact on reliability. This may result in retirement of a significant amount of generation.

4.4 Update on NYISO target voltage.

Mr. Hochberg requested that this item be brought up regularly so the RRS remains aware of this topic.

AI 130-3: This topic will be placed on the action item list to have the NYISO present on this topic.

4.5 Con Edison Loss of Gas

Changes to the system were discussed and how these changes could impact the LOG/MOB study results.

5.0 Committee Reports

5.1 EC

No report.

5.2 ICS

No report.

5.3 RCMS

No report.

6.0 Next Meeting

Meeting #130 was adjourned at 13:24

The next meeting (#131) is scheduled for Thursday, May 6, 2010 at 9:30 in the NYSERDA offices located at 17 Columbia Circle, Albany, NY.