

NORTH AMERICAN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL

Princeton Forrestal Village, 116-390 Village Boulevard, Princeton, New Jersey 08540-5731

Technical Analysis of the August 14, 2003, Blackout: *What Happened, Why, and What Did We Learn?*

**Report to the NERC Board of Trustees
by the NERC Steering Group**

July 13, 2004

Acknowledgements

NERC expresses its deep gratitude to all of the people who worked on the August 14, 2003, blackout investigation. More than 100 individuals brought their expertise, dedication, and integrity to the effort and worked together tirelessly for months as a cohesive team. Many had to be away from their regular jobs and their homes for extended periods — the sacrifices are appreciated.

NERC acknowledges the strong leadership of the Steering Group, which guided the investigation on behalf of NERC. The Steering Group members are:

Paul F. Barber, Facilitator
W. Terry Boston, Tennessee Valley Authority
Mark Fidrych, Western Area Power Administration
Sam R. Jones, Electric Reliability Council of Texas
Yakout Mansour, British Columbia Transmission Corporation
M. Dale McMaster, Alberta Electric System Operator
William (Bill) K. Newman, Southern Company Services
Terry M. Winter, California ISO

David Hilt, NERC Vice President-Compliance, directed the NERC investigation. He was assisted by Gerry Cauley, Director-Standards.

The NERC investigation team leaders are worthy of special recognition for their extraordinary efforts in managing assigned portions of the investigation. It was their expertise, objectivity, and hard work that made the investigation a success. They provided the analytical insights into what happened on August 14 and why, and developed much of the material included in this final report. The team leaders making significant contributions to the final report are:

Tom Bowe, PJM Interconnection, LLC
Gary C. Bullock, Tennessee Valley Authority
Robert W. Cummings, NERC
Jeffrey E. Dagle, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Joseph H. Eto, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
Edward F. Hulls, Western Area Power Administration
T.J. (Tim) Kucey, National Energy Board
Frank Macedo, Hydro One
Carlos A. Martinez, Electric Power Group
James K. Robinson, PPL Electric Utilities
Robert B. Stuart, Pacific Gas & Electric
Vickie A. VanZandt, Bonneville Power Administration
Thomas E. Wiedman, Exelon

NERC's investigation supported the electric system working group of the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force, and the NERC teams benefited from the guidance and insights of the electric system working group co-chairs, David Meyer of the U.S. Department of Energy, Alison Silverstein of the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Tom Rusnov representing Canada. This report expands on and complements the Task Force report, and sections of this report were developed in close collaboration with the electric system working group.

More than 100 additional volunteers and the staffs of NERC and the regional reliability councils participated in the investigation. To all who helped, both named and unnamed, thank you!

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. NERC INVESTIGATION	1
	B. REPORT OVERVIEW	5
	C. KEY ENTITIES AFFECTED BY THE AUGUST 14 BLACKOUT	5
II.	CONDITIONS PRIOR TO THE START OF THE BLACKOUT SEQUENCE	11
	A. SUMMARY OF SYSTEM CONDITIONS ON AUGUST 14, 2003	11
	B. ELECTRIC DEMAND AND COMPARISONS TO HISTORICAL LEVELS	12
	C. FACILITIES OUT OF SERVICE	14
	D. POWER TRANSFERS AND COMPARISONS TO HISTORICAL LEVELS	16
	E. VOLTAGE AND REACTIVE POWER CONDITIONS PRIOR TO THE BLACKOUT	19
	F. SYSTEM FREQUENCY	25
	G. CONTINGENCY ANALYSIS OF CONDITIONS AT 15:05 EDT ON AUGUST 14	26
III.	CAUSAL EVENTS LEADING TO THE POWER SYSTEM CASCADE	27
	A. EVENT SUMMARY	27
	B. SIGNIFICANT EVENTS PRIOR TO THE START OF THE BLACKOUT	28
	C. FE COMPUTER SYSTEM FAILURES: LOSS OF SITUATIONAL AWARENESS	32
	D. THE MISO STATE ESTIMATOR IS INEFFECTIVE FROM 12:15 TO 16:04 EDT	36
	E. PRECIPITATING EVENTS: 345-kV TRANSMISSION LINE TRIPS: 15:05 TO 15:41 EDT	38
	F. LOCALIZED CASCADE OF THE 138-kV SYSTEM IN NORTHEASTERN OHIO: 15:39 TO 16:08 EDT	52
IV.	CASCADING FAILURE OF THE POWER SYSTEM	58
	A. HOW THE CASCADE EVOLVED	58
	B. TRANSMISSION SYSTEM CASCADE IN NORTHERN OHIO AND SOUTH-CENTRAL MICHIGAN	60
	C. SAMMIS-STAR 345-kV TRIP: 16:05:57 EDT	61
	D. HIGH SPEED CASCADE	68
	E. ELECTRICAL ISLANDS SEEK EQUILIBRIUM: 16:10:46 TO 16:12 EDT	84
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	94
	A. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	94
	B. CAUSAL ANALYSIS RESULTS	94
	C. OTHER DEFICIENCIES	98
	D. NERC RECOMMENDATIONS	101

Tables

TABLE II.1	SYSTEM CONDITIONS FOR THE WEEK AUGUST 11–14, 2003	14
TABLE II.2	LOADS ON AUGUST 14 COMPARED TO SUMMER 2003 AND SUMMER 2002 PEAKS	14
TABLE II.3	FE DAY-AHEAD LOAD PROJECTIONS FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 11 TO 14, 2003	14
TABLE II.4	KEY GENERATORS NOT AVAILABLE ON AUGUST 14, 2003	15
TABLE III.1	138-kV LINE TRIPS NEAR AKRON: 15:39 TO 15:58:47	54
TABLE III.2	WEST AKRON STUCK BREAKER FAILURE	54
TABLE III.3	ADDITIONAL 138-kV LINE TRIPS NEAR AKRON	55

Figures

FIGURE I.1	NERC BLACKOUT INVESTIGATION ORGANIZATION	3
FIGURE I.2	AREA AFFECTED BY THE BLACKOUT	6
FIGURE I.3	FE OPERATING AREAS.....	7
FIGURE I.4	MIDWEST RELIABILITY COORDINATORS.....	9
FIGURE II.1	AUGUST 14 TEMPERATURES IN NORTHEASTERN UNITED STATES AND EASTERN CANADA.....	13
FIGURE II.2	GENERATION, DEMAND, AND INTERREGIONAL POWER FLOWS ON AUGUST 14 AT 15:05.....	17
FIGURE II.3	AUGUST 14, 2003, NORTHEAST-CENTRAL SCHEDULED TRANSFERS COMPARED TO HISTORICAL VALUES.....	18
FIGURE II.4	IMPORTS FOR LAKE ERIE SYSTEMS	18
FIGURE II.5	HOURLY IMPORTS INTO IMO.....	19
FIGURE II.6	REPRESENTATIVE VOLTAGE PROFILE ON FE SYSTEM DURING WEEK OF AUGUST 11.....	20
FIGURE II.7	345-kV VOLTAGES IN NORTHEASTERN OHIO ON AUGUST 14, 2003	20
FIGURE II.8	WEST-TO-EAST VOLTAGE PROFILE.....	22
FIGURE II.9	NORTH-TO-SOUTH VOLTAGE PROFILE.....	22
FIGURE II.10	REACTIVE RESERVES OF REPRESENTATIVE GROUPS OF GENERATORS ON AUGUST 14, 2003.....	24
FIGURE II.11	EASTERN INTERCONNECTION FREQUENCY PLOT FOR AUGUST 14, 2003.....	25
FIGURE III.1	EASTLAKE 5 OUTPUT PRIOR TO TRIP AT 13:31 EDT	29
FIGURE III.2	INITIAL EVENTS	31
FIGURE III.3	LOCATION OF THREE LINE TRIPS	39
FIGURE III.4	JUNIPER DFR INDICATION OF TREE CONTACT FOR LOSS OF THE CHAMBERLIN- HARDING LINE.....	39
FIGURE III.5	JUNIPER DFR INDICATION OF TREE CONTACT FOR LOSS OF HANNA-JUNIPER.....	42
FIGURE III.6	LINE LOADINGS AS THE NORTHEAST OHIO 345-kV LINES TRIP.....	46
FIGURE III.7	AKRON AREA SUBSTATIONS PARTICIPATING IN LOCALIZED 138-kV CASCADE.....	53
FIGURE III.8	CLEVELAND-AKRON CUT OFF	56
FIGURE III.9	LOAD ENCROACHMENT OF SAMMIS-STAR ZONE 3 IMPEDANCE RELAY	11
FIGURE IV.1	ACCUMULATED LINE AND GENERATOR TRIPS DURING THE CASCADE	59
FIGURE IV.2	AREA AFFECTED BY THE BLACKOUT	60
FIGURE IV.3	SAMMIS-STAR 345-kV LINE TRIP 16:05:57.....	61
FIGURE IV.4	POWER FLOWS AT 16:05:57, PRIOR TO THE SAMMIS-STAR TRIP	62
FIGURE IV.5	POWER FLOWS AT 16:05:58, AFTER THE SAMMIS-STAR TRIP.....	62
FIGURE IV.6	LINE FLOWS INTO MICHIGAN	63
FIGURE IV.7	OHIO 345-kV LINES TRIP, 16:08:59 TO 16:09:07	64
FIGURE IV.8	POWER FLOWS AT 16:09:25	64
FIGURE IV.9	NEW YORK-ONTARIO LINE FLOWS AT NIAGARA.....	65
FIGURE IV.10	FIRST POWER SWING HAS VARYING IMPACTS ON NEW YORK INTERFACES.....	66
FIGURE IV.11	MICHIGAN AND OHIO POWER PLANTS TRIP OR RUN BACK	67
FIGURE IV.12	TRANSMISSION AND GENERATION TRIPS IN EASTERN MICHIGAN, 16:10:36 TO 16:10:37.....	68
FIGURE IV.13	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:37.....	69
FIGURE IV.14	FLOWS ON KEITH-WATERMAN 230-kV ONTARIO-MICHIGAN TIE LINE.....	70
FIGURE IV.15A	SIMULATED 345-kV LINE LOADINGS FROM 16:05:57 THROUGH 16:10:38.6	71
FIGURE IV.15B	SIMULATED REGIONAL INTERFACE LOADINGS FROM 16:05:57 THROUGH 16:10:38.4.....	71

FIGURE IV.16	MICHIGAN LINES TRIP AND OHIO SEPARATES FROM PENNSYLVANIA, 16:10:36 TO 16:10:38.6.....	72
FIGURE IV.17	REAL AND REACTIVE POWER AND VOLTAGE FROM ONTARIO INTO MICHIGAN.....	73
FIGURE IV.18	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:39.....	73
FIGURE IV.19	MEASURED POWER FLOWS AND FREQUENCY ACROSS REGIONAL INTERFACES, 16:10:30 TO 16:11:00, WITH KEY EVENTS IN THE CASCADE.....	75
FIGURE IV.20	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:40.....	76
FIGURE IV.21	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:41.....	76
FIGURE IV.22	CLEVELAND AND TOLEDO ISLANDED, 16:10:39 TO 16:10:46.....	78
FIGURE IV.23	GENERATORS UNDER STRESS IN DETROIT, AS SEEN FROM KEITH PSDR.....	79
FIGURE IV.24	WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA SEPARATES FROM NEW YORK, 16:10:39 TO 16:10:44.....	80
FIGURE IV.25	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:44.....	81
FIGURE IV.26	NORTHEAST SEPARATES FROM EASTERN INTERCONNECTION, 16:10:45.....	82
FIGURE IV.27	POWER FLOWS AT 16:10:45.....	82
FIGURE IV.28	PJM TO NEW YORK TIES DISCONNECT.....	83
FIGURE IV.29	NEW YORK AND NEW ENGLAND SEPARATE, MULTIPLE ISLANDS FORM.....	84
FIGURE IV.30	MEASURED POWER FLOWS AND FREQUENCY ACROSS REGIONAL INTERFACES, 16:10:45 TO 16:11:30, WITH KEY EVENTS IN THE CASCADE.....	86
FIGURE IV.31	SEPARATION OF ONTARIO AND WESTERN NEW YORK.....	89
FIGURE IV.32	ELECTRIC ISLANDS REFLECTED IN FREQUENCY PLOT.....	91
FIGURE IV.33	AREA AFFECTED BY THE BLACKOUT.....	92
FIGURE IV.34	CASCADE SEQUENCE SUMMARY.....	93

IV. Cascading Failure of the Power System

Section III described how uncorrected problems in northern Ohio developed to 16:05:57, the last point at which a cascade of line trips could have been averted. The investigation also sought to understand how and why the cascade spread and stopped as it did. This section details the sequence of events in the cascade, how and why it spread, and how it stopped in each geographic area.

The cascade spread beyond Ohio and caused a widespread blackout for three principal reasons. First, the loss of the Sammis-Star line in Ohio, following the loss of other transmission lines and weak voltages within Ohio, triggered many subsequent line trips. Second, many of the key lines that tripped between 16:05:57 and 16:10:38 operated on zone 3 impedance relays (or zone 2 relays set to operate like zone 3s), which responded to overloads rather than faults on the protected facilities. The speed at which they tripped accelerated the spread of the cascade beyond the Cleveland-Akron area. Third, the evidence indicates that the relay protection settings for the transmission lines, generators, and underfrequency load-shedding in the Northeast may not be sufficient to reduce the likelihood and consequences of a cascade, nor were they intended to do so. These issues are discussed in depth below.

This analysis is based on close examination of the events in the cascade, supplemented by dynamic simulations of the electrical phenomena that occurred. At the completion of this report, the modeling had progressed through 16:11:00, and was continuing. Thus, this section is informed and validated by modeling up until that time. Explanations after that time reflect the investigation team's best hypotheses given the available data, and may be confirmed or modified when the modeling is complete. Final modeling results will be published as a technical report at a later date.

A. How the Cascade Evolved

A series of line outages in northeastern Ohio starting at 15:05 caused heavy loadings on parallel circuits, leading to the trip and lock-out of the Sammis-Star line at 16:05:57. This was the event that triggered a cascade of line outages on the high voltage system, causing electrical fluctuations and generator trips such that within seven minutes the blackout rippled from the Cleveland-Akron area across much of the northeastern United States and Canada. By 16:13, more than 508 generating units at 265 power plants had been lost, and tens of millions of people in the United States and Canada were without electric power.

The events in the cascade started slowly, but spread quickly. Figure IV.1 illustrates how the number of lines and generators lost stayed relatively low during the Ohio phase of the blackout, but then picked up speed after 16:08:59. The cascade was complete only two-and-one-half minutes later.




Figure IV.1 — Accumulated Line and Generator Trips During the Cascade

The collapse of the FE transmission system induced unplanned shifts of power across the region. Shortly before the collapse, large (but normal) electricity flows were moving through the FE system from generators in the south (Tennessee and Kentucky) and west (Illinois and Missouri) to load centers in northern Ohio, eastern Michigan, and Ontario. Once the 345-kV and 138-kV system outages occurred in the Cleveland-Akron area, power that was flowing into that area over those lines shifted onto lines to the west and the east. The rapid increase in loading caused a series of lines within northern Ohio to trip on zone 3 impedance relays. A “ripping” effect occurred as the transmission outages propagated west across Ohio into Michigan. The initial propagation of the cascade can best be described as a series of line trips caused by sudden, steady state power shifts that overloaded other lines — a “domino” effect.

The line trips progressed westward across Ohio, then northward into Michigan, separating western and eastern Michigan, causing a 500 MW power reversal within Michigan toward Cleveland. Many of these line trips were caused by zone 3 impedance relay actions that accelerated the speed of the line trips. With paths cut from the west, a massive power surge flowed from PJM into New York and Ontario in a counter-clockwise flow around Lake Erie to serve the load still connected in eastern Michigan and northern Ohio. Transient instability began after 16:10:38, and large power swings occurred. First, a power surge of 3,700 MW flowed into Michigan across the Canadian border. Then the flow reversed by 5,800 MW within one second and peaked at 2,100 MW from Michigan to Canada. Relays on the lines between PJM and New York saw massive power swings and tripped those lines. Ontario’s east-west tie line also tripped, leaving northwestern Ontario connected to Manitoba and Minnesota.

The entire northeastern United States and eastern Ontario then became a large electrical island separated from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection. The major transmission split initially occurred along the long transmission lines across the Pennsylvania border to New York, and then proceeded into northeastern New Jersey. The resulting large electrical island, which had been importing power prior to the cascade, quickly became unstable after the massive transient swings and system separation. There was not sufficient generation on-line within the island to meet electricity demand. Systems to the south and west of the split, such as PJM, AEP, and others further away, remained intact and were mostly

unaffected by the outage. Once the Northeast split from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection, the cascade was isolated to that portion of the Interconnection.

