



NORTHEAST POWER COORDINATING COUNCIL, INC.
1040 AVE OF THE AMERICAS, NEW YORK, NY 10018 TELEPHONE (212) 840-1070 FAX (212) 302-2782

Classification of Bulk Power System Elements

Adopted by the Members of the Northeast Power Coordinating Council Inc., this April 28, 2007 based on recommendation by the Reliability Coordinating Committee, in accordance with Section VIII of the NPCC Inc. Bylaws dated May 18, 2006 as amended to date.

1.0 Introduction

NPCC defines specific requirements applicable to design, operation, and **protection** of the **bulk power system**. The object of this *Classification of Bulk Power System Elements* (Document A-10) is to provide the methodology to identify the **bulk power system elements**, or parts thereof, of the interconnected NPCC Region.

The methodology in this document is used to classify **elements** of the **bulk power system** and may result in **elements** being added to or removed from the NPCC **Bulk Power System List**. The methodology in this document is based on the following:

- Results of an analysis done on a bus basis can be applied to identify which **elements**, or portions thereof, connected to the bus are part of the **bulk power system**.
- **Elements** shall not automatically be included or excluded from the **bulk power system** based on voltage class. Application of this methodology may be omitted at buses that can be logically excluded from the **bulk power system** based on study results at other buses tested using this methodology. If a bus is determined to be **bulk power system**, all other buses with elements connected to that bus must be tested.
- **Elements** shall be evaluated based on this methodology when significant changes occur on the system that could change an **element's bulk power system** status; the evaluation may be limited to the affected part of the system.
- **Areas** and facility owners may adopt methodologies that exceed the requirements set forth in this document for their own purposes. However, only **elements** classified as **bulk power system** as a result of testing described in this document shall be included on the NPCC's list of **bulk power system elements**. NPCC criteria and compliance monitoring shall consider only the system **elements** listed on NPCC's list of **bulk power system elements**.

The Classification of **Bulk Power System Elements** is based on three defined terms: **bulk power system**, **local area** and **significant adverse impact**.

2.0 Definitions

Terms in *italics* in this document are defined in this section.

Terms in **bold** are defined in the *NPCC Glossary of Terms* (Document A-7).

2.1 *Bus*

Within this document the term *bus* refers to a junction with sensing or **protection** equipment within a substation or switching station at which the terminals of two or more **elements** are connected, regardless of whether circuit breakers are provided. In this context, *bus* may not have a direct correlation to the use of this term in substation design or a power flow data set.

In some configurations a *bus* may include more than one physical *bus*, such as in a breaker-and-a-half arrangement or a single-line-single-breaker arrangement in which two physical *buses* are connected through a *bus-tie* breaker. The examples in Figure 1 depict two of many possible configurations where two physical *buses* are tested as a single *bus*. *Buses* that are separated by normally open *bus-tie* breakers are considered as separate *buses*. The termination of line sections through switches should not be considered as a *bus* requiring testing unless the switches are activated as part of a **protection system** for the line which they sectionalize as part of normal **protection system** actions.




Figure 1 – Configurations where *Bus A* and *Bus B* are tested as one *bus*.

In some configurations **elements** may not be terminated to the *bus* through circuit breakers, such as the generator *bus* for a unit connected generator or a *bus* between a transmission line and transformer that are switched as a single circuit. The examples in Figure 2 depict two of many configurations where two physical *buses* are tested as separate *buses*.




Figure 2 – Configurations where *Bus A* and *Bus B* are tested as two separate *buses*.

2.2 *Uncleared Locally*

Within this document the phrase *uncleared locally* is used to denote failure of the **protection** including **Special Protection Systems** for the *bus* under test to initiate tripping of all associated interrupting devices regardless of their location.

Protection located at other *buses* is assumed to operate as designed when that **protection** cannot be disabled by failure of a single component in common with the **protection** at the *bus* under test. For example, consider the case where the **protection** for **elements** connected to higher voltage level and lower voltage level *buses* in the same station share a dc source, and an independent dc source is provided for second **protection groups** associated with **elements** connected to the higher voltage level *bus*. In this case, it is acceptable when testing the lower voltage level *bus* to assume correct operation of any **protection groups** associated with **elements** connected to the higher voltage level *bus* capable of detecting the **fault** and supplied by the independent dc source.

In cases where circuit breakers are not provided at the terminals of the **element** at the *bus* under test (as shown in Figure 2, *bus A*), *uncleared locally* includes a failure to clear a **fault** by circuit breakers located at another *bus* within the same substation, unless back-up **protection** at that other *bus* using an independent dc source would detect the **fault** and initiate clearing.

