

NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Conference Call #22

October 13, 2005

3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Members/Alternates Present:

Mr. Curt Dahl (LIPA), Chairman
Mr. Bart Franey (National Grid)
Mr. Steve Jeremko (NYSEG-RGE)
Mr. 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. Greg Drake (NYISO)
Mr. Steve Keller (NYPSC)
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant)

Guests Present:

Mr. Gary Jordan (GE) – Limited Participation
Mr. Madison Milhous (KeySpan Ravenswood)

1. Preliminary IRM Base Case Results

Greg Drake briefed ICS on the preliminary IRM base case results, which thus far consist of the 16% statewide reserve margin (SRM), 17% SRM and 18% SRM cases. The 19% SRM case was in progress at the time of the conference call. At the 18% SRM point, the corresponding New York City adjusted installed capacity is 84.0% and the Long Island adjusted installed capacity is 99.3%.

The results are based on moving perfect capacity to achieve 0.1 LOLE. A question was asked on the conversion factors used to translate perfect capacity to real capacity. Greg Drake responded that when adjusting upstate capacity (zones A through I) to the desired SRM, the zonal EFORs for A through I were used to convert perfect capacity to real capacity. When shifting capacity for both into and out of zone J or K, Greg Drake uses the EFOR of a combined cycle, which is 5.7%. King Look suggested that when removing capacity, the average EFOR of the zone should be used because capacity is

removed from the average fleet in the zone, and when adding capacity, the average EFOR of a combined cycle should be used because it is assumed new capacity added is a combined cycle unit.

King Look questioned the 84.0% adjusted installed capacity level for New York City corresponding to the 18% SRM, because it is significantly higher than the 78.3% New York City LCR corresponding to the 2005 base IRM of 17.6%. Curt Dahl suggested the reason for the increase could be the change in the modeling of the PJM to New York City tie. King Look asked that the effect of the change in the modeling of the PJM to New York City tie be isolated from the effect of the change in the PJM external model.

- *As a new action item (#CC22-1), Greg Drake will conduct at the 18% SRM a sensitivity case of removing the modeling change to the PJM to New York City tie, i.e., model it as a 1000 MW tie and not unit sensitive.*

2. Unconstrained Case

Greg Drake informed ICS that the revised unconstrained case using the prior methodology of adjusting load is 15.1%. This is significantly lower than the previous results that showed the unconstrained case using the prior methodology to be 17.7%, with the difference being that the 17.7% did not reflect (as an oversight) elimination of all internal constraints, specifically kept the Central East, Total East, the Long Island Grouping and the Athens/UPNY-SENY nomogram intact.

- *As a new action item (#CC22-2), Greg Drake will determine the unconstrained case using the unified methodology of adjusting capacity.*

3. Dynamic Interface Model

Curt Dahl asked John Adams about the status of the development of the dynamic interface model for use in the sensitivity case to evaluate the potential effect of the 345 kV Sprain Brook and Dunwoodie series reactors. John Adams indicated that the NYISO's primary focus is currently on the Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process Reliability Needs Assessment, but he will get back to ICS on the status of the dynamic interface model.

Secretary: King Look