In the final phase, after 16:10:46, the large electrical island in the northeast had less generation than load, and was unstable with large power surges and swings in frequency and voltage. As a result, many lines and generators across the disturbance area tripped, breaking the area into several electrical islands. Generation and load within most of the smaller islands were unbalanced, leading to further tripping of lines and generating units until equilibrium was established in each island. Although much of the disturbance area was fully blacked out in this process, some islands were able to reach equilibrium between generation and load without a total loss of service. For example, the island consisting of most of New England and the Maritime provinces stabilized, and generation and load returned to balance. Another island consisted of load in western New York and a small portion of Ontario, supported by some New York generation, the large Beck and Saunders plants in Ontario, and the 765-kV interconnection to Québec. These two large islands survived but other areas with large load centers collapsed into a blackout condition (Figure IV.2).




Figure IV.2 — Area Affected by the Blackout

B. Transmission System Cascade in Northern Ohio and South-Central Michigan

1. Overview

After the loss of Sammis-Star and the underlying 138-kV system, there were no large capacity transmission lines left from the south to support the significant amount of load in northern Ohio (Figure IV.3). This overloaded the transmission paths west and northwest into Michigan, causing a sequential loss of lines and power plants.




Figure IV.3 — Sammis-Star 345-kV Line Trip 16:05:57

The key events in this phase of the cascade were:

- 16:05:57: Sammis-Star 345-kV line tripped by zone 3 relay
- 16:08:59: Galion-Ohio Central-Muskingum 345-kV line tripped
- 16:09:06: East Lima-Fostoria Central 345-kV line tripped on zone 3 relay, causing a ripple of power swings through New York and Ontario into Michigan
- 16:09:08 to 16:10:27: Several power plants were lost, totaling 937 MW

C. Sammis-Star 345-kV Trip: 16:05:57 EDT

Sammis-Star did not trip due to a short circuit to ground (as did the prior 345-kV lines that tripped). Sammis-Star tripped due to protective zone 3 relay action that measured low apparent impedance (Figure III.9). There was no fault and no major power swing at the time of the trip; rather, high flows at 130 percent of the line's emergency rating, together with depressed voltages, caused the overload to appear to the protective relays as a remote fault on the system. In effect, the relay could no longer differentiate between a remote three-phase fault and conditions of high loading and low voltage. Moreover, the reactive flows (Vars) on the line were almost ten times higher than they had been earlier in the day because of the degrading conditions in the Cleveland-Akron area. The relay operated as designed.

The Sammis-Star trip completely severed the 345-kV path into northern Ohio from southeastern Ohio, triggering a new, fast-paced sequence of 345-kV transmission line trips in which each line trip placed a greater flow burden on those lines remaining in service. These line outages left only three paths for power to flow into western Ohio: (1) from northwestern Pennsylvania to northern Ohio around the south shore of Lake Erie, (2) from southwestern Ohio toward northeastern Ohio, and (3) from eastern Michigan and Ontario. The line interruptions substantially weakened northeast Ohio as a source of power to eastern

Michigan, making the Detroit area more reliant on 345-kV lines west and northwest of Detroit, and from northwestern Ohio to eastern Michigan.




Figure IV.4 — Power Flows at 16:05:57, Prior to the Sammis-Star Trip

Soon after the Sammis-Star trip, four of the five 48 MW Handsome Lake combustion turbines in western Pennsylvania tripped off-line. These units are connected to the 345-kV system by the Homer City-Wayne 345-kV line, and were operating that day as synchronous condensers to participate in PJM's spinning reserve market (not to provide voltage support). When Sammis-Star tripped and increased loadings on the local transmission system, the Handsome Lake units were close enough electrically to sense the impact and tripped off-line at 16:07:00 on under-voltage relay protection.




Figure IV.5 — Power Flows at 16:05:58, After the Sammis-Star Trip

During the period between the Sammis-Star trip and the trip of East Lima-Fostoria 345-kV line at 16:09:06.3, the system was still in a steady-state condition. Although one line after another was overloading and tripping within Ohio, this was happening slowly enough under relatively stable conditions that the system could readjust; after each line loss, power flows would redistribute across the remaining lines. This is illustrated in Figure IV.6, which shows the megawatt flows on the MECS interfaces with AEP (Ohio), FE (Ohio), and Ontario. The graph shows a shift from 150 MW of imports to 200 MW of exports from the MECS system into FE at 16:05:57 after the loss of Sammis-Star, after which this held steady until 16:08:59, when the loss of East Lima-Fostoria Central cut the main energy path from the south and west into Cleveland and Toledo. Loss of this path was significant, causing flow from MECS into FE to jump from 200 MW up to 2,300 MW, where it swung dynamically before stabilizing.




Figure IV.6 — Line Flows Into Michigan

1. Line Trips Westward across Ohio and Generator Trips in Michigan and Ohio: 16:08:59 to 16:10:27 EDT

Key events in this portion of the cascade are:

- 16:08:59: Galion-Ohio Central-Muskingum 345-kV line tripped
- 16:09:06: East Lima-Fostoria Central 345-kV line tripped, causing a large power swing from Pennsylvania and New York through Ontario to Michigan

The Muskingum-Ohio Central-Galion line tripped first at Muskingum at 16:08:58.5 on a phase-to-ground fault. The line reclosed and tripped again at 16:08:58.6 at Ohio Central. The line reclosed a second time and tripped again at Muskingum on a zone 3 relay. Finally, the line tripped and locked open at Galion on a low magnitude B Phase ground fault. After the Muskingum-Ohio Central-Galion line outage and

numerous 138-kV line trips in central Ohio, the East Lima-Fostoria Central line tripped at 16:09:06 on zone 3 relay operation due to high current and low voltage (80 percent). Modeling indicates that if automatic under-voltage load-shedding had been in place in northeastern and central Ohio, it might have been triggered at or before this point and dropped enough load to reduce or eliminate the subsequent line overloads that spread the cascade. The line trips across Ohio are shown in figure IV.7.




Figure IV.7 — Ohio 345-kV Lines Trip, 16:08:59 to 16:09:07

The tripping of the Galion-Ohio Central-Muskingum and East Lima-Fostoria Central transmission lines removed the transmission paths from southern and western Ohio into northern Ohio and eastern Michigan. Northern Ohio was connected to eastern Michigan by only three 345-kV transmission lines near the southwestern bend of Lake Erie. Thus, the combined northern Ohio and eastern Michigan load centers were left connected to the rest of the grid only by: (1) transmission lines eastward from northeastern Ohio to northwestern Pennsylvania along the southern shore of Lake Erie, and (2) westward by lines west and northwest of Detroit, Michigan, and from Michigan into Ontario (Figure IV.8).




Figure IV.8 — Power Flows at 16:09:25

Although the blackout of August 14 has been labeled by some as a voltage collapse, it was not a voltage collapse as that term has been traditionally used by power system engineers. Voltage collapse occurs when an increase in load or loss of generation or transmission facilities causes voltage to drop, which causes a further reduction in reactive power from capacitors and line charging, and still further voltage reductions. If the declines continue, these voltage reductions cause additional elements to trip, leading to further reduction in voltage and loss of load. The result is a progressive and uncontrollable decline in voltage because the power system is unable to provide the reactive power required to supply the reactive power demand. This did not occur on August 14. While the Cleveland-Akron area was short of reactive power reserves, there was sufficient reactive supply to meet the reactive power demand in the area and maintain stable albeit depressed 345-kV voltage for the outage conditions experienced from 13:31 to 15:32. This included the first forced outage at 13:31 (Eastlake 5 trip) to the third contingency at 15:32 (Hanna-Juniper trip). Only after the fourth contingency, the lockout of South Canton-Star at 15:42, did the 345-kV voltage drop below 90 percent at the Star substation.

As the cascade progressed beyond Ohio, it did not spread due to insufficient reactive power and a voltage collapse, but because of large line currents with depressed voltages, dynamic power swings when the East Lima-Fostoria Central line trip separated southern Ohio from northern Ohio, and the resulting transient instability after northern Ohio and eastern Michigan were isolated onto the Canadian system.

Figure IV.9 shows voltage levels recorded in the Niagara area. It shows that voltage levels remained stable until about 16:10:30, despite significant power fluctuations. In the cascade that followed, the voltage instability was a companion to, not a driver of, the angular instability that tripped generators and lines. A high-speed recording of 345-kV flows at Niagara Falls taken by the Hydro One recorders (shown as the lower plot in Figure IV.9), shows the impact of the East Lima-Fostoria Central and the New York-to-Ontario power swing, which continued to oscillate for more than ten seconds. Looking at the MW flow plot, it is clear that when Sammis-Star tripped, the system experienced oscillations that quickly damped out and rebalanced. But East Lima-Fostoria triggered significantly greater oscillations that worsened in magnitude for several cycles, and then dampened more slowly but continued to oscillate until the Argenta-Battle Creek trip 90 seconds later. Voltages also began to decline at that time.




Figure IV.9 — New York-Ontario Line Flows at Niagara

After the East Lima-Fostoria Central trip, power flows increased dramatically and quickly on the lines into and across southern Michigan. Although power had initially been flowing northeast out of Michigan into Ontario, that flow suddenly reversed and approximately 500 to 700 MW of power flowed southwest out of Ontario through Michigan to serve the load of Cleveland and Toledo. This flow was fed by 700 MW pulled out of PJM through New York on its 345-kV network. This was the first of several inter-area power and frequency events that occurred over the next two minutes. This was the system's response to the loss of the northwestern Ohio transmission paths, and the stress that the Cleveland, Toledo, and Detroit loads put onto the surviving lines and local generators.

The far right side of Figure IV.9 shows the fluctuations in flows and voltages at the New York-Ontario Niagara border triggered by the trips of the Argenta-Battle Creek, Argenta-Tompkins, Hampton-Pontiac, and Thetford-Jewell 345-kV lines in Michigan, and the Erie West-Ashtabula-Perry 345-kV line linking the Cleveland area to Pennsylvania. Farther south, the very low voltages on the northern Ohio transmission system made it difficult for the generation in the Cleveland and Lake Erie area to remain synchronous with southeast Michigan. Over the next two minutes, generators in this area shut down after reaching a point of no recovery as the stress level across the remaining ties became excessive.

Figure IV.10, showing metered power flows along the New York interfaces, documents how the flows heading north and west toward Detroit and Cleveland varied at three different New York interfaces. Beginning at 16:09:05, power flows jumped simultaneously across all three interfaces; but when the first power surge peaked at 16:09:09, the change in flow was highest on the PJM interface and lowest on the New England interface. Power flows increased significantly on the PJM-New York and New York-Ontario interfaces because of the redistribution of flow around Lake Erie to serve the loads in northern Ohio and eastern Michigan. The New England and Maritimes systems maintained the same generation-to-load balance and did not carry the redistributed flows because they were not in the direct path of the flows. Therefore, the New England-New York interface flows showed little response.




Figure IV.10 — First Power Swing has Varying Impacts on New York Interfaces

Before this first major power swing on the Michigan/Ontario interface, power flows in the NPCC Region (Québec, Ontario and the Maritimes, New England, and New York) were typical for the summer period and well within acceptable limits. Up until this time, transmission and generation facilities were in a secure state across the NPCC region.

2. Loss of Generation Totaling 946 MW: 16:09:08 to 16:10:27 EDT

The following generation was lost from 16:09:08 to 16:10:27 (Figure IV.11):

- 16:09:08: Michigan Cogeneration Venture (MCV) plant run back of 300 MW (from 1,263 MW to 963 MW)
- 16:09:15: Avon Lake 7 unit tripped (82 MW)
- 16:09:17: Burger 3, 4, and 5 units tripped (355 MW total)
- 16:09:23 to 30: Kinder Morgan units 3, 6, and 7 tripped (209 MW total)

The MCV plant in central Michigan experienced a 300 MW run-back. The Avon Lake 7 unit tripped due to the loss of the voltage regulator. The Burger units tripped after the 138-kV lines from the Burger 138-kV generating substation bus to substations in Ohio tripped from high reactive power flow due to the low voltages in the Cleveland area. Three units at the Kinder Morgan generating station in south-central Michigan tripped due to a transformer fault and over-excitation.




Figure IV.11 — Michigan and Ohio Power Plants Trip or Run Back

Power flows into Michigan from Indiana increased to serve loads in eastern Michigan and northern Ohio (still connected to the grid through northwest Ohio and Michigan) and voltages dropped from the imbalance between high loads and limited transmission and generation capability.

D. High Speed Cascade

Between 16:10:36 and 16:13, a period of less than a minute and a half, a chain reaction of thousands of events occurred on the grid, driven by physics and automatic equipment operations. When it was over, much of the Northeast was in the dark.

1. Transmission and Generation Trips in Michigan: 16:10:36 to 16:10:37 EDT

The following key events occurred as the cascade propagated from Ohio and sliced through Michigan:

- 16:10:36.2: Argenta-Battle Creek 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:36.3: Argenta-Tompkins 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:36.8: Battle Creek-Oneida 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:37: Sumpter Units 1, 2, 3, and 4 units tripped on under-voltage (300 MW near Detroit)
- 16:10:37.5: MCV Plant output dropped from 944 MW to 109 MW on over-current protection

Together, the above line outages interrupted the west-to-east transmission paths into the Detroit area from south-central Michigan. The Sumpter generating units tripped in response to under-voltage on the system. Michigan lines west of Detroit then began to trip, as shown in Figure IV.12.




Figure IV.12 — Transmission and Generation Trips in Eastern Michigan, 16:10:36 to 16:10:37

The Argenta-Battle Creek relay first opened the line at 16:10:36.230. The line reclosed automatically at 16:10:37, then tripped again. This line connects major generators — including the Cook and Palisades nuclear plants and the Campbell fossil plant — to the Eastern MECS system. This line is designed with auto-reclose breakers at each end of the line, which do an automatic high-speed reclose as soon as they open to restore the line to service with no interruptions. Since the majority of faults on the North

American grid are temporary, automatic reclosing can enhance stability and system reliability. However, situations can occur where the power systems behind the two ends of the line could go out of phase during the high-speed reclose period (typically less than 30 cycles, or one half second, to allow the air to de-ionize after the trip to prevent arc re-ignition). To address this and protect generators from the harm that an out-of-synchronism reconnect could cause, it is worth studying whether a synchro-check relay is needed to reclose only when the two ends of a line are within a certain voltage and phase angle tolerance. No such protection was installed at Argenta-Battle Creek. When the line reclosed, there was a 70 degree difference in phase across the circuit breaker reclosing the line. There is no evidence that the reclose harmed the local generators. Power flows following the trip of the central Michigan lines are shown in Figure IV.13.




Figure IV.13 — Power Flows at 16:10:37

2. Western and Eastern Michigan Separate: 16:10:37 to 16:10:38 EDT

The following key events occurred at 16:10:37–38:

- 16:10:38.2: Hampton-Pontiac 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:38.4: Thetford-Jewell 345-kV line tripped

After the Argenta lines tripped, the phase angle between eastern and western Michigan significantly increased. Hampton-Pontiac and Thetford-Jewell were the only lines connecting Detroit to the rest of the grid to the north and west. When these lines tripped out of service, it left the loads in Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, and their surrounding areas served only by local generation and the lines north of Lake Erie connecting Detroit east to Ontario and the lines south of Lake Erie from Cleveland east to northwestern Pennsylvania. These trips completed the separation of the high voltage transmission system between eastern and western Michigan.

Power system disturbance recorders at Keith and Lambton, Ontario, captured these events in the flows across the Ontario-Michigan interface, as shown in Figure IV.14. The plots show that the west-to-east Michigan separation (culminating with the Thetford-Jewell trip), combined a fraction of a second later with the trip of the Erie West-Ashtabula-Perry 345-kV line connecting Ohio and Pennsylvania, was the

trigger for a sudden 3,700 MW power surge from Ontario into Michigan. When Thetford-Jewell tripped, power that had been flowing into Michigan and Ohio from western Michigan, western Ohio, and Indiana was cut off. The nearby Ontario recorders saw a pronounced impact as flows into Detroit readjusted to flow in from Ontario instead.

On the boundary of northeastern Ohio and northwestern Pennsylvania, the Erie West-Ashtabula-Perry line was the last 345-kV link to the east for northern Ohio loads. When that line severed, all the power that moments before had flowed across Michigan and Ohio paths was now diverted in a counter-clockwise loop around Lake Erie through the single path left in eastern Michigan, pulling power out of Ontario, New York, and PJM.




Figure IV.14 — Flows on Keith-Waterman 230-kV Ontario-Michigan Tie Line

Figure IV.15a shows the results of modeling of line loadings on the Ohio, Michigan, and other regional interfaces for the period between 16:05:57 until the Thetford-Jewell trip; this helps to illustrate how power flows shifted during this period. Evolving system conditions were modeled for August 14, based on the 16:05:50 power flow case developed by the MAAC-ECAR-NPCC Operations Studies Working Group. Each horizontal line in the graph indicates a single or set of 345-kV lines and their loading as a function of normal ratings over time as first one, then another, set of circuits tripped out of service. In general, each subsequent line trip causes the remaining line loadings to rise. Note that Muskingum and East Lima-Fostoria Central were overloaded before they tripped, but the Michigan west and north interfaces were not overloaded before they tripped. Erie West-Ashtabula-Perry was loaded to 130 percent after the Hampton-Pontiac and Thetford-Jewell trips.

