

# **NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee**

**Conference Call #21**

**August 8, 2005**

**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**

Meeting Minutes

## **Attendees**

Members/Alternates Present:

Mr. Curt Dahl (LIPA), Chairman  
Mr. Bart Franey (National Grid)  
Mr. Steve Jeremko (NYSEG-RGE)  
Mr. Steve Whalen (NYSEG-RGE)  
Mr. Rich Wright (Central Hudson)  
Mr. Carlos Villalba (Con Edison)  
Mr. King Look (Con Edison), Secretary

Advisers/Non-member Participants Present:

Mr. John Adams (NYISO)  
Mr. Al Adamson (Consultant)  
Mr. Ed Schrom (NYPSC)  
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant)

Guests Present:

Mr. Bill Lamanna (NYISO) – Limited Participation  
Mr. John Pade (NYISO) – Limited Participation  
Mr. Madison Milhous (KeySpan Ravenswood)  
Mr. Mayer Sasson (Con Edison)  
Mr. Pietro Pericolo (Con Edison)

## **1. Transmission Topology**

Bill Lamanna reviewed with ICS the NYISO's latest findings on the transmission interface limits as well as the recommended modeling of the PSEG – Con Edison Wheel.

### **1.1. Transmission Interface Limits**

Bill Lamanna reported to ICS that the following transmission interfaces could potentially be reduced because of voltage limitation when the 345 kV series reactors at Sprain Brook and Dunwoodie are in service while certain generating units are also out of service:

- UPNY / SENY (from zones E and F to zone G): This interface could potentially be reduced by 100 MW from 5100 MW to 5000 MW. This reduction also reflects the growing load and MVAR demand just north of UPNY/SENY.
- UPNY / Con Ed (from zone G to zone H): This interface could potentially be reduced by 400 MW from 5600 MW to 5200 MW.
- Dunwoodie South (as defined in MARS) and Y49/Y50: Bill Lamanna proposed to group Dunwoodie South and Y49/Y50 as an interface. The interface grouping of Dunwoodie South and Y49/Y50 could potentially be reduced by 670 MW from 4970 MW to 4300 MW. Curt Dahl objected to sharing the 670 MW reduction on Y49/Y50 (from zones I to K) on the basis that the physical capability between zones I and K is unchanged and that the restriction is north of Long Island. Bill Lamanna indicated that from a NYCA LOLE or IRM perspective, it makes sense on any Monte Carlo iteration in MARS to shift any Y49/Y50 capacity unused by Long Island over to Dunwoodie South to support New York City if needed.

Pietro Pericolo from Con Edison's Transmission Planning Department indicated that many of the reactive resources on the Con Edison 138 kV system were not used in the NYISO study of the effect of the 345 kV Sprain Brook and Dunwoodie series reactors. Con Edison system operators have historically used 138 kV reactive resources to supply the 345 kV system. Curt Dahl suggested that the NYISO and Con Edison should come to a resolution on the effect, if any, of the 345 kV Sprain Brook and Dunwoodie series reactors.

Mayer Sasson questioned the appropriateness for the NYSRC to adopt the potential effect of the 345 kV Sprain Brook and Dunwoodie series reactors as reported by Bill Lamanna in the base case assumptions for the 2006-2007 IRM Study, given that a transmission owner (Con Edison) has objected to the results reported by NYISO Staff. Mayer Sasson suggested under such situation ICS will have to wait for the outcome of discussions between Con Edison and the NYISO in the stakeholder process. Mayer Sasson recommended, and ICS agreed that the potential effect of the series reactors should be assessed as a sensitivity case and not be part of the base case assumptions in the 2006-2007 IRM Study.

## **1.2. PSEG – Con Edison Wheel**

According to Bill Lamanna, PJM has indicated that it cannot simultaneously deliver 1100 MW from PJM-East to zone G and 1000 MW from PJM-East to zone J.

- PJM-East to Zone G Limit: PJM has suggested to the NYISO that the PJM-East to zone G limit should be zero, but it has not offered conclusive proof why that should be the case. Given that Total East is limited to 6000 MW and the Central East Group is limited to 4550 MW, the PJM-East to zone G limit would have to be about 500 MW assuming about 1000 MW for PJM-East to

zone J. Based on this, Bill Lamanna recommended that the PJM-East to zone G limit be reduced from the current level of 1100 MW to 500 MW. ICS agreed to include the proposed 500 MW limit for the PJM-East to zone G interface in the base case assumptions in the 2006-2007 IRM Study.

- **PJM-East to Zone J Limit:** Bill Lamanna indicated that the NYISO has evaluated the NYCA LOLE with PJM-East to zone J at:
  - the current limit of 1000 MW without Staten Island modeled as a separate zone (NYCA LOLE = 0.03)
  - the current limit of 1000 MW with Staten Island modeled as a separate zone (NYCA LOLE = 0.031)
  - 1500 MW limit without Staten Island modeled as a separate zone (NYCA LOLE = 0.028)

These results show a negligible change and that it is not necessary to model Staten Island as a separate zone. However, the PJM-East to zone J interface should be limited to 1200 MW maximum, which can be supported by 1000 MW over the two Hudson to Farragut lines (i.e., “B” and “C” lines) and 200 MW over the Linden to Goethals line (i.e., “A” line). PJM has set the floor on the PJM-East to Zone J interface to be 600 MW. As a result, Bill Lamanna recommended that the PJM-East to zone J interface to vary between 600 MW and 1200 MW, contingent on the availability of the PSEG units at Bergen, Hudson and Linden. ICS agreed to include the proposed 600 to 1200 MW limit for the PJM-East to zone J interface in the base case assumptions in the 2006-2007 IRM Study.

### **1.3. Norwalk to Northport Cable (Line 1385)**

Curt Dahl indicated that the transfer capability of the 286 MW Norwalk to Northport Cable is dependent on the availability of generation at Norwalk Harbor. ICS agreed this should be in the base case assumptions in the 2006-2007 IRM Study.

## **2. Load Forecast Uncertainty Model**

John Pade reviewed with ICS the revised zones A through I load forecast uncertainty model, which shows a significant broadening of the distribution profile relative to the previous model. John Pade indicated the statewide load forecast uncertainty model remains reasonable.

## **3. DMNC Derating**

John Adams spoke about the DMNC derating, which showed the latest to be 637 MW statewide versus 711 MW statewide last year. Curt Dahl disagreed with the DMNC derating in zone K. Market Monitoring is going to re-examine the DMNC derating in zone K, but their review will not be completed until August 19, 2005, which is after the August 12<sup>th</sup> EC meeting. Curt Dahl indicated he will need to discuss this off-line with John Adams.

**4. Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be moved from August 31<sup>st</sup> to September 2<sup>nd</sup>. King Look will send out an email to ICS confirming the change in meeting date.

*Secretary: King Look*