Operations Working Group Report

March, 2013

The Operations Working Group (OWG) met on February 20, 2013 and considered the following:

**OWG Meeting Notes Review –**

The working group reviewed and approved the January 2013 meeting notes with few changes.

**Revision Request Review –**

|  |
| --- |
| **104NOGRR Smiley.png** |
| **Removal of Transmission Operator Definition from the Nodal Operating Guide** |
| Language Review |
| **OWG Action**: OWG agreed to Table till March Smiley.png |
| Discussion:  This NOGRR proposes deleting the definition of Transmission Operator from the Nodal Operating Guides.  ERCOT owes comments on this NOGRR to PRS by December. ERCOT proposed to table the NOGRR.  OWG agreed to table NOGRR 104 till March |
|  |
|  |

**Operations Report –**

* VJ Betanabhatla gave the Operations Report. , no comments or questions were received.

**Operations Task Force Report –**

The Operations Task Force will meet to discuss the pending assignments below. Ross Owen offered to host the meeting at Oncor.

* 1. David Penny mentioned that language in the Protocols indicates real -time data for reliability purposes must be accurate within 3% percent.  Language in the Operating Guides indicates voltage is to be maintained within 2% of the voltage profile.  These requirements appear to conflict with each other, even though by the hierarchal process, the Protocols supersede the Operating Guides in this case.  Additionally, language in ERCOT’s Steady State Voltage Control Procedure states that transmission voltage should not exceed 105% nor fall below 95% of the nominal voltage during normal operation of the system and that transmission voltage during emergencies (including contingency events) should not exceed equipment over excitation ratings. **OTF is to review the language in the Operating Guides**.
  2. David Penny mentioned that based on data provided by the TOs, there appeared to be instances during cycling of feeders the TOs were not meeting their load-shed obligation for brief periods of time. **OTF is to review the language in the Operating Guides**.
  3. **OTF was asked** **to develop a sample scorecard to be used for Reactive Testing**; ie units that have been tested and passed, failed, have yet to test.

**Seminar Task Force Report**

No Report Given.

**Texas RE Update Report –**

David Penny mentioned that the following standards are out for ballet:

PRC-004

PRC-024

PRC-025; and

FERC order 754

BAL-001 TRE-1 Regional Standard was approved and will be sent to FERC for approval.

**System Operations Report –** No new procedure changes to report.

**Other –**

1. Isabel Flores was not available at this meeting to discuss verifying RARF data vs. Real-time Reactive testing each calendar year. **ERCOT will coordinate this discussion for the next meeting**.
2. UFLS and Firm load shed issues. If load shed is part of mitigation plan what is the basis and responsible party? Load shed language in the OG are related to EEA, need to look at firm load shed issues for other reasons. Possible need to OG language, group believes this is covered under existing language and Mitigation Plans.

Dave Penny wanted to discuss this to make sure we don’t have any relay settings that might be lower than the post contingency emergency rating. After discussing this OWG agreed that this might not be a problem at ERCOT and this issue needs to be discussed in a different group.

1. John Warren has been reviewing the inconsistencies in the Emergency Notice language between the OG and Protocols. He will be meeting with Curtis Crews to discuss this. **John Warren will provide an update to OWG in the next meeting.**
2. Texas RE requested input from OWG on the following issue from the San Diego event:

* Handling of relay settings in ratings, particularly when these are most limiting series elements
* TOs set the relay settings, SOL methodologies are sent to ERCOT.
* Operational use of facility owner’s ratings when different values are not available for continuous, 2 hour and 15 minute capability
* ERCOT operates all transmission elements to maintain post-contingency loading to below the 2-hour rating and base case to the normal rating.
* Consideration of overload relay trip times when establishing post-contingency mitigation plans
* ERCOT has implemented a process of ensuring that relay operations will not interfere with post-contingency mitigations plans.
* Review process for coordination of SPS and UVLS with other protection schemes, especially overload relays
* ERCOT will review SPS procedures and add a step to coordinate relay settings with SPS operations, so that the relay settings will not interfere with SPS operations.  TOs determine how UVLS schemes interact with relay settings.

Ross Owen asked ERCOT for an update on the action items from the CREZ workshop on 11/05/2012. He suggested it is time to schedule another meeting to address the open issues. It is important that each CREZ TO see what static devices are in service in each area. They can receive ICCP data from their neighbors; however it would be best if ERCOT has a display that all TOs can see that shows this information. **Colleen will follow up with John Adams.**

**Future Meeting Dates –**

* Wednesday, March 20th 2013 at ERCOT Met Center room 168. This meeting will include a half day dedicated to discussion on Energization of CREZ lines.