The regional interface loadings graph (Figure VI.15b) shows that loadings at the interfaces between PJM-New York, New York-Ontario, and New York-New England were well within normal ratings before the east-west Michigan separation.




Figure IV.15a — Simulated 345-kV Line Loadings From 16:05:57 Through 16:10:38.6




Figure IV.15b — Simulated Regional Interface Loadings From 16:05:57 Through 16:10:38.4

3. Large Counter-clockwise Power Surge around Lake Erie: 16:10:38.6 EDT

The following key events occurred at 16:10:38:

- 16:10:38.2: Hampton-Pontiac 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:38.4: Thetford-Jewell 345-kV line tripped
- 16:10:38.6: Erie West-Ashtabula-Perry 345-kV line tripped at Perry
- 16:10:38.6: Large power surge to serve loads in eastern Michigan and northern Ohio swept across Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York through Ontario into Michigan

Perry-Ashtabula was the last 345-kV line connecting northern Ohio to the east along the southern shore of Lake Erie. This line tripped at the Perry substation on a zone 3 relay operation and separated the northern Ohio 345-kV transmission system from Pennsylvania and all 345-kV connections. After this trip, the load centers in eastern Michigan and northern Ohio (Detroit, Cleveland, and Akron) remained connected to the rest of the Eastern Interconnection only to the north of Lake Erie at the interface between the Michigan and Ontario systems (Figure IV.16). Eastern Michigan and northern Ohio now had little internal generation left and voltage was declining. The frequency in the Cleveland area dropped rapidly, and between 16:10:39 and 16:10:50, underfrequency load shedding in the Cleveland area interrupted about 1,750 MW of load. However, the load shedding was not enough to reach a balance with local generation and arrest the frequency decline. The still-heavy loads in Detroit and Cleveland drew power over the only major transmission path remaining: the lines from eastern Michigan east into Ontario.




Figure IV.16 — Michigan Lines Trip and Ohio Separates From Pennsylvania, 16:10:36 to 16:10:38.6

At 16:10:38.6, after the 345-kV transmission paths in Michigan and Ohio tripped, the power that had been flowing at modest levels into Michigan from Ontario suddenly jumped in magnitude. While flows from Ontario into Michigan had been in the 250 to 350 MW range since 16:10:09.06, with this new surge the

flows peaked at 3,700 MW at 16:10:39 (Figure IV.17). Electricity moved along a giant loop from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection through Pennsylvania and into New York and Ontario, and then into Michigan via the remaining transmission path to serve the combined loads of Cleveland, Toledo, and Detroit (Figure IV.18). This sudden large change in power flows lowered voltages and increased current levels on the transmission lines along the Pennsylvania-New York transmission interface.




Figure IV.17 — Real and Reactive Power and Voltage From Ontario Into Michigan




Figure IV.18 — Power Flows at 16:10:39

This power surge was of such a large magnitude that frequency was not the same across the Eastern Interconnection. The power swing resulted in a rapid rate of voltage decay. Flows into Detroit exceeded 3,700 MW and 1,500 Mvar; the power surge was draining real power out of the northeast, causing voltages in Ontario and New York to drop. At the same time, local voltages in the Detroit area were plummeting because Detroit had already lost 500 MW of local generation. The electric system in the Detroit area would soon lose synchronism and black out (as evidenced by the rapid power oscillations decaying after 16:10:43).

Just before the Argenta-Battle Creek trip, when Michigan separated west-to-east at 16:10:37, almost all of the generators in the Eastern Interconnection were operating in synchronism with the overall grid frequency of 60 Hertz, but when the large swing started, those machines began to swing dynamically. After the 345-kV line trip at 16:10:38, the Northeast entered a period of transient instability and loss of generator synchronicity. Between 16:10:38 and 16:10:41, the power swings caused a sudden localized increase in system frequency, hitting 60.7 Hz at Lambton and 60.4 Hz at Niagara.

Because the demand for power in Michigan, Ohio, and Ontario was drawing on lines through New York and Pennsylvania, heavy power flows were moving northward from New Jersey over the New York tie lines to meet those power demands, exacerbating the power swing. Figure IV.19 shows actual net line flows summed across the interfaces between the main regions affected by these swings: Ontario into Michigan, New York into Ontario, New York into New England, and PJM into New York. This shows that the power swings did not move in unison across every interface at every moment, but varied in magnitude and direction. This occurred for two reasons. First, the availability of lines across each interface varied over time, as did the amount of load that drew upon each interface, so net flows across each interface were not facing consistent demand with consistent capability as the cascade progressed. Second, the speed and magnitude of the swing was moderated by the inertia, reactive power capabilities, loading conditions, and locations of the generators across the entire region.

After Cleveland was cut off from Pennsylvania and eastern power sources, Figure IV.19 also shows the start of the dynamic power swing at 16:10:38.6. Because the loads of Cleveland, Toledo, and Detroit (less the load already blacked out) were now served through Michigan and Ontario, this forced a large shift in power flows to meet that demand. As noted above, flows from Ontario into Michigan increased from 1,000 MW to a peak of 3,700 MW shortly after the start of the swing, while flows from PJM into New York were close behind (Figure IV.20). But within one second after the peak of the swing, at 16:10:40, flows reversed and flowed back from Michigan into Ontario at the same time that frequency at the interface dropped (Figure IV.21). The large load and imports into northern Ohio were losing synchronism with southeastern Michigan. Flows that had been westbound across the Ontario-Michigan interface by more than 3,700 MW at 16:10:38.8 reversed to 2,100 MW eastbound by 16:10:40, and then returned westbound starting at 16:10:40.5.




Figure IV.19 — Measured Power Flows and Frequency Across Regional Interfaces, 16:10:30 to 16:11:00, With Key Events in the Cascade



Figure IV.20 — Power Flows at 16:10:40

Two 345-kV lines tripped because of zone 1 relay action along the border between PJM and the NYISO due to the transient overloads and depressed voltage. After the separation from PJM, the dynamic surges also drew power from New England and the Maritimes. The combination of the power surge and frequency rise caused 380 MW of pre-selected Maritimes generation to trip off-line due to the operation of the New Brunswick Power “Loss of Line 3001” Special Protection System. Although this system was designed to respond to failures of the 345-kV link between the Maritimes and New England, it operated in response to the effects of the power surge. The link remained intact during the event.




Figure IV.21 — Power Flows at 16:10:41

4. Northern Ohio and Eastern Michigan Systems Degraded Further: 16:10:39 to 16:10:46 EDT

The following events occurred in northern Ohio and eastern Michigan over a period of seven seconds from 16:10:39 to 16:10:46:

Line trips in Ohio and eastern Michigan:

- 16:10:39.5: Bayshore-Monroe 345-kV line
- 16:10:39.6: Allen Junction-Majestic-Monroe 345-kV line
- 16:10:40.0: Majestic-Lemoyne 345-kV line
- Majestic 345-kV Substation: one terminal opened sequentially on all 345-kV lines
- 16:10:41.8: Fostoria Central-Galion 345-kV line
- 16:10:41.911: Beaver-Davis Besse 345-kV line

Underfrequency load shedding in Ohio:

- FirstEnergy shed 1,754 MVA load
- AEP shed 133 MVA load

Six power plants, for a total of 3,097 MW of generation, tripped off-line in Ohio:

- 16:10:42: Bay Shore Units 1–4 (551 MW near Toledo) tripped on over-excitation
- 16:10:40: Lakeshore unit 18 (156 MW, near Cleveland) tripped on underfrequency
- 16:10:41.7: Eastlake 1, 2, and 3 units (304 MW total, near Cleveland) tripped on under-frequency
- 16:10:41.7: Avon Lake unit 9 (580 MW, near Cleveland) tripped on underfrequency
- 16:10:41.7: Perry 1 nuclear unit (1,223 MW, near Cleveland) tripped on underfrequency
- 16:10:42: Ashtabula unit 5 (184 MW, near Cleveland) tripped on underfrequency

Five power plants producing 1,630 MW tripped off-line near Detroit:

- 16:10:42: Greenwood unit 1 tripped (253 MW) on low voltage, high current
- 16:10:41: Belle River unit 1 tripped (637 MW) on out-of-step
- 16:10:41: St. Clair unit 7 tripped (221 MW, DTE unit) on high voltage
- 16:10:42: Trenton Channel units 7A, 8, and 9 tripped (648 MW)
- 16:10:43: West Lorain units (296 MW) tripped on under-voltage

In northern Ohio, the trips of the Bay Shore-Monroe, Majestic-Lemoyne, Allen Junction-Majestic-Monroe 345-kV lines, and the Ashtabula 345/138-kV transformer cut off Toledo and Cleveland from the north, turning that area into an electrical island (Figure IV.22). After these 345-kV line trips, the high power imports from southeastern Michigan into Ohio suddenly stopped at 16:10:40. Frequency in this island began to fall rapidly. This caused a series of power plants in the area to trip off-line due to the operation of underfrequency relays, including the Bay Shore units. Cleveland area load was disconnected by automatic underfrequency load shedding (approximately 1,300 MW), and another 434 MW of load

was interrupted after the generation remaining within this transmission island was tripped by underfrequency relays. This sudden load drop would contribute to the reverse power swing described previously. In its own island, portions of Toledo blacked out from automatic underfrequency load shedding but most of the Toledo load was restored by automatic reclosing of lines such as the East Lima-Fostoria Central 345-kV line and several lines at the Majestic 345-kV substation.




Figure IV.22 — Cleveland and Toledo Islanded, 16:10:39 to 16:10:46

The Perry nuclear plant is located in Ohio on Lake Erie, not far from the Pennsylvania border. The Perry plant was inside the decaying electrical island and tripped soon thereafter on underfrequency, as designed. A number of other units near Cleveland tripped off-line by underfrequency protection. Voltage in the island dropped, causing the Beaver-Davis Besse 345-kV line between Cleveland and Toledo to trip. This marked the end for Cleveland, which could not sustain itself as a separate island. However, by separating from Cleveland, Toledo was able to resynchronize with the rest of the eastern inter-connection once the phase angle across the open East Lima-Fostoria 345-kV line came back within its limits and re-closed.

The large power surge into Michigan, beginning at 16:10:38, occurred when Toledo and Cleveland were still connected to the grid through Detroit. After the Bayshore-Monroe line tripped at 16:10:39, Toledo and Cleveland separated into their own island, dropping a large amount of load off of the Detroit system. This suddenly left Detroit with excess generation, much of which greatly accelerated in angle as the depressed voltage in Detroit (caused by the high demand in Cleveland) caused the Detroit units to begin to pull out of step with the rest of the grid. When voltage in Detroit returned to near-normal, the generators could not sufficiently decelerate to remain synchronous. This out-of-step condition is evident in Figure IV.23, which shows at least two sets of generator “pole slips” by plants in the Detroit area

between 16:10:40 and 16:10:42. Several large units around Detroit: Belle River, St. Clair, Greenwood, Monroe, and Fermi Nuclear all tripped in response. After the Cleveland-Toledo island formed at 16:10:40, Detroit frequency spiked to almost 61.7 Hz before dropping, momentarily equalized between the Detroit and Ontario systems. But Detroit frequency then began to decay at 2 Hz/sec and the generators experienced under-speed conditions.




Figure IV.23 — Generators Under Stress in Detroit, as Seen From Keith PSDR

Re-examination of Figure IV.19 shows the power swing from the northeast through Ontario into Michigan and northern Ohio that began at 16:10:37, and how it reverses and swings back around Lake Erie at 16:10:39. That return was caused by the combination of natural oscillation accelerated by major load losses, as the northern Ohio system disconnected from Michigan. It caused a power flow change of 5,800 MW, from 3,700 MW westbound to 2,100 eastbound across the Ontario-to-Michigan border between 16:10:39.5 and 16:10:40. Since the system was now fully dynamic, this large oscillation eastbound would lead naturally to a rebound, which began at 16:10:40 with an inflection point reflecting generation shifts between Michigan and Ontario and additional line losses in Michigan.

5. Western Pennsylvania-New York Separation: 16:10:39 to 16:10:44 EDT


The following events occurred over a five-second period from 16:10:39 to 16:10:44, beginning the separation of New York and Pennsylvania:

- 16:10:39: Homer City-Watercure Road 345-kV
- 16:10:39: Homer City-Stolle Road 345-kV
- 16:10:44: South Ripley-Erie East 230-kV, and South Ripley-Dunkirk 230-kV
- 16:10:44: East Towanda-Hillside 230-kV

Responding to the swing of power out of Michigan toward Ontario and into New York and PJM, zone 1 relays on the 345-kV lines separated Pennsylvania from New York (Figure IV.24). Homer City-

Watercure (177 miles) and Homer City-Stolle Road (207 miles) are relatively long lines with high impedances. Zone 1 relays do not have timers, and therefore operate nearly instantly when a power swing enters the relay target circle. For normal length lines, zone 1 relays have smaller target circles because the relay is measuring less than the full length of the line, but for a long line the greater impedance enlarges the relay target circle and makes it more likely to be hit by the power swing. The Homer City-Watercure and Homer City-Stolle Road lines do not have zone 3 relays.

Given the length and impedance of these lines, it was highly likely that they would trip and separate in the face of such large power swings. Most of the other interfaces between regions have shorter ties. For instance, the ties between New York and Ontario and Ontario to Michigan are only about two miles long, so they are electrically very short and thus have much lower impedance and trip less easily than these long lines. A zone 1 relay target on a short line covers a small distance so a power swing is less likely to enter the relay target circle at all, averting a zone 1 trip.



**Figure IV.24 — Western Pennsylvania Separates From New York,
16:10:39 to 16:10:44**

At 16:10:44, (see Figure IV.25) the northern part of the Eastern Interconnection (including eastern Michigan) was connected to the rest of the Interconnection at only two locations: (1) in the east through the 500-kV and 230-kV ties between New York and northeastern New Jersey, and (2) in the west through the long and electrically fragile 230-kV transmission path connecting Ontario to Manitoba and Minnesota. The separation of New York from Pennsylvania (leaving only the lines from New Jersey into New York connecting PJM to the northeast) helped to buffer PJM in part from these swings. Frequency was high in Ontario at that point, indicating that there was more generation than load, so much of this flow reversal never got past Ontario into New York.




Figure IV.25 — Power Flows at 16:10:44

6. Final Separation of the Northeast from the Eastern Interconnection: 16:10:43 to 16:10:45 EDT

The following line trips between 16:10:43 to 16:10:45 resulted in the northeastern United States and eastern Canada becoming an electrical island completely separated from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection:

- 16:10:43: Keith-Waterman 230-kV line tripped
- 16:10:45: Wawa-Marathon 230-kV lines tripped
- 16:10:45: Branchburg-Ramapo 500-kV line tripped

At 16:10:43, eastern Michigan was still connected to Ontario, but the Keith-Waterman line that forms part of that interface disconnected due to apparent impedance. This put more power onto the remaining interface between Ontario and Michigan, but triggered sustained oscillations in both power flow and frequency along the remaining 230-kV line.

At 16:10:45, northwest Ontario separated from the rest of Ontario when the Wawa-Marathon 230-kV lines (168 km long) disconnected along the northern shore of Lake Superior, tripped by zone 1 distance relays at both ends. This separation left the loads in the far northwest portion of Ontario connected to the Manitoba and Minnesota systems, and protected them from the blackout (Figure IV.26).




Figure IV.26 — Northeast Separates From Eastern Interconnection, 16:10:45




Figure IV.27 — Power Flows at 16:10:45

As shown in Figure IV.27, the 69-mile long Branchburg-Ramapo line and Ramapo transformer between New Jersey and New York was the last major transmission path remaining between the Eastern Interconnection and the area ultimately affected by the blackout. Figure IV.28 shows how that line disconnected at 16:10:45, along with other underlying 230 and 138-kV lines in northeastern New Jersey. Branchburg-Ramapo was carrying over 3,000 MVA and 4,500 amps with voltage at 79 percent before it tripped, either on a high-speed swing into zone 1 or on a direct transfer trip. The investigation team is still examining why the higher impedance 230-kV overhead lines tripped while the underground Hudson-Farragut 230-kV cables did not; the available data suggest that the lower impedance of underground cables made these less vulnerable to the electrical strain placed on the system.




