

NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #98

April 8th, 2009

9:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

	Present	Tel
Members / Alternates:		
Mr. Curt Dahl (LIPA), Chairman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Carlos Villalba (Con Edison), Secretary.....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Timothy Bush (Generation Owners).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bart Franey (National Grid).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Steve Jeremko (NYSEG-RGE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Mark Younger (Slater Consulting - Generation Owners)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Rajee Mustafa (NYPA).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Rich Wright (CHG&E)	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mrs. Patricia Caletka (NYSEG-RGE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Madison Milhous (National Grid).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Hilary Goldman (Con Edison).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Mr. Kelvin Chu (Con Edison).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Mark Cordeiro (Municipal Power Agency).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Han Huang (NYPA).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Glenn Haake (Dynergy, Inc. - Generation Owners)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Harry Joscher (PSEG Power, LLC).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Advisers/Non-member Participants:		
Mr. Al Adamson (Consultant)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. John Adams (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Greg Drake (NYISO).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Frank Ciani (NYISO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Mr. Peter Carney (NYISO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Arthur Maniaci (NYISO).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Ed Schrom (NYPSC).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Guests Present:

Mr. Robert Boyle (NYPA)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. John Charlton (NYISO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bill Lamanna (NYISO).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Frank Francis (BEMI).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Clyde Custer (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Erin Hogan (NYSERDA).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. John Pade (NYISO-Consultant).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mrs. Mary Ann Wilccek (NYISO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Sam Krueger (Dynergy, Inc.).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Alan Ackerman (Customized Energy Solutions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Paul Gioia (NYSRC).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Chris De Graffenried (NYPA).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

** Additionally present was Steve Kanach, NYISO market monitoring.

Action Items

- 1. Review of previous meeting minutes and action items.**
- 2. Review of outage rate trend analysis**
- 3. Review of proposed changes to NYSRC rule changes on outage data reporting requirements.**
- 4. 2010 IRM study assumptions**
- 5. Proposed/preliminary PJM East representation by Con Edison (this is action item 78-1)**
- 6. ISONE/NYSRC IRM comparison report.**
 - http://www.iso-ne.com/genrtion_resrcs/reports/nepool_oc_review/2008/icr2008-2009_report_final_3-21-2008.pdf
 - http://www.iso-ne.com/genrtion_resrcs/reports/nepool_oc_review/2008/icr_2011-2012_report_final_12-01-08.pdf

Next meetings:

April 29, 2009 -- Meeting #99

June 3, 2009 -- Meeting #100

June 24, 2009 – Meeting#101

August 5, 009 – Meeting#102

September 2, 2009 – Meeting#103

September 30, 2009 – Meeting#104

November 4, 2009 – Meeting#105

December 1, 2009 – Meeting#106

1. Review of previous meeting minutes and action items.

1.1. Closed

Minutes 95 and 96 were approved. Need to be finalized and posted on website.

1.2. New

Changes/additions to this agenda

- Loop Flow Switch discussion

1.3. Revised Meeting Minutes

All items were revised and the following items were discussed in detail.

97-1. Meeting 97:

- Load forecast issue – the group agrees that it is necessary to have an October 1st load forecast update but is unclear that the new load forecasts must be examined and evaluated and compared to the current load forecast methodology for accuracy.

- For the Forward Capacity Market IRM study, the group decided not to use the new GOLD book values in order to be consistent with the IRM study.
- External ICAP Allocation needs to be revisited and document.
- Carlos Villalba (secretary) will revisit minutes and resend out to the group as soon as possible (by 4/18/09). The minutes will be finalized following this revision.
- Discussion on the MARS output file (OT.09) – clarification was asked to the NYISO to describe what information is confidential compared to last year and what information is permitted to be disclosed. It was requested that a reason be provided for information that is deemed confidential.

97-2.New items added to meeting minutes 97:

- **97-1.** SCRs performance modeling in MARS and NYISO's recommendation. Item assigned to Dave Lawrence, Greg Drake, and Mark Younger.
- **97-2.** Finalize schedule tracking for IRM study. Item assigned to Greg Drake and Steve Jeremko.
 - **Needs to be conjunctive with Policy 5.**
- **97-3.** Comments on the external ICAP paper
 - **Question whether or not ICAP information was posted on the website.** This will be posted; however, the group needs to respond with comments to the documents. The ICAP documents need to be finalized by 6/2/09.

