

# NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #171

April 28th, 2015

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

## Attendees

	Present	Tel
Members / Alternates:		
Mr. Yuri Fishman (PSEG-LI) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Khatune Zannat (PSEG-LI) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Rich Wright (CHG&E) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Gregory Chu (Con Edison), <b>ICS Vice Chair/Secretary</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Sanderson Chery (Con Edison) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Richard Brophy (NYSEG-RGE) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Syed Ahmed (National Grid) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics, LLC.) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advisers/Non-member Participants:		
Ms. Erin Hogan (DOS), <b>ICS Chair</b> .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Howard Tarler (NYISO) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Dana Walters (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Greg Drake (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Frank Ciani (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Carl Patka (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Kate Berger (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bill Lamanna (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Al Adamson (Consultant).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. John Adams (Consultant) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Scott Leuthauser (Consultant for H.Q. Services) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Alan Ackerman (Customized Energy Solutions).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Mr. Timothy Lundin (Customized Energy Solutions) .....  .....   
Mr. James Scheiderich (ECS).....  .....

Guests Present:

### 1. ICS Meeting Minutes Process

Vice Chair/Secretary Gregory Chu (Con Edison) stated that he doesn't mind continue putting together detailed minutes because he felt that capturing detailed information is important. He agreed with Jim Scheiderich's (ECS) point about the detail discussion on a specific topic lasting over many meetings, unless captured in the minutes, would inevitably be forgotten and the group have to repeat the same discussion unnecessarily.

### 2. SCR Demand Response Preliminary Model Values

Kate Berger (NYISO) presented the preliminary model values of SCR to be included in the 2016 IRM study. Ms. Berger mentioned that there were no demand response events called during summer 2014. Therefore, the NYISO is recommending the same Translation Factor (0.9) and Fatigue Factor (1.0) as last year's study since there is no additional information available.

The NYISO is also recommending that Effective Capacity Value be updated to include years that did not have events. As a result, the ECV is recommended to be 0.85, instead of 0.95 from last year's study.

The overall effective performance of SCR when taken into account all three factors is 68.4%

### 3. 2016 IRM Study Topology

Bill Lamanna (NYISO) spoke at the meeting and informed the group that the topology is currently being put together and it will be presented to the group at the June meeting. **(AI 171-1)**

Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics) wondered if all 3 TOTS project will be included in the topology. Mr. Lamanna said that they would put together 2 topologies; one with TOTS and one without. Vice Chair Chu said he did reach out but did not hear back on the status of TOTS.

Mr. Younger suggested that the NYISO provide some permutation with the 3 TOTS projects to give members the various impacts in case 1 or 2 or all 3 of the projects would be in service by summer 2016. Dana Walters (NYISO) felt that ICS should provide the guidance in choosing the permutations. Vice Chair Chu believe that by the next ICS meeting we would know more about TOTS.

#### **4. MARS version**

Frank Ciani (NYISO) said that GE is working on a new version of MARS that includes the option for multiple wind shape. It is currently in version 3.19, which is a beta version. The official release would be 3.20, but that version will not be ready in time for this year's study. As a result, the NYISO will conduct this year's study with the same version 3.18 from last year.

#### **5. Outside World EOPs/PJM Model**

Al Adamson (NYSRC-consultant) stated that the draft report was circulated at the last meeting, and comments were collected and incorporated. Chair Hogan provided some additional editorial changes and John Adams (NYSRC-consultant) and Mr. Adamson will incorporate them into the final version.

The NYISO is currently running some sensitivity cases with the new PJM model area, but the cases have not yet been completed and thus the report will not be provided to the Executive Committee by their May meeting.

Greg Drake (NYISO) stated that they've added 3 additional areas to PJM, 1 of which is a new bubble to represent Dominion and Penelec. The NYISO also

added RFC-OTH and MRO-US to model. The draft results with these additional areas reduced NYCA to 0.05 to 0.06 LOLE, with the demand resources still in place (5600 MW). Next, the NYISO removed the demand resources and NYCA LOLE increased past 0.1 LOLE (0.4). Thus, demand resources is still needed for PJM 0.1 LOLE. Syed Ahmed (National Grid) wondered if we did not model PJM internal constraints would we achieve 0.1 LOLE. Mr. Adamson reminded ICS that Policy 5 requires, and it has been our practice, that internal transmission constraints be recognized within the Outside World Areas. NPCC also models PJM internal constraints. Mr. Adamson stated that perhaps a sensitivity case can be performed if members are interested in examining the IRM impact of modeling PJM without internal constraints. Mr. Adams also reminded the group that PJM would model SERC, which we did not include in our model, and that could be the reason we still need demand resources to achieve PJM 0.1 LOLE. Mr. Adams stated that SERC is not looked at by NPCC because they only model directly connected regions.

Mr. Drake asked the group if MRO-US and RFC-OTH should be modeled given those areas don't have direct ties to NYCA. Vice chair Chu felt that those two regions while not directly connected to us, but they are crucial to PJM and since our study focus is PJM, we should probably keep them in. Furthermore, if the NYISO has already put them in the model, there's no reason to remove them since the hard work is already completed. Mr. Adams cautioned that the problem here is a lack of load shape data for those two regions. Mr. Drake recommended dropping MRO-US and RFC-OTH, keeping DOM-VEPC and PJM internal constraints, and adding demand resources to get back to 0.1 LOLE. He felt that those two regions don't really help New York due to transmission constraints. Nonetheless, Mr. Drake suggested that they would keep MRO-US and RFC-OTH and determine the amount of DR needed to get back to 0.1 LOLE. Then, he'll isolate the two regions and determine the amount of DR to get back to 0.1 LOLE again.