Figure IV.28 — PJM to New York Ties Disconnect

This left the northeast portion of New Jersey connected to New York, while Pennsylvania and the rest of New Jersey remained connected to the rest of the Eastern Interconnection. Within northeastern New Jersey, the separation occurred along the 230-kV corridors, which are the main supply feeds into the northern New Jersey area (the two Roseland-Athenia circuits and the Linden-Bayway circuit). These circuits supply the large customer load in northern New Jersey and are a primary route for power transfers into New York City, so they are usually more highly loaded than other interfaces. These lines tripped west and south of the large customer loads in northeast New Jersey.

The separation of New York, Ontario, and New England from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection occurred due to natural breaks in the system and automatic relay operations, which performed exactly as designed. No human intervention occurred by any operators to affect this split. At this point, the Eastern Interconnection was divided into two major sections. To the north and east of the separation point lay New York City, northern New Jersey, New York state, New England, the Canadian Maritimes provinces, eastern Michigan, the majority of Ontario, and the Québec system.

The rest of the Eastern Interconnection, to the south and west of the separation boundary, was not seriously affected by the blackout. Approximately 3,700 MW of excess generation in the main portion of

the Eastern Interconnection that was on-line to export into the Northeast was now separated from the load it had been serving. This left the northeastern island with even less in-island generation on-line as it attempted to stabilize during the final phase of the cascade.

E. Electrical Islands Seek Equilibrium: 16:10:46 to 16:12 EDT

1. Overview

During the next three seconds, the islanded northern section of the Eastern Interconnection broke apart internally.

- New York-New England upstate transmission lines disconnected: 16:10:46 to 16:10:47
- New York transmission system split along Total East interface: 16:10:49
- The Ontario system just west of Niagara Falls and west of St. Lawrence separated from the western New York island: 16:10:50

Figure VI.29 illustrates the events of this phase.




Figure IV.29 — New York and New England Separate, Multiple Islands Form

A half minute later, two more separations occur:

- Southwestern Connecticut separates from New York City: 16:11:22
- Remaining transmission lines between Ontario and eastern Michigan separate: 16:11:57

By this point, most portions of the affected area were blacked out. This last phase of the cascade is principally about the search for balance between loads and generation in the various islands that have formed. The primary mechanism for reaching that balance was underfrequency load shedding (UFLS).

The following UFLS operated on the afternoon of August 14:

- Ohio shed over 1,883 MW beginning at 16:10:39
- Michigan shed a total of 2,835 MW
- New York shed a total of 10,648 MW in several steps, beginning at 16:10:48
- PJM shed a total of 1,324 MW in three steps in northern New Jersey, beginning at 16:10:48
- New England shed a total of 1,098 MW

The entire northeastern system was experiencing large scale, dynamic oscillations during this period. Even if the UFLS and generation had been perfectly balanced at any moment in time, these oscillations would have made stabilization difficult and unlikely. Figure IV.30 gives an overview of the power flows and frequencies during the period 16:10:45 through 16:11:00, capturing most of the key events in the final phase of the cascade.




Figure IV.30 — Measured Power Flows and Frequency Across Regional Interfaces, 16:10:45 to 16:11:30, With Key Events in the Cascade

After the blackout of 1965, the utilities serving New York City and neighboring northern New Jersey increased the integration between the systems serving this area to increase the flow capability into New York and improve the reliability of the system as a whole. The combination of the facilities in place and the pattern of electrical loads and flows on August 14 caused New York to be tightly linked electrically to northern New Jersey and southwestern Connecticut, and moved previously existing weak spots on the grid out past this combined load and network area.

2. New York-New England Separation: 16:10:46 to 16:10:54 EDT

Prior to New England's separation from the Eastern Interconnection at approximately 16:11, voltages became depressed due to the large power swings occurring across the interconnection while trying to feed the collapsing areas to the west. Immediately following the separation of New England and the Maritimes from the Eastern Interconnection, the Connecticut transmission system voltages went high. This was the result of capacitors remaining in service, load loss, reduced reactive losses on transmission circuits, and loss of generation to regulate the system voltage. Overvoltage protective relays operated, tripping both transmission and distribution capacitors across the Connecticut system. In addition, the load in the area of Connecticut that was still energized began to increase during the first 7–10 minutes following the initial separation as loads reconnected. This increase in load was most likely due to customers restoring process load, which tripped during transient instability. The load increase combined with the capacitors tripping resulted in the transmission voltages going from high to low within approximately five minutes. To stabilize the system, New England operators ordered all fast start generation by 16:16 and took decisive action to manually drop approximately 80 MW of load in southwest Connecticut by 16:39. They dropped another 325 MW in Connecticut and 100 MW in western Massachusetts by 16:40. These measures helped to stabilize the New England and Maritime island following their separation from the rest of the Eastern Interconnection.

Between 16:10:46 and 16:10:54, the separation between New England and New York occurred along five northern ties and seven ties within southwestern Connecticut. At the time of the east-west separation in New York at 16:10:49, New England was isolated from the eastern New York island. The only remaining tie was the PV-20 circuit connecting New England and the western New York island, which tripped at 16:10:54. Because New England was exporting to New York before the disturbance across the southwestern Connecticut tie, but importing on the Norwalk-Northport tie, the Pleasant Valley path opened east of Long Mountain (in other words, internal to southwestern Connecticut) rather than along the actual New York-New England tie. Immediately before the separation, the power swing out of New England occurred because the New England generators had increased output in response to the drag of power through Ontario and New York into Michigan and Ohio. The power swings continuing through the region caused this separation and caused Vermont to lose approximately 70 MW of load.

When the ties between New York and New England disconnected, most of New England, along with the Maritime provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, became an island with generation and demand balanced sufficiently close that it was able to remain operational. The New England system had been exporting close to 600 MW to New York, so it was relatively generation-rich and experienced continuing fluctuations until it reached equilibrium. Before the Maritimes and New England separated from the Eastern Interconnection at approximately 16:11, voltages became depressed across portions of New England and some large customers disconnected themselves automatically. However, southwestern Connecticut separated from New England and remained tied to the New York system for about one minute.

While frequency within New England fluctuated slightly and recovered quickly after 16:10:40, frequency in the New York-Ontario-Michigan-Ohio island varied severely as additional lines, loads, and generators tripped, reflecting the magnitude of the generation deficiency in Michigan and Ohio.

Due to its geography and electrical characteristics, the Québec system in Canada is tied to the remainder of the Eastern Interconnection via high-voltage DC links instead of AC transmission lines. Québec was able to survive the power surges with only small impacts because the DC connections shielded it from the frequency swings. At the same time, the DC ties into upper New York and New England served as resources to stabilize those two islands and helped keep them energized during the cascade.

3. New York Transmission Split East-West: 16:10:49 EDT

The transmission system split internally within New York along the Total East interface, with the eastern portion islanding to contain New York City, northern New Jersey, and southwestern Connecticut. The eastern New York island had been importing energy, so it did not have enough surviving generation on-line to balance load. Frequency declined quickly to below 58.0 Hz and triggered 7,115 MW of automatic UFLS. Frequency declined further, as did voltage, causing pre-designed trips at the Indian Point nuclear plant and other generators in and around New York City through 16:11:10. New York's Total East and Central East interfaces, where the New York internal split occurred, are routinely among the most heavily loaded paths in the state and are operated under thermal, voltage, and stability limits to respect their relative vulnerability and importance.

Examination of the loads and generation in the eastern New York island indicates that before 16:10:00, the area had been importing electricity and had less generation on-line than load. At 16:10:50, seconds after the separation along the Total East interface, the eastern New York area had experienced significant load reductions due to UFLS — Consolidated Edison, which serves New York City and surrounding areas, dropped more than 40 percent of its load on automatic UFLS. But at this time, the system was still experiencing dynamic conditions; as illustrated in Figure IV.31, frequency was falling, flows and voltages were oscillating, and power plants were tripping off-line. Had there been a slow islanding situation and more generation on-line, it might have been possible for the Eastern New York island to rebalance given its high level of UFLS. However, events happened so quickly and the power swings were so large that rebalancing would have been unlikely, with or without the northern New Jersey and southwestern Connecticut loads hanging onto eastern New York. This was further complicated because the high rate of change in voltages at load buses reduced the actual levels of load shed by UFLS relative to the levels needed and expected.

4. Western New York-Ontario Interface

The Ontario system separated from the western New York island just west of Niagara Falls and west of St. Lawrence at 16:10:50. This separation was due to relay operations that disconnected nine 230-kV lines within Ontario. These left most of Ontario isolated. Ontario's large Beck and Saunders hydro stations, along with some Ontario load, the NYPA Niagara and St. Lawrence hydro stations, and NYPA's 765-kV AC interconnection to their HVDC tie with Québec, remained connected to the western New York system, supporting the demand in upstate New York. From 16:10:49 to 16:10:50, frequency in Ontario declined below 59.3 Hz, initiating automatic UFLS (3,000 MW). This load shedding dropped about 12 percent of Ontario's remaining load. Between 16:10:50 and 16:10:56, the isolation of Ontario's 2,300 MW Beck and Saunders hydro units onto the western New York island, coupled with UFLS, caused the frequency in this island to rise to 63.4 Hz due to excess generation relative to the load remaining within the island. This is shown in Figure VI.31. The high frequency caused trips of five of the U.S. nuclear units within the island, and the last one tripped on the second frequency rise.




Figure IV.31 — Separation of Ontario and Western New York

Three of the 230-kV transmission circuits reclosed near Niagara automatically to reconnect Ontario to New York at 16:10:56. Even with these lines reconnected, the main Ontario island (still attached to New York and eastern Michigan) was extremely deficient in generation, so its frequency declined towards 58.8 Hz, the threshold for the second stage of UFLS. Over the next two seconds, another 19 percent of Ontario demand (4,800 MW) automatically disconnected by UFLS. At 16:11:10, these same three lines tripped a second time west of Niagara, and New York and most of Ontario separated for a final time. Following this separation, the frequency in Ontario declined to 56 Hz by 16:11:57. With Ontario still supplying 2,500 MW to the Michigan-Ohio load pocket, the remaining ties with Michigan tripped at 16:11:57. Ontario system frequency declined, leading to a widespread shutdown at 16:11:58 and a loss of 22,500 MW of load in Ontario, including the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, and Ottawa.

5. Southwest Connecticut Separated From New York City: 16:11:22 EDT

In southwestern Connecticut, when the Long Mountain-Plum Tree line (connected to the Pleasant Valley substation in New York) disconnected at 16:11:22, it left about 500 MW of demand supplied only through a 138-kV underwater tie to Long Island. About two seconds later, the two 345-kV circuits connecting southeastern New York to Long Island tripped, isolating Long Island and southwestern Connecticut, which remained tied together by the underwater Norwalk Harbor to Northport 138-kV cable. The cable tripped about 20 seconds later, causing southwestern Connecticut to black out.

6. Western New York Stabilizes

Within the western New York island, the 345-kV system remained intact from Niagara east to the Utica area, and from the St. Lawrence/Plattsburgh area south to the Utica area through both the 765-kV and 230-kV circuits. Ontario's Beck and Saunders generation remained connected to New York at Niagara and St. Lawrence, respectively, and this island stabilized with about 50 percent of the pre-event load remaining. The boundary of this island moved southeastward as a result of the reclosure of Fraser-to-Coopers Corners 345-kV at 16:11:23.

7. Eastern New York Island Splits

As a result of the severe frequency and voltage changes, many large generating units in New York and Ontario tripped off-line. The eastern island of New York, including the heavily populated areas of southeastern New York, New York City, and Long Island, experienced severe frequency and voltage decline. At 16:11:29, the New Scotland-to-Leeds 345-kV circuits tripped, separating the eastern New York island into northern and southern sections. The small remaining load in the northern portion of the eastern island (the Albany area) retained electric service, supplied by local generation until it could be resynchronized with the western New York island. The southern island, including New York City, rapidly collapsed into a blackout.

8. Remaining Transmission Lines Between Ontario and Eastern Michigan Separate: 16:11:57 EDT

Before the blackout, New England, New York, Ontario, eastern Michigan, and northern Ohio were scheduled net importers of power. When the western and southern lines serving Cleveland, Toledo, and Detroit collapsed, most of the load remained on those systems, but some generation had tripped. This exacerbated the generation/load imbalance in areas that were already importing power. The power to serve this load came through the only major path available, via Ontario. After most of IMO was separated from New York and generation to the north and east, much of the Ontario load and generation was lost; it took only moments for the transmission paths west from Ontario to Michigan to fail.

When the cascade was over at about 16:12, much of the disturbed area was completely blacked out, but isolated pockets still had service because load and generation had reached equilibrium. Ontario's large Beck and Saunders hydro stations, along with some Ontario load, the NYPA Niagara and St. Lawrence hydro stations, and NYPA's 765-kV AC interconnection to the Québec HVDC tie, remained connected to the western New York system, supporting demand in upstate New York.

Figure IV.32 shows frequency data collected by the distribution-level monitors of Softswitching Technologies, Inc. (a commercial power quality company serving industrial customers) for the area affected by the blackout. The data reveal at least five separate electrical islands in the Northeast as the cascade progressed. The two paths of red circles on the frequency scale reflect the Albany area island (upper path) versus the New York City island, which declined and blacked out much earlier.




Figure IV.32 — Electric Islands Reflected in Frequency Plot

9. Cascading Sequence Essentially Complete: 16:13 EDT

Most of the Northeast (the area shown in gray in Figure VI.33) had now blacked out. Some isolated areas of generation and load remained on-line for several minutes. Some of those areas in which a close generation-demand balance could be maintained remained operational.




Figure IV.33 — Areas Affected by the Blackout

One relatively large island remained in operation, serving about 5,700 MW of demand, mostly in western New York. Ontario's large Beck and Saunders hydro stations, along with some Ontario load, the NYPA Niagara and St. Lawrence hydro stations, and NYPA's 765-kV AC interconnection with Québec, remained connected to the western New York system, supporting demand in upstate New York. This island formed the basis for restoration in both New York and Ontario.

The entire cascade sequence is summarized graphically in figure VI.34.




Figure IV.34 — Cascade Sequence Summary

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

A. General Conclusions

The August 14 blackout had many similarities with previous large-scale blackouts, including the 1965 Northeast blackout that was the basis for forming NERC in 1968, and the July 1996 outages in the West. Common factors include: conductor contacts with trees, inability of system operators to visualize events on the system, failure to operate within known safe limits, ineffective operational communications and coordination, inadequate training of operators to recognize and respond to system emergencies, and inadequate reactive power resources.

The general conclusions of the NERC investigation are as follows:

- Several entities violated NERC operating policies and planning standards, and those violations contributed directly to the start of the cascading blackout.
- The approach used to monitor and ensure compliance with NERC and regional reliability standards was inadequate to identify and resolve specific compliance violations before those violations led to a cascading blackout.
- Reliability coordinators and control areas have adopted differing interpretations of the functions, responsibilities, authorities, and capabilities needed to operate a reliable power system.
- In some regions, data used to model loads and generators were inaccurate due to a lack of verification through benchmarking with actual system data and field testing.
- Planning studies, design assumptions, and facilities ratings were not consistently shared and were not subject to adequate peer review among operating entities and regions.
- Available system protection technologies were not consistently applied to optimize the ability to slow or stop an uncontrolled cascading failure of the power system.
- Deficiencies identified in studies of prior large-scale blackouts were repeated, including poor vegetation management, operator training practices, and a lack of adequate tools that allow operators to visualize system conditions.

B. Causal Analysis Results

This section summarizes the causes of the blackout. Investigators found that the Sammis-Star 345-kV line trip was a seminal event, after which power system failures began to spread beyond northeastern Ohio to affect other areas. After the Sammis-Star line outage at 16:05:57, the accelerating cascade of line and generator outages would have been difficult or impossible to stop with installed protection and controls. Therefore, the causes of the blackout are focused on problems that occurred before the Sammis-Star outage.

The causes of the blackout described here did not result from inanimate events, such as “the alarm processor failed” or “a tree contacted a power line.” Rather, the causes of the blackout were rooted in deficiencies resulting from decisions, actions, and the failure to act of the individuals, groups, and organizations involved. These causes were preventable prior to August 14 and are correctable. Simply put — blaming a tree for contacting a line serves no useful purpose. The responsibility lies with the organizations and persons charged with establishing and implementing an effective vegetation management program to maintain safe clearances between vegetation and energized conductors.

Each cause identified here was verified to have existed on August 14 prior to the blackout. Each cause was also determined to be both a necessary condition to the blackout occurring and, in conjunction with the other causes, sufficient to cause the blackout. In other words, each cause was a direct link in the causal chain leading to the blackout and the absence of any one of these causes could have broken that chain and prevented the blackout. This definition distinguishes causes as a subset of a broader category of identified deficiencies. Other deficiencies are noted in the next section; they may have been contributing factors leading to the blackout or may present serious reliability concerns completely unrelated to the blackout, but they were not deemed by the investigators to be direct causes of the blackout. They are still important; however, because they might have caused a blackout under a different set of circumstances.