3.0 Classification of Bulk Power System Elements

3.1 Testing Conditions and Assumptions

Studies conducted for the purpose of determining the **elements** of the **bulk power system** shall assume the following conditions:

- 3.1.1. Power flow transfers, **load** and **generation** patterns expected to exist for the period under study which stress the system in a manner critical to the classification of the *bus* to be tested. All **reclosing** facilities rendered inoperative.
- 3.1.2. Operation of **Special Protection Systems**, undervoltage **load shedding** and underfrequency **load shedding** modeled as designed.
- 3.1.3. Load models used in the **Transient Stability** Test are consistent with **Area** practices for the studies of rotor angle stability.
- 3.1.4. Load models used for steady state testing are either constant MVA or are based on actual system testing with LTC movement.
- 3.1.5. Stability simulation runs until the system response can be clearly determined.
- 3.1.6. Generic or detailed relay models to monitor, after tripping of remote terminals, the potential for tripping of un-faulted **elements**.

3.2 Test Methodology

Both **transient stability** and steady-state tests are used to determine the impact on system performance resulting from power system **faults**.

Testing is based on application of a *bus fault* at a single voltage level that is *uncleared locally*. Tripping of un-faulted **elements** associated with clearing the test **fault** does not constitute a **significant adverse impact**.

Depending on system configuration or topology, testing only **faults** at *buses* can fail to uncover **significant adverse impacts** arising from a design criteria contingency involving the loss of two adjacent transmission circuits on a common tower. Hence, specific tests in 1c and 2c below are designed to assess this contingency for its potential **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**.

A **transient stability** test may be done first to identify *buses* at which **faults** may cause a **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**.

For those *buses* which are not classified as **bulk power system** in the **transient stability** test, a steady-state test is used to identify *buses* at which **faults** may cause a **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**.

Step 1 - Transient Stability Test

Simulate the **transient stability** condition of a three-phase **fault** with delayed clearing at the *bus* under test (step 1a). If the test results in a positive **bulk power system** determination, more detailed testing (step 1b) may be applied to obtain a more precise determination.

- 1a. Apply a three-phase **fault** for at least 10 seconds at the *bus* that is being tested. Do not open any of the **elements** connected to the *bus* for the duration of the **fault**. After 10 seconds, simulate tripping of all terminals of each **element** connected to the *bus* under test. In cases where there is no **fault** interrupting device at the remote terminal of an **element**, open all terminals of all **elements** between the *bus* under test and the interrupting device(s) that will open to clear the **fault**. This test is performed as an efficient, but conservative method for evaluating the impacts of:

- *bus faults* which would result in faster clearing time, and
- **faults** off the *bus*.

It is recognized that due to the conservative nature of this test some **elements** could be classified unnecessarily as part of the **bulk power system**. If the above test results in a positive **bulk power system** determination, the following additional testing may be utilized to obtain a more precise determination. Subsequent testing utilizes design clearing times for the conditions being tested, as stated below.

- 1b. Apply a three-phase **fault** at the *bus*, which is *uncleared locally* and trip the remote terminals of all **elements** that will open to clear the **fault**. Remote clearing times shall be based on design **fault clearing** times, assuming no communications from the station under test to the remote terminals.

Transformers and other **elements** connected to the *bus* shall only be tripped by operation of independent remote **protection groups** capable of clearing a **fault** on the *bus* under test.

Some **protection groups** (e.g. directional comparison blocking) at remote terminals may provide high-speed **fault clearing** for faults at the *bus* under test. In order to test the effects of longer **fault clearing** times for fault conditions when these remote **protection**

groups would not provide high speed **fault clearing**, for either test (1a) or (1b) above:

- High-speed **fault clearing** at remote terminals must be ignored; or
- Testing must vary the placement of the 3-phase **fault** on the elements connected to the bus under test to include locations beyond the reach of the high-speed tripping relay element at the remote terminal.

However, the **protective relay** settings may be reviewed to determine whether the *bus* could be classified as not part of the **bulk power system** if faster remote **fault** clearing can be achieved. If **protective relay** settings are modified, an assessment shall be conducted to ensure that the faster clearing time does not compromise the security of the **protection system**. Until the **protective relay** settings are modified, the *bus* must be classified as **bulk power system**.

- 1c. The test above is meant to cover the majority of design criteria contingencies. However, the **elements** associated with the *bus* under test must be reviewed to ensure adverse consequences resulting from a design criteria contingency involving the loss of two adjacent transmission circuits on a common tower are not overlooked.

If a circuit terminating at the *bus* under test shares a multiple circuit tower with an adjacent circuit that does not terminate at the *bus* under test, the adjacent circuit design contingency must also be assessed. In such cases, simultaneous permanent phase to ground **faults** on different phases of each of two adjacent transmission circuits shall be applied at critical common tower locations. The **fault** on the circuit associated with the *bus* under test which is *uncleared locally*, shall be simulated with **normal fault clearing** at the remote terminal and on the adjacent circuit.

If the **fault** has a **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**, the *bus* is classified as part of the **bulk power system**.

For *buses* not classified as part of **bulk power system** in Step 1, continue with the Steady State Test in step 2.