## **6. Revised ICS Scope**

Mr. Adamson pointed out that the new language on assumption changes was corrected to state that the Executive Committee approves those changes, not the ICS. The ICS scope will be presented at the next EC meeting for their approval.

## **7. EISPC Report**

Mr. Adamson added the three conclusions from the “best practices” discovery and the report was reviewed and approved by the EC.

## **8. Policy 5 Changes**

Vice chair Chu stated that there are 3 topics currently that may require a write-up and will result in Policy 5 changes: Outside world modeling, Alignment Procedures, and Inclusion Date Rule. Mr. Drake would like to review Policy 5 to see if updated large hydro derate warrants a change in the language. Vice chair Chu doesn't believe so, but it wouldn't hurt if the NYISO double checks the Policy just in case.

## **9. Inclusion Date**

Vice chair Chu mentioned that Chair Hogan put together a document that described the 3 different options that ICS members can choose in order to present members' preference to the EC.

Vice chair Chu said that he didn't agree with revised wording of the document, and pointed out for example, capacity shifting in IRM/LCR calculation is NOT problematic regardless of how we treat incoming units because current shifting method is not done at a unit level, but rather at the MW level.

Mr. Younger stated that the important part is to have us agree with the treatment of the new unit and if the new unit added to the model will be on maintenance until its in service date, then there may not be an issue at all.

Mr. Drake felt that some of wording in this document draws attention to items that are being discussed in other groups. He felt that this boils down to the proper accounting of the amount of available capacity to shift.

Mr. Younger said that if we are to go to the EC with this list of options, we need to tell them more details about each option, including the recommended methodology.

Vice chair Chu said that we need to rework this document since he agreed with Mr. Younger that we need to tell the EC what we intend to do in each option.

Mr. Younger suggested that perhaps for option 3 we should determine the amount of LOLE events by month to determine the weighting of amount of capacity derate to apply to a proposed unit. As an example, Mr. Younger said that assume for June, July, and August had 0.01, 0.06, and 0.03 LOLE respectively. A new unit being considered will have a cumulative derate based on the proposed in-service month. So if the unit is coming in July, 90% of its capacity will be modeled. If the unit is coming in August, only 30% will be modeled, etc.

Mr. Walters asked if this had a high priority since there are no units that would be affected by this rule this upcoming study year. The members agreed that there's no urgency to implement this policy change. Without this change, reliability would not be jeopardized.

Mr. Younger also suggested that we could build up the base case for this year (not including the new units), and at the end, check the LOLE ratio by month, and determine if the previously mentioned ratio needs to be applied to the new units for model inclusion. **(AI 171-2)**

Rick Brophy (NYSEG) asked if his impression was correct that the model already can handle new units added to the model by placing those units in maintenance until in-service date. Vice Chair Chu said Mr. Brophy is correct and Mark Walling (GE) previously stated that. Mr. Brophy said option 2 would be the easiest to

implement without too much complexity. Vice Chair Chu said that the true con for option 2 is if there's an in-service date slippage, then we may overestimate the capacity assistance since that new unit is not available in real life.

Mr. Walters also suggested a possible option 4, where the new unit entering after June would be left out in the base case, but a sensitivity case can be performed with the unit in and the EC can consider the sensitivity result in their vote.

Mr. Adamson was concerned that from this discussion, it appears that some ICS members would prefer to provide this document to the EC and ask them to make a decision for us. Vice Chair Chu assured Mr. Adamson that we would try to work together as a group to first reach an agreed method if possible. If not, a consensus vote would be taken and the voting results (including majority and minority votes) will be presented to the EC along with the majority vote as the recommendation for their final approval. Vice Chair Chu believe we can come to an agreement at the end and as a highly technical and competent group we would eventually be able to determine the best possible approach prior to presenting this to the EC.

## **10. 2016-17 IRM Assumption Matrix**

Mr. Drake said the NYISO has not updated the assumptions because the Gold Book was just approved the day before this meeting. He is asking members to provide any updates (new units/retiring units) they might be aware of.

Mr. Adamson asked if the NYISO has any concerns about the assumptions, of which Mr. Drake said the topology may be of concern. Mr. Walters said that there shouldn't be any major concerns on the topology, other than TOTS inclusion/exclusion. Mr. Younger said if TOTS is expected to be in service, we shouldn't be excluding them. Mr. Walters felt that the question is really about having TOTS in the base case or not.

Vice Chair Chu asked the NYISO to provide the draft assumption matrix to the members for review prior to the June ICS meeting. **(AI 171-3)**

Arthur Maniaci to present load shape model and load forecast uncertainty model  
at the June ICS meeting **(AI 171-4)**

Secretary: Gregory Chu

*(Con Edison)*

---

Next meetings:

Meeting 172, Wednesday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 173, Wednesday, July 1<sup>st</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 174, Wednesday, August 5<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 175, Wednesday, September 2<sup>nd</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 176, Tuesday, September 29<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 177, Tuesday, October 27<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 178, Monday, November 30<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

---