1. Causes of the Blackout

Group 1 Causes: FE lacked situational awareness of line outages and degraded conditions on the FE system. The first five causes listed below collectively resulted in a lack of awareness by the FE system operators that line outages were occurring on the FE system and that operating limit violations existed after the trip of the Chamberlin-Harding line at 15:05 and worsened with subsequent line trips. This lack of situational awareness precluded the FE system operators from taking corrective actions to return the system to within limits, and from notifying MISO and neighboring systems of the degraded system conditions and loss of critical functionality in the control center.

Cause 1a: FE had no alarm failure detection system. Although the FE alarm processor stopped functioning properly at 14:14, the computer support staff remained unaware of this failure until the second EMS server failed at 14:54, some 40 minutes later. Even at 14:54, the responding support staff understood only that all of the functions normally hosted by server H4 had failed, and did not realize that the alarm processor had failed 40 minutes earlier. Because FE had no periodic diagnostics to evaluate and report the state of the alarm processor, nothing about the eventual failure of two EMS servers would have directly alerted the support staff that the alarms had failed in an infinite loop lockup — or that the alarm processor had failed in this manner both earlier and independently of the server failure events. Even if the FE computer support staff had communicated the EMS failure to the operators (which they did not) and fully tested the critical functions after restoring the EMS (which they did not), there still would have been a minimum of 40 minutes, from 14:14 to 14:54, during which the support staff was unaware of the alarm processor failure.

Cause 1b: FE computer support staff did not effectively communicate the loss of alarm functionality to the FE system operators after the alarm processor failed at 14:14, nor did they have a formal procedure to do so. Knowing the alarm processor had failed would have provided FE operators the opportunity to detect the Chamberlin-Harding line outage shortly after 15:05 using supervisory displays still available in their energy management system. Knowledge of the Chamberlin-Harding line outage would have enabled FE operators to recognize worsening conditions on the FE system and to consider manually reclosing the Chamberlin-Harding line as an emergency action after subsequent outages of the Hanna-Juniper and Star-South Canton 345-kV lines. Knowledge of the alarm processor failure would have allowed the FE operators to be more receptive to information being received from MISO and neighboring systems regarding degrading conditions on the FE system. This knowledge would also have allowed FE operators to warn MISO and neighboring systems of the loss of a critical monitoring function in the FE control center computers, putting them on alert to more closely monitor conditions on the FE system, although there is not a specific procedure requiring FE to warn MISO of a loss of a critical control center function. The FE operators were complicit in this deficiency by not recognizing the alarm processor failure existed, although no new alarms were received by the operators after 14:14. A period of more than 90

minutes elapsed before the operators began to suspect a loss of the alarm processor, a period in which, on a typical day, scores of routine alarms would be expected to print to the alarm logger.

Cause 1c: FE control center computer support staff did not fully test the functionality of applications, including the alarm processor, after a server failover and restore. After the FE computer support staff conducted a warm reboot of the energy management system to get the failed servers operating again, they did not conduct a sufficiently rigorous test of critical energy management system applications to determine that the alarm processor failure still existed. Full testing of all critical energy management functions after restoring the servers would have detected the alarm processor failure as early as 15:08 and would have cued the FE system operators to use an alternate means to monitor system conditions. Knowledge that the alarm processor was still failed after the server was restored would have enabled FE operators to proactively monitor system conditions, become aware of the line outages occurring on the system, and act on operational information that was received. Knowledge of the alarm processor failure would also have allowed FE operators to warn MISO and neighboring systems, assuming there was a procedure to do so, of the loss of a critical monitoring function in the FE control center computers, putting them on alert to more closely monitor conditions on the FE system.

Cause 1d: FE operators did not have an effective alternative to easily visualize the overall conditions of the system once the alarm processor failed. An alternative means of readily visualizing overall system conditions, including the status of critical facilities, would have enabled FE operators to become aware of forced line outages in a timely manner even though the alarms were non-functional. Typically, a dynamic map board or other type of display could provide a system status overview for quick and easy recognition by the operators. As with the prior causes, this deficiency precluded FE operators from detecting the degrading system conditions, taking corrective actions, and alerting MISO and neighboring systems.

Cause 1e: FE did not have an effective contingency analysis capability cycling periodically on-line and did not have a practice of running contingency analysis manually as an effective alternative for identifying contingency limit violations. Real-time contingency analysis, cycling automatically every 5–15 minutes, would have alerted the FE operators to degraded system conditions following the loss of the Eastlake 5 generating unit and the Chamberlin-Harding 345-kV line. Initiating a manual contingency analysis after the trip of the Chamberlin-Harding line could also have identified the degraded system conditions for the FE operators. Knowledge of a contingency limit violation after the loss of Chamberlin-Harding and knowledge that conditions continued to worsen with the subsequent line losses would have allowed the FE operators to take corrective actions and notify MISO and neighboring systems of the developing system emergency. FE was operating after the trip of the Chamberlin-Harding 345-kV line at 15:05, such that the loss of the Perry 1 nuclear unit would have caused one or more lines to exceed their emergency ratings.

Group 2 Cause: FE did not effectively manage vegetation in its transmission rights-of-way.

Cause 2: FE did not effectively manage vegetation in its transmission line rights-of-way. The lack of situational awareness resulting from Causes 1a–1e would have allowed a number of system failure modes to go undetected. However, it was the fact that FE allowed trees growing in its 345-kV transmission rights-of-way to encroach within the minimum safe clearances from energized conductors that caused the Chamberlin-Harding, Hanna-Juniper, and Star-South Canton 345-kV line outages. These three tree-related outages triggered the localized cascade of the Cleveland-Akron 138-kV system and the overloading and tripping of the Sammis-Star line, eventually snowballing into an uncontrolled wide-area cascade. These three lines experienced non-random, common mode failures due to unchecked tree growth. With properly cleared rights-of-way and calm weather, such

as existed in Ohio on August 14, the chances of those three lines randomly tripping within 30 minutes is extremely small. Effective vegetation management practices would have avoided this particular sequence of line outages that triggered the blackout. However, effective vegetation management might not have precluded other latent failure modes. For example, investigators determined that there was an elevated risk of a voltage collapse in the Cleveland-Akron area on August 14 if the Perry 1 nuclear plant had tripped that afternoon in addition to Eastlake 5, because the transmission system in the Cleveland-Akron area was being operated with low bus voltages and insufficient reactive power margins to remain stable following the loss of Perry 1.

Group 3 Causes: Reliability coordinators did not provide effective diagnostic support.

Cause 3a: MISO was using non-real-time information to monitor real-time operations in its area of responsibility. MISO was using its Flowgate Monitoring Tool (FMT) as an alternative method of observing the real-time status of critical facilities within its area of responsibility. However, the FMT was receiving information on facility outages from the NERC SDX, which is not intended as a real-time information system and is not required to be updated in real-time. Therefore, without real-time outage information, the MISO FMT was unable to accurately estimate real-time conditions within the MISO area of responsibility. If the FMT had received accurate line outage distribution factors representing current system topology, it would have identified a contingency overload on the Star-Juniper 345-kV line for the loss of the Hanna-Juniper 345-kV line as early as 15:10. This information would have enabled MISO to alert FE operators regarding the contingency violation and would have allowed corrective actions by FE and MISO. The reliance on non-real-time facility status information from the NERC SDX is not limited to MISO; others in the Eastern Interconnection use the same SDX information to calculate TLR curtailments in the IDC and make operational decisions on that basis. What was unique compared to other reliability coordinators on that day was MISO's reliance on the SDX for what they intended to be a real-time system monitoring tool.

Cause 3b: MISO did not have real-time topology information for critical lines mapped into its state estimator. The MISO state estimator and network analysis tools were still considered to be in development on August 14 and were not fully capable of automatically recognizing changes in the configuration of the modeled system. Following the trip of lines in the Cinergy system at 12:12 and the DP&L Stuart-Atlanta line at 14:02, the MISO state estimator failed to solve correctly as a result of large numerical mismatches. MISO real-time contingency analysis, which operates only if the state estimator solves, did not operate properly in automatic mode again until after the blackout. Without real-time contingency analysis information, the MISO operators did not detect that the FE system was in a contingency violation after the Chamberlin-Harding 345-kV line tripped at 15:05. Since MISO was not aware of the contingency violation, MISO did not inform FE and thus FE's lack of situational awareness described in Causes 1a-e was allowed to continue. With an operational state estimator and real-time contingency analysis, MISO operators would have known of the contingency violation and could have informed FE, thus enabling FE and MISO to take timely actions to return the system to within limits.

Cause 3c: The PJM and MISO reliability coordinators lacked an effective procedure on when and how to coordinate an operating limit violation observed by one of them in the other's area due to a contingency near their common boundary. The lack of such a procedure caused ineffective communications between PJM and MISO regarding PJM's awareness of a possible overload on the Sammis-Star line as early as 15:48. An effective procedure would have enabled PJM to more clearly communicate the information it had regarding limit violations on the FE system, and would have enabled MISO to be aware of those conditions and initiate corrective actions with FE.

C. Other Deficiencies

The deficiencies listed above were determined by investigators to be necessary and sufficient to cause the August 14 blackout — therefore they are labeled causes. Investigators identified many other deficiencies, which did not meet the “necessary and sufficient” test, and therefore were not labeled as causes of the blackout. In other words, a sufficient set of deficiencies already existed to cause the blackout without these other deficiencies.

However, these other deficiencies represent significant conclusions of the investigation, as many of them aggravated the enabling conditions or the severity of the consequences of the blackout. An example is the ninth deficiency listed below, regarding poor communications within the FE control center. Poor communications within the control center did not cause the blackout and the absence of those poor communications within the FE control center would not have prevented the blackout. However, poor communications in the control center was a contributing factor, because it increased the state of confusion in the control center and exacerbated the FE operators’ lack of situational awareness. The investigators also discovered a few of these deficiencies to be unrelated to the blackout but still of significant concern to system reliability. An example is deficiency number eight: FE was operating close to a voltage collapse in the Cleveland-Akron area, although voltage collapse did not initiate the sequence of events that led to the blackout.

1. Summary of Other Deficiencies Identified in the Blackout Investigation

1. **The NERC and ECAR compliance programs did not identify and resolve specific compliance violations before those violations led to a cascading blackout.** Several entities in the ECAR region violated NERC operating policies and planning standards, and those violations contributed directly to the start of the cascading blackout. Had those violations not occurred, the blackout would not have occurred. The approach used for monitoring and assuring compliance with NERC and regional reliability standards prior to August 14 delegated much of the responsibility and accountability to the regional level. Due to confidentiality considerations, NERC did not receive detailed information about violations of specific parties prior to August 14. This approach meant that the NERC compliance program was only as effective as that of the weakest regional reliability council.
2. **There are no commonly accepted criteria that specifically address safe clearances of vegetation from energized conductors.** The National Electrical Safety Code specifies in detail criteria for clearances from several classes of obstructions, including grounded objects. However, criteria for vegetation clearances vary by state and province, and by individual utility.
3. **Problems identified in studies of prior large-scale blackouts were repeated on August 14, including deficiencies in vegetation management, operator training, and tools to help operators better visualize system conditions.** Although these issues had been previously reported, NERC and some regions did not have a systematic approach to tracking successful implementation of those prior recommendations.
4. **Reliability coordinators and control areas have adopted differing interpretations of the functions, responsibilities, authorities, and capabilities needed to operate a reliable power system.** For example, MISO delegated substantial portions of its reliability oversight functions to its member control areas and did not provide a redundant set of eyes adequate for monitoring a wide-area view of reliability in its area of responsibility. Further, NERC operating policies do not specify what tools are specifically required of control areas and reliability coordinators, such as state estimation and network analysis tools, although the policies do specify the expected outcomes of analysis.

5. **In ECAR, data used to model loads and generators were inaccurate due to a lack of verification through benchmarking with actual system data and field testing.** Inaccuracies in load models and other system modeling data frustrated investigators trying to develop accurate simulations of the events on August 14. Inaccurate model data introduces potential errors in planning and operating models. Further, the lack of synchronized data recorders made the reconstruction of the sequence of events very difficult.
6. **In ECAR, planning studies, design assumptions, and facilities ratings were not consistently shared and were not subject to adequate peer review among operating entities and regions.** As a result, systems were studied and analyzed in “silos” and study assumptions and results were not always understood by neighboring systems, although those assumptions affected those other systems.
7. **Available system protection technologies were not consistently applied to optimize the ability to slow or stop an uncontrolled cascading failure of the power system.** The effects of zone 3 relays, the lack of under-voltage load shedding, and the coordination of underfrequency load shedding and generator protection are all areas requiring further investigation to determine if opportunities exist to limit or slow the spread of a cascading failure of the system.
8. **FE was operating its system with voltages below critical voltages and with inadequate reactive reserve margins.** FE did not retain and apply knowledge from earlier system studies concerning voltage collapse concerns in the Cleveland-Akron area. Conventional voltage studies done by FE to assess normal and abnormal voltage ranges and percent voltage decline did not accurately determine an adequate margin between post-contingency voltage and the voltage collapse threshold at various locations in their system. If FE had conducted voltage stability analyses using well-established P-V and Q-V techniques, FE would have detected insufficient dynamic reactive reserves at various locations in their system for the August 14 operating scenario that includes the Eastlake 5 outage. Additionally, FE’s stated acceptable ranges for voltage are not compatible with neighboring systems or interconnected systems in general. FE was operating in apparent violation of its own historical planning and operating criteria that were developed and used by Centerior Energy Corporation (The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and the Toledo Edison Company) prior to 1998 to meet the relevant NERC and ECAR standards and criteria. In 1999, FE reduced its operating voltage lower limits in the Cleveland-Akron area compared to those criteria used in prior years. These reduced minimum operating voltage limits were disclosed in FE’s 1999–2003 Planning & Operating Criteria Form 715 submittal to FERC, but were not challenged at the time.
9. **FE did not have an effective protocol for sharing operator information within the control room and with others outside the control room.** FE did not have an effective plan for communications in the control center during a system emergency. Communications within the control center and with others outside the control center were confusing and hectic. The communications were not effective in helping the operators focus on the most urgent problem in front of them — the emerging system and computer failures.
10. **FE did not have an effective generation redispatch plan and did not have sufficient redispatch resources to relieve overloaded transmission lines supplying northeastern Ohio.** Following the loss of the Chamberlin-Harding 345-kV line, FE had a contingency limit violation but did not have resources available for redispatch to effectively reduce the contingency overload within 30 minutes.
11. **FE did not have an effective load reduction plan and did not have an adequate load reduction capability, whether automatic or manual, to relieve overloaded transmission lines**

supplying northeastern Ohio. A system operator is required to have adequate resources to restore the system to a secure condition within 30 minutes or less of a contingency. Analysis shows that shedding 2,000 MW of load in the Cleveland-Akron area after the loss of the Star-South Canton 345-kV line or shedding 2,500 after the West Akron Substation 138-kV bus failure could have halted the cascade in the northeastern Ohio area.

- 12. FE did not adequately train its operators to recognize and respond to system emergencies, such as multiple contingencies.** The FE operators did not recognize the information they were receiving as clear indications of an emerging system emergency. Even when the operators grasped the idea that their computer systems had failed and the system was in trouble, the operators did not formally declare a system emergency and inform MISO and neighboring systems.
- 13. FE did not have the ability to transfer control of its power system to an alternate center or authority during system emergencies.** FE had not arranged for a backup control center or backup system control and monitoring functions. A typical criterion would include the need to evacuate the control center due to fire or natural disaster. Although control center evacuation was not required on August 14, FE had an equivalent situation with the loss of its critical monitoring and control functionality in the control center.
- 14. FE operational planning and system planning studies were not sufficiently comprehensive to ensure reliability because they did not include a full range of sensitivity studies based on the 2003 Summer Base Case.** A comprehensive range of planning studies would have involved analyses of all operating scenarios likely to be encountered, including those for unusual operating conditions and potential disturbance scenarios.
- 15. FE did not perform adequate hour-ahead operations planning studies after Eastlake 5 tripped off-line at 13:31 to ensure that FE could maintain a 30-minute response capability for the next contingency.** The FE system was not within single contingency limits from 15:06 to 16:06. In addition to day-ahead planning, the system should have been restudied after the forced outage of Eastlake 5.
- 16. FE did not perform adequate day-ahead operations planning studies to ensure that FE had adequate resources to return the system to within contingency limits following the possible loss of their largest unit, Perry 1.** After Eastlake 4 was forced out on August 13, the operational plan was not modified for the possible loss of the largest generating unit, Perry 1.
- 17. FE did not have or use specific criteria for declaring a system emergency.**
- 18. ECAR and MISO did not precisely define “critical facilities” such that the 345-kV lines in FE that caused a major cascading failure would have to be identified as critical facilities for MISO.** MISO’s procedure in effect on August 14 was to request FE to identify critical facilities on its system to MISO.
- 19. MISO did not have additional monitoring tools that provided high-level visualization of the system.** A high-level monitoring tool, such as a dynamic map board, would have enabled MISO operators to view degrading conditions in the FE system.
- 20. ECAR and its member companies did not adequately follow ECAR Document 1 to conduct regional and interregional system planning studies and assessments.** This would have

enabled FE to further develop specific operating limits of their critical interfaces by assessing the effects of power imports and exports, and regional and interregional power transfers.