Step 2 - Steady State Test

Simulate the post-**contingency** steady-state conditions based on one of the

following outcomes of the **fault** applied to the *bus* under test:

- 2a. If the **fault** was cleared based on design **fault clearing** times in the **Transient Stability** Test, open the same **elements** that were opened to clear the **fault** in the Transient Test. Post-**contingency** conditions shall reflect operation of all automatic devices.
- 2b. If the **fault** was not cleared based on design **fault clearing** times in the **Transient Stability** Test, assume that the **fault** propagates to the nearest location where it can be detected by independent **protection groups** and open the **elements** that would be opened by the **protection groups** to clear the **fault**. Note that because **fault clearing** will occur at interrupting devices capable of clearing the **fault**, it may be necessary to open multiple **elements** between the *bus* under test and the relevant interrupting devices, for example, a transmission line and transformer in series as shown in Figure 2.
- 2c. As in Step 1, the steady state test above is meant to cover the majority of design criteria contingencies. However, the **elements** associated with the *bus* under test must be reviewed to ensure adverse consequences resulting from a design criteria contingency involving the loss of two adjacent transmission circuits on a common tower are not overlooked. The post-contingency analysis must assess the loss of any adjacent circuit on common towers with a circuit terminating at the *bus* under test in addition to the **elements** associated with the *bus* under test.

Voltages and thermal loading will be assessed for **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area** following automatic actions. In cases where a power flow solution is not obtained, other techniques shall be used to assess the impact of the event on the power system.

If the **fault** has a **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**, the *bus* is classified as part of the **bulk power system**.

Note that Step 2 can be done prior to Step 1. If a *bus* is classified as part of the **bulk power system** by the Steady State Test (Step 2), the **Transient Stability** Test (Step 1) need not be done for that *bus*.

3.3 Utilization of Test Results to Classify on an **Element-by-Element** Basis.

Classification of **bulk power system elements** is achieved by applying the results of the above tests to the **elements** connected to the tested *bus*.

An **element** with only one terminal such as a generator, shunt reactor, or capacitor bank, is classified as part of the **bulk power system** if the *bus* at which it is connected is classified as part of the **bulk power system**.

An **element** with multiple terminals such as a transformer or transmission line is classified as part of the **bulk power system** if any terminal of the **element** is connected to a *bus* that is classified as part of the **bulk power system**. The **bulk power system** classification may be limited to only a portion of the **element** if all of the following conditions are met:

- At least one terminal is connected to a *bus* that is not part of the **bulk power system**.
- The Steady State Test has been applied at the *buses* connected to all terminals of the **element** and none of these *buses* have been classified as part of the **bulk power system** based on results of the Steady State Test.
- The **Transient Stability** Test has been applied between the terminals of the **element** to identify those portions of the **element** for which the **Transient Stability** Test will not result in a **significant adverse impact** outside of the **local area**.

3.4 Documentation

Documentation for **Bulk Power System** classification shall include:

- 3.4.1 The rationale for the test conditions and assumptions used that are not listed above in 3.1.
- 3.4.2 The criteria used in evaluating the result of the testing including but not limited to stability, voltage, and thermal performance.
- 3.4.3 Detailed result of the testing shall be provided upon request.

4.0 Application and List Maintenance

Each **Area** shall be responsible for the application of the *Classification of Bulk Power System Elements* as described in this document and shall submit proposed changes and supporting documentation to the Task Force on System Studies (TFSS).

The “NPCC **Bulk Power System List**” will be maintained by the TFSS. Additions to and removals from the NPCC **Bulk Power System List** will be submitted by TFSS to the Reliability Coordinating Committee (RCC) for approval.

4.1 Addition of Elements to the Bulk Power System List

When application of this methodology identifies an **element** that was not part of the **bulk power system** should be classified as a **bulk power system element**, documentation of the analysis shall be presented to the TFSS. Once classification of the **element** is recommended by TFSS and approved by the RCC the **element** will be added to the NPCC **Bulk Power System List** with the appropriate comments and information. All task forces and the Compliance Committee will be notified once an **element** is approved by the RCC to be added to the **Bulk Power System List**. Within three months of an element being added to the **Bulk Power System List**, a plan and schedule for achieving compliance shall be provided to TFSP for review and acceptance. TFSP may require modifications to the proposed plan and schedule.

4.2 Removal of Elements from the Bulk Power System List

When application of this methodology identifies a **bulk power system element** that no longer should be classified as a **bulk power system element**, documentation of the analysis shall be submitted to the TFSS. If reclassification of the **element** is recommended by TFSS and approved by the RCC, the **element** will be removed from the NPCC **Bulk Power System List**.

Lead Task Force:	Task Force on Coordination of Planning
Reviewed for concurrence by:	TFSS, TFCO, TFSP, and TFIST
Review frequency:	4 years
References:	<i>Basic Criteria for Design and Operation of Interconnected Power Systems (Document A-2)</i> <i>NPCC Glossary of Terms (Document A-7)</i>