- **97-4.** Consult with NYISO's Law Department whether or not and why the MARS output file OT09 is deemed confidential.

- **97-5.** Status of PJM transmission line project Susquehanna – Lackawanna – Jefferson – Roseland – Hudson – Branchburg. Item assigned to Carlos Villalba.
 - Issued closed.

2. Review of outage rate trend analysis

- 2.1. Issue over the EFORD calculation. There seemed to be an issue on confirming the methodology for calculating the EFORD because EFORD values couldn't be verified.
- 2.2. Suggestion to get NERC to process the EFORD values for NYCA units.
- 2.3. Suggestion to use the NERC spreadsheet to confirm the calculation. Why would the EFORD calculation yield two different results?
- 2.4. It was clarified that not all units are included in the EFORD calculation and that some of the information is confidential.
- 2.5. *Micrograds* is the current software used to analyze the EFORD data. There is question as to how accurate this information is and can it be reproduced and verified.
- 2.6. To verify *Micrograds* is accurate, take a set of units supplied by the NYISO and calculate ERORD values. Then compare to NERC trends and verify calculation. However, the NYISO cautioned that the data might not match NERC exactly.
- 2.7. Issue with reserve shut down and partial outages and how they are accounted for and interpreted into the model.
- 2.8. There was concern expressed over why NYISO does not report GADS data with NERC – NYISO said it's not part of their requirements.

2.9. Trend analysis data to be circulated to the group.

3. Review of proposed changes to NYSRC rule changes on outage data reporting requirements.

3.1. RCMS prepared a report on outage reporting issues.

3.2. Concern that bad outage data has been used for IRM studies – as a result, RCMS made a series of recommendations.

3.3. First recommendation is for RS to revise CM 5 – reporting requirements for units on outage data.

3.4. RS not only decided to revise CM 5, market participant's requirement to provide outage data, but also to revise requirements with the ISO as far as developing procedures for developing and providing outage data. Additionally, the ICS and reliability council would like NYISO to begin a reporting procedure to release data to the stakeholders named above.

3.5. The following procedure, CM 5, needs to be revisited and/or updated. Revisions to CM 5 were as follows:

3.5.1. GADS reporting instructions improved.

3.5.2. Outage reporting schedules need to be revisited and/or updated.

3.5.3. Training programs for GADS reporting need to be specified and provided to ICAP market participants.

3.5.4. Reporting procedures should include consequences for generators don't report accurate data – or don't comply.

3.5.5. (*NEW ITEM) For ISO to prepare procedures for the screening and reviewing of all outage data received from ICAP providers. ISO has been working on this now. Procedures should be designed to provide complete consistent and accurate data and should be followed and employed by the ISO. Thus, these procedures need to be provided and used prior to using data for IRM or reliability studies.

3.5.6. Reliability council wants to be able to request specific outage data trend analysis for in NERC format data every year (if needed) – broken down to a level that doesn't reveal confidential information.

- 3.5.7. Conclusion – CM 4 – ICS requests that generators also submit data in NERC format to NYISO.
- 3.5.8. Conclusion – CM 6 – ICS requests that NYISO submit data in NERC format.
- 3.5.9. NYISO would like a month to report back on the feasibility of these reporting requests.
- 3.5.10. NYPA also wants ISO to report data every year in NERC (or GAR reports) format so they can do EFORD analysis.
- 3.5.11. NYISO brought up the question of whether or not there is there a way to get around these modifications of these reporting and verifying rules? Should market participants just report straight to NERC (for a fee) and EFORD analysis and trend information can be requested from this organization at any time without requesting it from the NYISO?

4. Transmission Representation

- 4.1. Without Bill Lamana present, this was put off until he can review.

5. 2010 IRM Modeling Assumptions

- 5.1. Environmental assumptions for the FCM were updated. This needs to be circulated to the group for review.
- 5.2. Will present FCM assumptions that were adapted from the IRM assumptions at the next meeting. Also need documentation of the sensitivity scenarios.
- 5.3. Recommendation will be made on the FCM by the end of June.

6. Loop Flow Switch Issue and Modeling (Loop Flow Presentation Viewed)

- 6.1. White paper sent out on this issue. Results send out to the group on 4/07/09. Power point presentation made to discuss loop flow issues, analysis, and results.
- 6.2. Needs comments and quick turnaround from the ICS.