- 21. ECAR did not have a coordinated procedure to develop and periodically review reactive power margins.** This would have enabled all member companies to establish maximum power transfer levels and minimum operating voltages to respect these reactive margins.
- 22. Operating entities and reliability coordinators demonstrated an over-reliance on the administrative levels of the TLR procedure to remove contingency and actual overloads, when emergency redispatch of other emergency actions were necessary.** TLR is a market-based congestion relief procedure and is not intended for removing an actual violation in real-time.
- 23. Numerous control areas in the Eastern Interconnection, including FE, were not correctly tagging dynamic schedules, resulting in large mismatches between actual, scheduled, and tagged interchange on August 14.** This prevented reliability coordinators in the Eastern Interconnection from predicting and modeling the effects of these transactions on the grid.

D. Blackout Recommendations

1. NERC Recommendations Approved February 10, 2004

On February 10, 2004, the NERC Board of Trustees approved 14 recommendations offered by the NERC Steering Group to address the causes of the August 14 blackout and other deficiencies. These recommendations remain valid and applicable to the conclusions of this final report. The recommendations fall into three categories:

Actions to Remedy Specific Deficiencies: Specific actions directed to FE, MISO, and PJM to correct the deficiencies that led to the blackout.

- Correct the direct causes of the August 14, 2003, blackout.

Strategic Initiatives: Strategic initiatives by NERC and the regional reliability councils to strengthen compliance with existing standards and to formally track completion of recommended actions from August 14, and other significant power system events.

- Strengthen the NERC Compliance Enforcement Program.
- Initiate control area and reliability coordinator reliability readiness audits.
- Evaluate vegetation management procedures and results.
- Establish a program to track implementation of recommendations.

Technical Initiatives: Technical initiatives to prevent or mitigate the impacts of future cascading blackouts.

- Improve operator and reliability coordinator training.
- Evaluate reactive power and voltage control practices.
- Improve system protection to slow or limit the spread of future cascading outages.

- Clarify reliability coordinator and control area functions, responsibilities, capabilities, and authorities.
- Establish guidelines for real-time operating tools.
- Evaluate lessons learned during system restoration.
- Install additional time-synchronized recording devices as needed.
- Reevaluate system design, planning, and operating criteria.
- Improve system modeling data and data exchange practices.

2. U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force Recommendations

On April 5, 2004, the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force issued its final report of the August 14 blackout containing its 46 recommendations. The recommendations were grouped into four areas:

Group 1: Institutional Issues Related to Reliability (Recommendations 1–14)

Group 2: Support and Strengthen NERC's Actions of February 10, 2004 (Recommendations 15–31)

Group 3: Physical and Cyber Security of North American Bulk Power Systems (Recommendations 32–44)

Group 4: Canadian Nuclear Power Sector (Recommendations 45–46)

The investigation team is encouraged by the recommendations of the Task Force and believes these recommendations are consistent with the conclusions of the NERC investigation. Although the NERC investigation has focused on a technical analysis of the blackout, the policy recommendations in Group 1 appear to support many of NERC's findings regarding the need for legislation for enforcement of mandatory reliability standards. In other recommendations, the Task Force seeks to strengthen compliance enforcement and other NERC functions by advancing reliability policies at the federal, state, and provincial levels.

The second group of Task Force recommendations builds upon the original fourteen NERC recommendations approved in February 2004. NERC has considered these expanded recommendations, is implementing these recommendations where appropriate, and will inform the Task Force if additional considerations make any recommendation inappropriate or impractical.

The third group of Task Force recommendations addresses critical infrastructure protection issues. NERC agrees with the conclusions of the Task Force (Final Task Force report, page 132) that there is “no evidence that a malicious cyber attack was a direct or indirect cause of the August 14, 2003, power outage.” The recommendations of the Task Force report are forward-looking and address issues that should be considered, whether or not there had been a blackout on August 14. NERC has assigned its Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee to evaluate these recommendations and report what actions, if any, NERC should take to implement those recommendations.

The fourth group of recommendations is specific to Canadian nuclear facilities and is outside the scope of NERC responsibilities.

Additional NERC Recommendations

While the ongoing NERC investigation has confirmed the validity of the original fourteen NERC recommendations and the NERC Steering Group concurs with the Task Force's recommendations, four

additional NERC recommendations resulted from further investigation since February and in consideration of the Task Force final report. The additional NERC recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation 4d — Develop a standard on vegetation clearances.

The Planning Committee, working with the Standards Authorization Committee, shall develop a measurable standard that specifies the minimum clearances between energized high voltage lines and vegetation. Appropriate criteria from the National Electrical Safety Code, or other appropriate code, should be adapted and interpreted so as to be applicable to vegetation.

Recommendation 15 — Develop a standing capability for NERC to investigate future blackouts and disturbances.

NERC shall develop and be prepared to implement a NERC standing procedure for investigating future blackouts and system disturbances. Many of the methods, tools, and lessons from the investigation of the August 14 blackout are appropriate for adoption.

Recommendation 16 — Accelerate the standards transition.

NERC shall accelerate the transition from existing operating policies, planning standards, and compliance templates to a clear and measurable set of reliability standards. (This recommendation is consistent with the Task Force recommendation 25.)

Recommendation 17 — Evaluate NERC actions in the areas of cyber and physical security

The Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee shall evaluate the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force's Group III recommendations to determine if any actions are needed by NERC and report a proposed action plan to the board.

Action Plan

NERC will develop a mechanism to track all of the NERC, Task Force, and other reliability recommendations resulting from subsequent investigations of system disturbances and compliance reviews. Details of that plan are outside the scope of this report.

3. Complete Set of NERC Recommendations

This section consolidates all NERC recommendations, including the initial 14 recommendations approved in February 2004 and the four additional recommendations described above, into a single place.

Recommendation 1: Correct the Direct Causes of the August 14, 2003, Blackout.

The principal causes of the blackout were that FE did not maintain situational awareness of conditions on its power system and did not adequately manage tree growth in its transmission rights-of-way. Contributing factors included ineffective diagnostic support provided by MISO as the reliability coordinator for FE and ineffective communications between MISO and PJM.

NERC has taken immediate actions to ensure that the deficiencies that were directly causal to the August 14 blackout are corrected. These steps are necessary to assure electricity customers, regulators, and others with an interest in the reliable delivery of electricity that the power system is being operated in a manner that is safe and reliable, and that the specific causes of the August 14 blackout have been identified and fixed.

Recommendation 1a: FE, MISO, and PJM shall each complete the remedial actions designated in Attachment A for their respective organizations and certify to the NERC board no later than June 30, 2004, that these specified actions have been completed. Furthermore, each organization shall present its detailed plan for completing these actions to the NERC committees for technical review on March 23–24, 2004, and to the NERC board for approval no later than April 2, 2004.

Recommendation 1b: The NERC Technical Steering Committee shall immediately assign a team of experts to assist FE, MISO, and PJM in developing plans that adequately address the issues listed in Attachment A, and other remedial actions for which each entity may seek technical assistance.

Recommendation 2: Strengthen the NERC Compliance Enforcement Program.

NERC's analysis of the actions and events leading to the August 14 blackout leads it to conclude that several violations of NERC operating policies contributed directly to an uncontrolled, cascading outage on the Eastern Interconnection. NERC continues to investigate additional violations of NERC and regional reliability standards and will issue a final report of those violations once the investigation is complete.

In the absence of enabling legislation in the United States and complementary actions in Canada and Mexico to authorize the creation of an electric reliability organization, NERC lacks legally sanctioned authority to enforce compliance with its reliability rules. However, the August 14 blackout is a clear signal that voluntary compliance with reliability rules is no longer adequate. NERC and the regional reliability councils must assume firm authority to measure compliance, to more transparently report significant violations that could risk the integrity of the interconnected power system, and to take immediate and effective actions to ensure that such violations are corrected. Although all violations are important, a significant violation is one that could directly reduce the integrity of the interconnected power systems or otherwise cause unfavorable risk to the interconnected power systems. By contrast, a violation of a reporting or administrative requirement would not by itself generally be considered a significant violation.

Recommendation 2a: Each regional reliability council shall report to the NERC Compliance Enforcement Program within one month of occurrence all significant violations of NERC operating policies and planning standards and regional standards, whether verified or still under investigation. Such reports shall confidentially note details regarding the nature and potential reliability impacts of the alleged violations and the identity of parties involved. Additionally, each regional reliability council shall report quarterly to NERC, in a format prescribed by NERC, all violations of NERC and regional reliability council standards.

Recommendation 2b: When presented with the results of the investigation of any significant violation, and with due consideration of the surrounding facts and circumstances, the NERC board shall require an offending organization to correct the violation within a specified time. If the board determines that an offending organization is non-responsive and continues to cause a risk to the reliability of the interconnected power systems, the board will seek to remedy the violation by requesting assistance of the appropriate regulatory authorities in the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Recommendation 2c: The Planning and Operating Committees, working in conjunction with the Compliance Enforcement Program, shall review and update existing approved and draft compliance templates applicable to current NERC operating policies and planning standards; and submit any revisions or new templates to the board for approval no later than March 31, 2004. To expedite this task, the NERC President shall immediately form a Compliance Template Task Force

comprised of representatives of each committee. The Compliance Enforcement Program shall issue the board-approved compliance templates to the regional reliability councils for adoption into their compliance monitoring programs.

This effort will make maximum use of existing approved and draft compliance templates in order to meet the aggressive schedule. The templates are intended to include all existing NERC operating policies and planning standards but can be adapted going forward to incorporate new reliability standards as they are adopted by the NERC board for implementation in the future.

Recommendation 2d: The NERC Compliance Enforcement Program and ECAR shall, within three months of the issuance of the final report from the Compliance and Standards investigation team, evaluate violations of NERC and regional standards, as compared to previous compliance reviews and audits for the applicable entities, and develop recommendations to improve the compliance process.

Recommendation 3: Initiate Control Area and Reliability Coordinator Reliability Readiness Audits.

In conducting its investigation, NERC found that deficiencies in control area and reliability coordinator capabilities to perform assigned reliability functions contributed to the August 14 blackout. In addition to specific violations of NERC and regional standards, some reliability coordinators and control areas were deficient in the performance of their reliability functions and did not achieve a level of performance that would be considered acceptable practice in areas such as operating tools, communications, and training. In a number of cases, there was a lack of clarity in the NERC policies with regard to what is expected of a reliability coordinator or control area. Although the deficiencies in the NERC policies must be addressed (see Recommendation 9), it is equally important to recognize that standards cannot prescribe all aspects of reliable operation and that minimum standards present a threshold, not a target for performance. Reliability coordinators and control areas must perform well, particularly under emergency conditions, and at all times strive for excellence in their assigned reliability functions and responsibilities.

Recommendation 3a: The NERC Compliance Enforcement Program and the regional reliability councils shall jointly establish a program to audit the reliability readiness of all reliability coordinators and control areas, with immediate attention given to addressing the deficiencies identified in the August 14 blackout investigation. Audits of all control areas and reliability coordinators shall be completed within three years and continue in a three-year cycle. The 20 highest priority audits, as determined by the Compliance Enforcement Program, will be completed by June 30, 2004.

Recommendation 3b: NERC will establish a set of baseline audit criteria to which regional criteria may be added. The control area requirements will be based on the existing NERC Control Area Certification Procedure. Reliability coordinator audits will include evaluation of reliability plans, procedures, processes, tools, personnel qualifications, and training. In addition to reviewing written documents, the audits will carefully examine the actual practices and preparedness of control areas and reliability coordinators.

Recommendation 3c: The reliability regions, with the oversight and direct participation of NERC, will audit each control area's and reliability coordinator's readiness to meet these audit criteria. FERC and other relevant regulatory agencies will be invited to participate in the audits, subject to the same confidentiality conditions as the other members of the audit teams.

Recommendation 4: Evaluate Vegetation Management Procedures and Results.

Ineffective vegetation management was a major cause of the August 14 blackout and also contributed to other historical large-scale blackouts, like the one that occurred on July 2–3, 1996, in the West. Maintaining transmission line rights-of-way (ROW), including maintaining safe clearances of energized lines from vegetation, under-build, and other obstructions incurs a substantial ongoing cost in many areas of North America. However, it is an important investment for assuring a reliable electric system. Vegetation, such as the trees that caused the initial line trips in FE that led to the August 14, 2003, outage is not the only type of obstruction that can breach the safe clearance distances from energized lines. Other examples include under-build of telephone and cable TV lines, train crossings, and even nests of certain large bird species.

NERC does not presently have standards for ROW maintenance. Standards on vegetation management are particularly challenging given the great diversity of vegetation and growth patterns across North America. However, NERC's standards do require that line ratings are calculated so as to maintain safe clearances from all obstructions. Furthermore, in the United States, the National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) Rules 232, 233, and 234 detail the minimum vertical and horizontal safety clearances of overhead conductors from grounded objects and various types of obstructions. NESC Rule 218 addresses tree clearances by simply stating, "Trees that may interfere with ungrounded supply conductors should be trimmed or removed." Several states have adopted their own electrical safety codes and similar codes apply in Canada.

Recognizing that ROW maintenance requirements vary substantially depending on local conditions, NERC will focus attention on measuring performance as indicated by the number of high-voltage line trips caused by vegetation. This approach has worked well in the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (WECC) since being instituted after the 1996 outages.

Recommendation 4a: NERC and the regional reliability councils shall jointly initiate a program to report all bulk electric system transmission line trips resulting from vegetation contact. The program will use the successful WECC vegetation monitoring program as a model.

A line trip includes a momentary opening and reclosing of the line, a lock out, or a combination. For reporting purposes, all vegetation-related openings of a line occurring within one 24-hour period should be considered one event. Trips known to be caused by severe weather or other natural disaster such as earthquake are excluded. Contact with vegetation includes both physical contact and arcing due to insufficient clearance.

All transmission lines operating at 230-kV and higher voltage, and any other lower voltage lines designated by the regional reliability council to be critical to the reliability of the bulk electric system, shall be included in the program.

Recommendation 4b: Beginning with an effective date of January 1, 2004, each transmission operator will submit an annual report of all vegetation-related high-voltage line trips to its respective reliability region. Each region shall assemble a detailed annual report of vegetation-related line trips in the region to NERC no later than March 31 for the preceding year, with the first reporting to be completed by March 2005 for calendar year 2004.

Vegetation management practices, including inspection and trimming requirements, can vary significantly with geography. Nonetheless, the events of August 14 and prior outages point to the need for independent verification that viable programs exist for ROW maintenance and that the programs are being followed.

Recommendation 4c: Each bulk electric transmission owner shall make its vegetation management procedure, and documentation of work completed, available for review and verification upon request by the applicable regional reliability council, NERC, or applicable federal, state, or provincial regulatory agency.

(NEW) Recommendation 4d: The Planning Committee, working with the Standards Authorization Committee, shall develop a measurable standard that specifies the minimum clearances between energized high voltage lines and vegetation. Appropriate criteria from the National Electrical Safety Code, or other appropriate code, should be adapted and interpreted so as to be applicable to vegetation.

Recommendation 5: Establish a Program to Track Implementation of Recommendations.

The August 14 blackout shared a number of contributing factors with prior large-scale blackouts, including:

- Conductors contacting trees
- Ineffective visualization of power system conditions and lack of situational awareness
- Ineffective communications
- Lack of training in recognizing and responding to emergencies
- Insufficient static and dynamic reactive power supply
- Need to improve relay protection schemes and coordination

It is important that recommendations resulting from system outages be adopted consistently by all regions and operating entities, not just those directly affected by a particular outage. Several lessons learned prior to August 14, if heeded, could have prevented the outage. WECC and NPCC, for example, have programs that could be used as models for tracking completion of recommendations. NERC and some regions have not adequately tracked completion of recommendations from prior events to ensure they were consistently implemented.

Recommendation 5a: NERC and each regional reliability council shall establish a program for documenting completion of recommendations resulting from the August 14 blackout and other historical outages, as well as NERC and regional reports on violations of reliability standards, results of compliance audits, and lessons learned from system disturbances.

Regions shall report quarterly to NERC on the status of follow-up actions to address recommendations, lessons learned, and areas noted for improvement. NERC staff shall report both NERC activities and a summary of regional activities to the board.

Recommendation 5b: NERC shall by January 1, 2005, establish a reliability performance monitoring function to evaluate and report bulk electric system reliability performance.

Assuring compliance with reliability standards, evaluating the reliability readiness of reliability coordinators and control areas, and assuring recommended actions are achieved will be effective steps in reducing the chances of future large-scale outages. However, it is important for NERC to also adopt a process for continuous learning and improvement by seeking continuous feedback on reliability performance trends, and not rely mainly on learning from and reacting to catastrophic failures.

Such a function would assess large-scale outages and near misses to determine root causes and lessons learned, similar to the August 14 blackout investigation. This function would incorporate the current Disturbance Analysis Working Group and expand that work to provide more proactive feedback to the NERC board regarding reliability performance. This program would also gather and analyze reliability performance statistics to inform the board of reliability trends. This function could develop procedures and capabilities to initiate investigations in the event of future large-scale outages or disturbances. Such procedures and capabilities would be shared between NERC and the regional reliability councils for use as needed, with NERC and regional investigation roles clearly defined in advance.

Recommendation 6: Improve Operator and Reliability Coordinator Training.

The investigation found that some reliability coordinators and control area operators had not received adequate training in recognizing and responding to system emergencies. Most notable was the lack of realistic simulations and drills for training and verifying the capabilities of operating personnel. This training deficiency contributed to the lack of situational awareness and failure to declare an emergency when operator intervention was still possible prior to the high-speed portion of the sequence of events.

Recommendation 6: All reliability coordinators, control areas, and transmission operators shall provide at least five days per year of training and drills in system emergencies, using realistic simulations, for each staff person with responsibility for the real-time operation or reliability monitoring of the bulk electric system. This system emergency training is in addition to other training requirements. Five days of system emergency training and drills are to be completed prior to June 30, 2004, with credit given for documented training already completed since July 1, 2003. Training documents, including curriculum, training methods, and individual training records, are to be available for verification during reliability readiness audits.

The term “realistic simulations” includes a variety of tools and methods that present operating personnel with situations to improve and test diagnostic and decision-making skills in an environment that resembles expected conditions during a particular type of system emergency. Although a full replica training simulator is one approach, lower cost alternatives such as PC-based simulators, tabletop drills, and simulated communications can be effective training aids if used properly.

NERC has published Continuing Education Criteria specifying appropriate qualifications for continuing education providers and training activities.

In the longer term, the NERC Personnel Certification Governance Committee (PCGC), which is independent of the NERC board, should explore expanding the certification requirements of system operating personnel to include additional measures of competency in recognizing and responding to system emergencies. The current NERC certification examination is a written test of the NERC Operating Manual and other references relating to operator job duties, and is not by itself intended to be a complete demonstration of competency to handle system emergencies.

Recommendation 7: Evaluate Reactive Power and Voltage Control Practices.

The blackout investigation identified inconsistent practices in northeastern Ohio with regard to the setting and coordination of voltage limits and insufficient reactive power supply. Although the deficiency of reactive power supply in northeastern Ohio did not directly cause the blackout, it was a contributing factor.

Planning Standard II.B.S1 requires each regional reliability council to establish procedures for generating equipment data verification and testing, including reactive power capability. Planning Standard III.C.S1

requires that all synchronous generators connected to the interconnected transmission systems shall be operated with their excitation system in the automatic voltage control mode unless approved otherwise by the transmission system operator. S2 of this standard also requires that generators shall maintain a network voltage or reactive power output as required by the transmission system operator within the reactive capability of the units.

On one hand, the unsafe conditions on August 14 with respect to voltage in northeastern Ohio can be said to have resulted from violations of NERC planning criteria for reactive power and voltage control, and those violations should have been identified through the NERC and ECAR compliance monitoring programs (addressed by Recommendation 2). On the other hand, investigators believe reactive power and voltage control deficiencies noted on August 14 are also symptomatic of a systematic breakdown of the reliability studies and practices in FE and the ECAR region. As a result, unsafe voltage criteria were set and used in study models and operations. There were also issues identified with reactive characteristics of loads, as addressed in Recommendation 14.

Recommendation 7a: The Planning Committee shall reevaluate within one year the effectiveness of the existing reactive power and voltage control standards and how they are being implemented in practice in the ten NERC regions. Based on this evaluation, the Planning Committee shall recommend revisions to standards or process improvements to ensure voltage control and stability issues are adequately addressed.

Recommendation 7b: ECAR shall, no later than June 30, 2004, review its reactive power and voltage criteria and procedures, verify that its criteria and procedures are being fully implemented in regional and member studies and operations, and report the results to the NERC board.

Recommendation 8: Improve System Protection to Slow or Limit the Spread of Future Cascading Outages.

The importance of automatic control and protection systems in preventing, slowing, or mitigating the impact of a large-scale outage cannot be stressed enough. To underscore this point, following the trip of the Sammis-Star line at 4:06, the cascading failure into parts of eight states and two provinces, including the trip of over 500 generating units and over 400 transmission lines, was completed in the next eight minutes. Most of the event sequence, in fact, occurred in the final 12 seconds of the cascade. Likewise, the July 2, 1996, failure took less than 30 seconds and the August 10, 1996, failure took only five minutes. It is not practical to expect operators will always be able to analyze a massive, complex system failure and to take the appropriate corrective actions in a matter of a few minutes. The NERC investigators believe that two measures would have been crucial in slowing or stopping the uncontrolled cascade on August 14:

- Better application of zone 3 impedance relays on high-voltage transmission lines
- Selective use of under-voltage load shedding.

First, beginning with the Sammis-Star line trip, many of the remaining line trips during the cascade phase were the result of the operation of a zone 3 relay for a perceived overload (a combination of high amperes and low voltage) on the protected line. If used, zone 3 relays typically act as an overreaching backup to the zone 1 and 2 relays, and are not intentionally set to operate on a line overload. However, under extreme conditions of low voltages and large power swings as seen on August 14, zone 3 relays can operate for overload conditions and propagate the outage to a wider area by essentially causing the system to “break up”. Many of the zone 3 relays that operated during the August 14 cascading outage were not set with adequate margins above their emergency thermal ratings. For the short times involved, thermal

heating is not a problem and the lines should not be tripped for overloads. Instead, power system protection devices should be set to address the specific condition of concern, such as a fault, out-of-step condition, etc., and should not compromise a power system's inherent physical capability to slow down or stop a cascading event.

Recommendation 8a: All transmission owners shall, no later than September 30, 2004, evaluate the zone 3 relay settings on all transmission lines operating at 230-kV and above for the purpose of verifying that each zone 3 relay is not set to trip on load under extreme emergency conditions. In each case that a zone 3 relay is set so as to trip on load under extreme conditions, the transmission operator shall reset, upgrade, replace, or otherwise mitigate the overreach of those relays as soon as possible and on a priority basis, but no later than December 31, 2005. Upon completing analysis of its application of zone 3 relays, each transmission owner may, no later than December 31, 2004, submit justification to NERC for applying zone 3 relays outside of these recommended parameters. The Planning Committee shall review such exceptions to ensure they do not increase the risk of widening a cascading failure of the power system.

The investigation team recommends that the zone 3 relay, if used, should not operate at or below 150 percent of the emergency ampere rating of a line, assuming a .85 per unit voltage and a line phase angle of 30 degrees.

A second key conclusion with regard to system protection was that if an automatic under-voltage load shedding scheme had been in place in the Cleveland-Akron area on August 14, there is a high probability the outage could have been limited to that area.

Recommendation 8b: Each regional reliability council shall complete an evaluation of the feasibility and benefits of installing under-voltage load shedding capability in load centers within the region that could become unstable as a result of being deficient in reactive power following credible multiple-contingency events. The regions are to complete the initial studies and report the results to NERC within one year. The regions are requested to promote the installation of under-voltage load shedding capabilities within critical areas, as determined by the studies to be effective in preventing an uncontrolled cascade of the power system.

The NERC investigation of the August 14 blackout has identified additional transmission and generation control and protection issues requiring further analysis. One concern is that generating unit control and protection schemes need to consider the full range of possible extreme system conditions, such as the low voltages and low and high frequencies experienced on August 14. The team also noted that improvements may be needed in underfrequency load shedding and its coordination with generator under and over-frequency protection and controls.

Recommendation 8c: The Planning Committee shall evaluate Planning Standard III — System Protection and Control and propose within one year specific revisions to the criteria to adequately address the issue of slowing or limiting the propagation of a cascading failure. The board directs the Planning Committee to evaluate the lessons from August 14 regarding relay protection design and application and offer additional recommendations for improvement.

Recommendation 9: Clarify Reliability Coordinator and Control Area Functions, Responsibilities, Capabilities, and Authorities.

Ambiguities in the NERC operating policies may have allowed entities involved in the August 14 blackout to make different interpretations regarding the functions, responsibilities, capabilities, and

authorities of reliability coordinators and control areas. Characteristics and capabilities necessary to enable prompt recognition and effective response to system emergencies must be specified.

The lack of timely and accurate outage information resulted in degraded performance of state estimator and reliability assessment functions on August 14. There is a need to review options for sharing of outage information in the operating time horizon (e.g., 15 minutes or less), so as to ensure the accurate and timely sharing of outage data necessary to support real-time operating tools such as state estimators, real-time contingency analysis, and other system monitoring tools.

On August 14, reliability coordinator and control area communications regarding conditions in northeastern Ohio were ineffective, and in some cases confusing. Ineffective communications contributed to a lack of situational awareness and precluded effective actions to prevent the cascade. Consistent application of effective communications protocols, particularly during emergencies, is essential to reliability. Alternatives should be considered to one-on-one phone calls during an emergency to ensure all parties are getting timely and accurate information with a minimum number of calls.

NERC operating policies do not adequately specify critical facilities, leaving ambiguity regarding which facilities must be monitored by reliability coordinators. Nor do the policies adequately define criteria for declaring transmission system emergencies. Operating policies should also clearly specify that curtailing interchange transactions through the NERC TLR procedure is not intended to be used as a method for restoring the system from an actual Operating Security Limit violation to a secure operating state.

The Operating Committee shall complete the following by June 30, 2004:

- Evaluate and revise the operating policies and procedures, or provide interpretations, to ensure reliability coordinator and control area functions, responsibilities, and authorities are completely and unambiguously defined.
- Evaluate and improve the tools and procedures for operator and reliability coordinator communications during emergencies.
- Evaluate and improve the tools and procedures for the timely exchange of outage information among control areas and reliability coordinators.

Recommendation 10: Establish Guidelines for Real-Time Operating Tools.

The August 14 blackout was caused by a lack of situational awareness that was in turn the result of inadequate reliability tools and backup capabilities. Additionally, the failure of the FE control computers and alarm system contributed directly to the lack of situational awareness. Likewise, MISO's incomplete tool set and the failure of its state estimator to work effectively on August 14 contributed to the lack of situational awareness.

Recommendation 10: The Operating Committee shall, within one year, evaluate the real-time operating tools necessary for reliable operation and reliability coordination, including backup capabilities. The Operating Committee is directed to report both minimum acceptable capabilities for critical reliability functions and a guide of best practices.

This evaluation should include consideration of the following:

- Modeling requirements, such as model size and fidelity, real and reactive load modeling, sensitivity analyses, accuracy analyses, validation, measurement, observability, update procedures, and procedures for the timely exchange of modeling data.

- State estimation requirements, such as periodicity of execution, monitoring external facilities, solution quality, topology error and measurement error detection, failure rates including times between failures, presentation of solution results including alarms, and troubleshooting procedures.
- Real-time contingency analysis requirements, such as contingency definition, periodicity of failure execution, monitoring external facilities, solution quality, post-contingency automatic actions, rates including mean/maximum times between failures, reporting of results, presentation of solution results including alarms, and troubleshooting procedures including procedures for investigating non-converging contingency studies.

Recommendation 11: Evaluate Lessons Learned During System Restoration.

The efforts to restore the power system and customer service following the outage were effective, considering the massive amount of load lost and the large number of generators and transmission lines that tripped. Fortunately, the restoration was aided by the ability to energize transmission from neighboring systems, thereby speeding the recovery. Despite the apparent success of the restoration effort, it is important to evaluate the results in more detail to determine opportunities for improvement. Blackstart and restoration plans are often developed through study of simulated conditions. Robust testing of live systems is difficult because of the risk of disturbing the system or interrupting customers. The August 14 blackout provides a valuable opportunity to apply actual events and experiences to learn to better prepare for system blackstart and restoration in the future. That opportunity should not be lost, despite the relative success of the restoration phase of the outage.

Recommendation 11a: The Planning Committee, working in conjunction with the Operating Committee, NPCC, ECAR, and PJM, shall evaluate the blackstart and system restoration performance following the outage of August 14, and within one year report to the NERC board the results of that evaluation with recommendations for improvement.

Recommendation 11b: All regional reliability councils shall, within six months of the Planning Committee report to the NERC board, reevaluate their procedures and plans to assure an effective blackstart and restoration capability within their region.

Recommendation 12: Install Additional Time-Synchronized Recording Devices as Needed.

A valuable lesson from the August 14 blackout is the importance of having time-synchronized system data recorders. NERC investigators labored over thousands of data items to synchronize the sequence of events, much like putting together small pieces of a very large puzzle. That process would have been significantly improved and sped up if there had been a sufficient number of synchronized data recording devices.

NERC Planning Standard I.F — Disturbance Monitoring does require location of recording devices for disturbance analysis. Often time, recorders are available, but they are not synchronized to a time standard. All digital fault recorders, digital event recorders, and power system disturbance recorders should be time stamped at the point of observation with a precise Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) synchronizing signal. Recording and time-synchronization equipment should be monitored and calibrated to assure accuracy and reliability.

Time-synchronized devices, such as phasor measurement units, can also be beneficial for monitoring a wide-area view of power system conditions in real-time, such as demonstrated in WECC with their Wide-Area Monitoring System (WAMS).

Recommendation 12a: The reliability regions, coordinated through the NERC Planning Committee, shall within one year define regional criteria for the application of synchronized recording devices in power plants and substations. Regions are requested to facilitate the installation of an appropriate number, type, and location of devices within the region as soon as practical to allow accurate recording of future system disturbances and to facilitate benchmarking of simulation studies by comparison to actual disturbances.

Recommendation 12b: Facilities owners shall, in accordance with regional criteria, upgrade existing dynamic recorders to include GPS time synchronization and, as necessary, install additional dynamic recorders.

Recommendation 13: Reevaluate System Design, Planning, and Operating Criteria.

The investigation report noted that FE entered the day on August 14 with insufficient resources to stay within operating limits following a credible set of contingencies, such as the loss of the Eastlake 5 unit and the Chamberlin-Harding line. NERC will conduct an evaluation of operations planning practices and criteria to ensure expected practices are sufficient and well understood. The review will reexamine fundamental operating criteria, such as n-1 and the 30-minute limit in preparing the system for a next contingency, and Table I Category C.3 of the NERC planning standards. Operations planning and operating criteria will be identified that are sufficient to ensure the system is in a known and reliable condition at all times, and that positive controls, whether manual or automatic, are available and appropriately located at all times to return the Interconnection to a secure condition. Daily operations planning, and subsequent real-time operations planning will identify available system reserves to meet operating criteria.

Recommendation 13a: The Operating Committee shall evaluate operations planning and operating criteria and recommend revisions in a report to the board within one year.

Prior studies in the ECAR region did not adequately define the system conditions that were observed on August 14. Severe contingency criteria were not adequate to address the events of August 14 that led to the uncontrolled cascade. Also, northeastern Ohio was found to have insufficient reactive support to serve its loads and meet import criteria. Instances were also noted in the FE system and ECAR area of different ratings being used for the same facility by planners and operators and among entities, making the models used for system planning and operation suspect. NERC and the regional reliability councils must take steps to assure facility ratings are being determined using consistent criteria and being effectively shared and reviewed among entities and among planners and operators.

Recommendation 13b: ECAR shall, no later than June 30, 2004, reevaluate its planning and study procedures and practices to ensure they are in compliance with NERC standards, ECAR Document No. 1, and other relevant criteria; and that ECAR and its members' studies are being implemented as required.

Recommendation 13c: The Planning Committee, working in conjunction with the regional reliability councils, shall within two years reevaluate the criteria, methods, and practices used for system design, planning, and analysis; and shall report the results and recommendations to the NERC board. This review shall include an evaluation of transmission facility ratings methods and practices, and the sharing of consistent ratings information.

Regional reliability councils may consider assembling a regional database that includes the ratings of all bulk electric system (100-kV and higher voltage) transmission lines, transformers, phase angle regulators,

and phase shifters. This database should be shared with neighboring regions as needed for system planning and analysis.

NERC and the regional reliability councils should review the scope, frequency, and coordination of interregional studies, to include the possible need for simultaneous transfer studies. Study criteria will be reviewed, particularly the maximum credible contingency criteria used for system analysis. Each control area will be required to identify, for both the planning and operating time horizons, the planned emergency import capabilities for each major load area.

Recommendation 14: Improve System Modeling Data and Data Exchange Practices.