- 6.3. Loop flow switch simulates PJM West to East support and other flows to external pools.
- 6.4. In MARS model, there is two loop flow switches: 1. In GEN OPTN table (gen pools) and one is in RESPOOL table. Independent of each other.
- 6.5. MARS uses loop flow in 3 passes that utilize loop flow switches. First pass, the zones within a control area try to help each other first. Control areas are processed sequentially. Assistance is modeled in the GEN POOL table and follows loop flows according to this priority order. If the switch is yes, all ties are in place and available to deliver assistance to deficient zones. If it's set to no, only internal ties provide assistance and external pools won't provide assistance. If loop flow occurs, or switched to yes, the ties will be allotted for loop flow – which means later on, you could have less assistance over these ties.
- 6.6. On pass two, control areas are providing assistance to other areas based upon RESPOOL table. If loop flow occurs, switch is yes, ties that are available for assistance will be used. If set to no, there must be a direct tie for control areas to provide assistance. A non-intuitive example of loop flow occurring even when loop flow switch is set to no is that PJM could still loop through our system from west to east even if tie is set to no. Thus, even if loop flow is set to no, direct ties will allow loop flow essential through control areas
- 6.7. In third pass, loop flow is not accounted for at all because sharing is allowed in all areas. Sharing is allowed according to need (deficiency), not loop flow capabilities.
- 6.8. Goes back to last year's study – anomalies on external ICAP studies when loop switch turned on, thus increasing external ICAP. The LOLE was lowered in NYCA (reliability improved) up to a certain external ICAP allowance. When external ICAP contracts were increased past this point, the LOLE began to get worse (or increase). These results were confusing and GE was asked to look at this issue.
- 6.9. GE was able to replicate anomaly that NYISO observed. GE looked at specific occurrences. If you can use loop flow (switch on), PJM West to

East can benefit by wheeling power through our system. This did affect our assistance from Ontario. Slides show numbers.

- 6.10. GE confirmed that loop flow in the yes position does impact the external ICAP study – GE confirms that all switches should be in no position and recommends that the GEN OPTN switches be in no position and eliminate RESPOOL table for the IRM study or even the external ICAP study.
- 6.11. The committee would like to know the impact of this modeling change on the study year's IRM, tan 45 point, and external ICAP. Question as to whether the curve shape will change with this modeling change.
Depending on how you model the switches determines the stresses on interfaces.
- 6.12. NYISO requests comments by committee within the next two weeks (4/24/09).

7. Proposed/preliminary PJM East representation by Con Edison (action item 78-1)

- 7.1. ICS members are going to look at the model presented by Con Edison and return comments by next meeting.
- 7.2. The following comments were made by Thomas Piascik from PSE&G:
 - 7.2.1. PSE&G north is defined as north of Linden and east of Roseland.
 - 7.2.2. According to the definition above, the "A" circuit (Linden Goethals) and the VFT should be connected to PSE&G South.
 - 7.2.3. The PSE&G 138 kV area should be split into a north and south with a week link between the two areas.

8. ISONE/NYSRC IRM comparison report

http://www.iso-ne.com/genrtion_resrcs/reports/nepool_oc_review/2008/icr2008-2009_report_final_3-21-2008.pdf

http://www.iso-ne.com/genrtion_resrcs/reports/nepool_oc_review/2008/icr_2011-2012_report_final_12-01-08.pdf

- 8.1. Circulated over a month ago

- 8.2. Background – NE IRM below 10%
- 8.3. Market participants in NE have expressed concern over this as their IRM goes down, but neighboring pools IRM goes in opposite direction (up).
- 8.4. NE measures IRM differently – market participants asked NE to show differences in reliability modeling techniques compared to NYISO.
- 8.5. ISONE shared results with NYISO.
- 8.6. Differences in how they model wind and other reliability resources.
- 8.7. Concern that their modeling techniques will allow them to develop reliability model and plan that is too overly reliant on New York's system.
- 8.8. NE uses Westinghouse model – we use MARS. MARS has nomogram capability and also has SCRs and scheduled outages and additional multi area capabilities. One example is NE doesn't use scheduled outages in the summer.
- 8.9. NYISO or ICS can discuss with NE our methodology for modeling our system and determining our reliability criterion.
- 8.10. Comments are requested on the reports – reliability council will be represented at the May ISONE meeting. There was question about who can listen to this meeting. There is interest from Con Edison to dial in to this meeting.

Meeting #98: April 8th, 2009, 9:30am – 4:00pm.

Secretary: Carlos Villalba (Con Edison); minutes prepared by Hilary Goldman (Con Edison)