The after-the-fact models developed to simulate August 14 conditions and events indicate that dynamic modeling assumptions, including generator and load power factors, used in planning and operating models were inaccurate. Of particular note, the assumptions of load power factor were overly optimistic (loads were absorbing much more reactive power than pre-August 14 models indicated). Another suspected problem is modeling of shunt capacitors under depressed voltage conditions. Regional reliability councils should establish regional power system models that enable the sharing of consistent, validated data among entities in the region. Power flow and transient stability simulations should be periodically compared (benchmarked) with actual system events to validate model data. Viable load (including load power factor) and generator testing programs are necessary to improve agreement between power flows and dynamic simulations and the actual system performance.

Recommendation 14: The regional reliability councils shall, within one year, establish and begin implementing criteria and procedures for validating data used in power flow models and dynamic simulations by benchmarking model data with actual system performance. Validated modeling data shall be exchanged on an interregional basis as needed for reliable system planning and operation.

(NEW) Recommendation 15: Develop a standing capability for NERC to investigate future blackouts and disturbances.

NERC shall develop and be prepared to implement a NERC standing procedure for investigating future blackouts and system disturbances. Many of the methods, tools, and lessons from the investigation of the August 14 blackout are appropriate for adoption.

(NEW) Recommendation 16: Accelerate the standards transition.

NERC shall accelerate the transition from existing operating policies, planning standards, and compliance templates to a clear and measurable set of reliability standards. (This recommendation is consistent with the Task Force recommendation 25).

(NEW) Recommendation 17 — Evaluate NERC actions in the areas of cyber and physical security.

The Critical Infrastructure Protection Committee shall evaluate the U.S.-Canada Power System Outage Task Force's Group III recommendations to determine if any actions are needed by NERC and report a proposed action plan to the board.

4. Specific Actions Directed to FE, MISO, and PJM

Corrective Actions to be Completed by FirstEnergy

FE shall complete the following corrective actions by June 30, 2004. Unless otherwise stated, the requirements apply to the FE northern Ohio system and connected generators.

1. Voltage Criteria and Reactive Resources

- a. **Interim Voltage Criteria.** The investigation team found that FE was not operating on August 14 within NERC planning and operating criteria with respect to its voltage profile and reactive power supply margin in the Cleveland-Akron area. FE was also operating outside its own historical planning and operating criteria that were developed and used by Centerior Energy Corporation (The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and the Toledo Edison Company) prior to 1998 to meet the relevant NERC and ECAR standards and criteria. FE stated acceptable ranges for voltage are not compatible with neighboring systems or interconnected systems in general.

Until such time that the study of the northern Ohio system ordered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on December 23 is completed, and until FE is able to determine (in b. below) a current set of voltage and reactive requirements verified to be within NERC and ECAR criteria, FE shall immediately operate such that voltages at all 345-kV buses in the Cleveland-Akron area shall have a minimum voltage of .95 per unit following the simultaneous loss of the two largest generating units in that area.

- b. **Calculation of Minimum Bus Voltages and Reactive Reserves.** FE shall, consistent with or as part of the FERC-ordered study, determine the minimum location-specific voltages at all 345-kV and 138-kV buses and all generating stations within their control area (including merchant plants). FE shall determine the minimum dynamic reactive reserves that must be maintained in local areas to ensure that these minimum voltages are met following contingencies studied in accordance with ECAR Document 1. Criteria and minimum voltage requirements must comply with NERC planning criteria, including Table 1A, Category C3, and Operating Policy 2.
- c. **Voltage Procedures.** FE shall determine voltage and reactive criteria and procedures to enable operators to understand and operate these criteria.
- d. **Study Results.** When the FERC-ordered study is completed, FE is to adopt the planning and operating criteria determined as a result of that study and update the operating criteria and procedures for its system operators. If the study indicates a need for system reinforcements, FE shall develop a plan for developing such reinforcements as soon as practical, and shall develop operational procedures or other mitigating programs to maintain safe operating conditions until such time that the necessary system reinforcements can be made.
- e. **Reactive Resources.** FE shall inspect all reactive resources, including generators, and assure that all are fully operational. FE shall verify that all installed capacitors have no blown fuses and that at least 98 percent of installed capacitors at 69-kV and higher are available and in service during the summer 2004.
- f. **Communications.** FE shall communicate its voltage criteria and procedures, as described in the items above to MISO and FE neighboring systems.

2. Operational Preparedness and Action Plan

The FE 2003 Summer Assessment was not considered to be sufficiently comprehensive to cover a wide range of known and expected system conditions, nor effective for the August 14 conditions based on the following:

- No voltage stability assessment was included to assess the Cleveland-Akron area which has a long-known history of potential voltage collapse, as indicated CEI studies prior to 1997, by non-convergence of power flow studies in the 1998 analysis, and advice from AEP of potential voltage collapse prior to the onset of the 2003 summer load period.
- Only single contingencies were tested for basically one set of 2003 study conditions. This does not comply with the study requirements of ECAR Document 1.
- Study conditions should have assumed a wider range of generation dispatch and import/export and interregional transfers. For example, imports from MECS (north-to-south transfers) are likely to be less stressful to the FE system than imports from AEP (south-to-north transfers). Sensitivity studies should have been conducted to assess the impact of each key parameter and derive the system operating limits accordingly based on the most limiting of transient stability, voltage stability, and thermal capability.
- The 2003 study conditions are considered to be more onerous than those assumed in the 1998 study, since the former has Davis Besse (830 MW) as a scheduled outage. However, the 2003 study does not show any voltage instability problems as shown by the 1998 study.
- The 2003 study conditions are far less onerous than the actual August 14 conditions from the generation and transmission availability viewpoint. This is another indication that n-1 contingency assessment, based on one assumed system condition, is not sufficient to cover the variability of changing system conditions due to forced outages.

FE shall prepare and submit to ECAR, with a copy to NERC, an Operational Preparedness and Action Plan to ensure system security and full compliance with NERC and [regional] planning and operating criteria, including ECAR Document 1. The action plan shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. **2004 Summer Studies.** Complete a 2004 summer study to identify a comprehensive set of System Operating Limits (OSL) and Interconnection Reliability Limits (IRLs) based on the NERC Operating Limit Definition Task Force Report. Any inter-dependency between FE OSL and those of its neighboring entities, known and forecasted regional and interregional transfers, shall be included in the derivation of OSL and IRL.
- b. **Extreme Contingencies.** Identify high-risk contingencies that are beyond normal studied criteria and determine the performance of the system for these contingencies. Where these extreme contingencies result in cascading outages, determine means to reduce their probability of occurrence or impact. These contingencies and mitigation plans must be communicated to FE operators, ECAR, MISO, and neighboring systems.
- c. **Maximum Import Capability.** Determine the maximum import capability into the Cleveland-Akron area for the summer of 2004, consistent with the criteria stated in (1) above and all applicable NERC and ECAR criteria. The maximum import capability shall take into account historical and forecasted transactions and outage conditions expected with due regard to maintaining adequate operating and local dynamic reactive reserves.

- d. **Vegetation Management.** FE was found to not be complying with its own procedures for rights-of-way maintenance and was not adequately resolving inspection and forced outage reports indicating persistent problems with vegetation contacts prior to August 14, 2003. FE shall complete rights-of-way trimming for all 345-kV and 138-kV transmission lines, so as to be in compliance with the National Electrical Safety Code criteria for safe clearances for overhead conductors, other applicable federal, state and local laws, and FE rights-of-way maintenance procedures. Priority should be placed on completing work for all 345-kV lines as soon as possible. FE will report monthly progress to NERC and ECAR.
- e. **Line Ratings.** FE shall reevaluate its criteria for calculating line ratings, survey the 345-kV, and 138-kV rights-of-way by visual inspection to ensure line ratings are appropriate for the clearances observed, and calculate updated ratings for each line. FE shall ensure that system operators, MISO, ECAR, NERC (MMWG), and neighboring systems are informed of and able to use the updated line ratings.

3. Emergency Response Capabilities and Preparedness

- a. **Emergency Response Resources.** FE shall develop a capability, no later than June 30, 2004, to reduce load in the Cleveland-Akron area by 1,500 MW within ten minutes of a directive to do so by MISO or the FE system operator. Such a capability may be provided by automatic or manual load shedding, voltage reduction, direct-controlled commercial or residential load management, or any other method or combination of methods capable of achieving the 1,500 MW of reduction in ten minutes without adversely affecting other interconnected systems. The amount of required load reduction capability may be reduced to an amount shown by the FERC-ordered study to be sufficient for response to severe contingencies and if approved by ECAR and NERC.
- b. **Emergency Response Plan.** FE shall develop emergency response plans, including plans to deploy the load reduction capabilities noted above. The plan shall include criteria for declaring an emergency and various states of emergency. The plan shall include detailed descriptions of authorities, operating procedures, and communication protocols with all the relevant entities including MISO, FE operators, and market participants within the FE area that have the ability to move generation or shed load upon orders from FE operators. The plan shall include procedures for load restoration after the declaration that the FE system is no longer in the emergency operating state.

4. Operating Center and Training

- a. **Operator Communications.** FE shall develop communications procedures for FE operating personnel to use within FE, with MISO and neighboring systems, and others. The procedure and the operating environment within the FE system control center shall allow focus on reliable system operation and avoid distractions such as calls from customers and others who are not responsible for operation of a portion of the transmission system.
- b. **Reliability Monitoring Tools.** FE shall ensure its state estimation and real-time contingency analysis functions are being used to reliably execute full contingency analysis automatically every ten minutes, or on demand, and to alarm operators of potential first contingency violations.
- c. **System Visualization Tools.** FE shall provide its operating personnel with the capability to visualize the status of the power system from an overview perspective and to determine critical system failures or unsafe conditions quickly without multiple-step searches for failures. A dynamic map board or equivalent capability is encouraged.

- d. **Backup Functions and Center.** FE shall develop and prepare to implement a plan for the loss of its system operating center or any portion of its critical operating functions. FE shall comport with the criteria of the NERC Reference Document — Back Up Control Centers, and ensure that FE is able to continue meeting all NERC and ECAR criteria in the event the operating center becomes unavailable. Consideration should be given to using capabilities at MISO or neighboring systems as a backup capability, at least for summer 2004, until alternative backup functionality can be provided.
- e. **GE XA21 System Updates.** Until the current energy management system is replaced, FE shall incorporate all fixes for the GE XA21 system known to be necessary to assure reliable and stable operation of critical reliability functions, and particularly to correct the alarm processor failure that occurred on August 14, 2003.
- f. **Operator Training.** Prior to June 30, 2004, FE shall meet the operator training requirements detailed in NERC Recommendation 6.
- g. **Technical Support.** FE shall develop and implement a written procedure describing the interactions between control center technical support personnel and system operators. The procedure shall address notification of loss of critical functionality and testing procedures.

5. Corrective Actions to be Completed by MISO

MISO shall complete the following corrective actions no later than June 30, 2004.

- 1. **Reliability Tools.** MISO shall fully implement and test its topology processor to provide its operating personnel real-time view of the system status for all transmission lines operating and all generating units within its system, and all critical transmission lines and generating units in neighboring systems. Alarms should be provided for operators for all critical transmission line outages. MISO shall establish a means of exchanging outage information with its members and neighboring systems such that the MISO state estimation has accurate and timely information to perform as designed. MISO shall fully implement and test its state estimation and real-time contingency analysis tools to ensure they can operate reliably no less than every ten minutes. MISO shall provide backup capability for all functions critical to reliability.
- 2. **Visualization Tools.** MISO shall provide its operating personnel with tools to quickly visualize system status and failures of key lines, generators, or equipment. The visualization shall include a high-level voltage profile of the systems at least within the MISO footprint.
- 3. **Training.** Prior to June 30, 2004, MISO shall meet the operator training criteria stated in NERC Recommendation 6.
- 4. **Communications.** MISO shall reevaluate and improve its communications protocols and procedures with operational support personnel within MISO, its operating members, and its neighboring control areas and reliability coordinators.
- 5. **Operating Agreements.** MISO shall reevaluate its operating agreements with member entities to verify its authority to address operating issues, including voltage and reactive management, voltage scheduling, the deployment and redispatch of real and reactive reserves for emergency response, and the authority to direct actions during system emergencies, including shedding load.

6. Corrective Actions to be Completed by PJM

PJM shall complete the following corrective actions no later than June 30, 2004.

Communications. PJM shall reevaluate and improve its communications protocols and procedures between PJM and its neighboring reliability coordinators and control areas.

Systems Failure Anatomy of a Blackout Part 2
Updated on: 4/30/2013

1. A series of line outages in northeastern Ohio caused heavy loadings on _____ circuits, leading to the trip and lock-out of the Sammis-Star line.
 - a) series
 - b) parallel
 - c) open
 - d) none of the above
2. Sammis-Star tripped due to _____.
 - a) protective zone 3 relay action that measured low apparent impedance
 - b) high flows at 130% of the line's emergency ratings
 - c) depressed voltages
 - d) all of the above
3. Voltage collapse occurs when an increase in load or loss of generation or transmission facilities causes voltage to drop, which causes a further reduction in reactive power from capacitors and line charging, and still further voltage reductions.
 - a) True
 - b) False
4. After the Argenta lines tripped, the phase angle between eastern and western Michigan significantly _____.
 - a) decreased
 - b) stayed the same
 - c) increased
5. The combination of the power surge and frequency rise caused _____ of pre-selected Maritimes generation to trip off-line due to the operation of the New Brunswick Power "Loss of Line 3001" Special Protection System.
 - a) 280 MW
 - b) 380 MW
 - c) 480 MW
 - d) 580 MW

6. Common factors between the August 14 blackout and previous large-scale blackouts, including the 1965 Northeast blackout and the July 1996 outages in the West include _____.
- a) conductor contacts with trees
 - b) inability of system operators to visualize events on the system
 - c) failure to operate within known safe limits
 - d) all of the above
7. Several entities violated NERC operating policies and planning standards, and those violations contributed directly to the start of the cascading blackout.
- a) True
 - b) False
8. The causes to the August 14 blackout were not preventable.
- a) True
 - b) False
9. The August 14 blackout was caused by _____.
- a) FE's lack of situation awareness of line outages and degraded conditions on the FE system
 - b) FE not effectively managing vegetation in its transmission line rights-of-way
 - c) reliability coordinators not providing effective diagnostic support
 - d) all of the above
10. Which of the following is a STRATEGIC INITIATIVE to remedy specific deficiencies.
- a) Improve operator and reliability coordinator training
 - b) Initiate control area and reliability coordinator readiness audits
 - c) Improve system protection to increase the spread of future cascading outages
 - d) Evaluate reactive power and voltage control practices
11. Which of the following is a TECHNICAL INITIATIVE to prevent or mitigate the impacts of future cascading blackouts?
- a) Strengthen the NERC Compliance Enforcement Program
 - b) Evaluate vegetation management procedures and results
 - c) Evaluate reactive power and voltage control practices
 - d) Establish a program to track implementation of recommendations

12. The term “_____” includes a variety of tools and methods that present operating personnel with situations to improve and test diagnostic and decision-making skills in an environment that resembles expected conditions during a particular type of system emergency.
- a) virtual simulations
 - b) test drive
 - c) realistic simulations
 - d) havoc preparedness
13. According to the NERC investigators, _____ would have been crucial in slowing or stopping the uncontrolled cascade on August 14.
- a) selective use of under-voltage load shedding
 - b) selective use of over-voltage load shedding
 - c) better application of zone 3 impedance relays on high-voltage transmission lines
 - d) both a) and c)
14. It is recommended that if the zone 3 relay is used, it should not operate at or below _____ of the emergency ampere rating of a line, assuming a 0.85 per unit voltage and a line phase angle of 30 degrees.
- a) 120%
 - b) 130%
 - c) 140%
 - d) 150%
15. As well as the inadequate reliability tools and backup capabilities, the failure of the FE control computers and alarm system contributed directly to the lack of situational awareness causing the August 14 blackout.
- a) True
 - b) False
16. All _____ should be time stamped at the point of observation with a precise Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) synchronizing signal.
- a) digital fault recorders
 - b) digital event recorders
 - c) power system disturbance recorders
 - d) all of the above

17. Based on after-the-fact models developed to simulate August 14 conditions and events by dynamic modeling, the loads were absorbing _____ reactive power than pre-August 14 models.
- a) much more
 - b) about the same amount
 - c) much less
 - d) none of the above
18. The August 14 blackout shared a number of contributing factors with prior large-scale blackouts, including _____.
- a) a lack of training in recognizing and responding to emergencies
 - b) ineffective communications
 - c) insufficient static and dynamic power supply
 - d) all of the above
19. Time-synchronized devices, such as _____, can also be beneficial for monitoring a wide-area view of power system conditions in real-time.
- a) synchronized measurement units
 - b) time measurement units
 - c) phasor measurement units
 - d) none of the above
20. Under the specific actions directed to FE (Operational Preparedness and Action Plan): The FE 2003 Summer Assessment was not considered to be sufficiently comprehensive to cover a wide range of known and expected system conditions.
- a) True
 - b) False