

# NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #165

October 28th, 2014

10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

## Attendees

	Present	Tel
Members / Alternates:		
Mr. Yuri Fishman (PSEG-LI) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Khatune Zannat (PSEG-LI) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Alexander Heckel (National Grid).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Syed Ahmed (National Grid) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Andrea Fossa (NYPA) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bob Boyle (NYPA) .....	<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 (NYSERDA), <b>ICS Chair</b> .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Howard Tarler (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Dana Walters (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"/>
Mr. Richard Quimby (NYPSC) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Ed Schrom (NYPSC) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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) .....  .....

Mr. Jim Scheiderich (Energy Curtailment Specialist).....  .....

Mr. Alan Ackerman (Customized Energy Solutions).....  .....

Mr. Timothy Lundin (Customized Energy Solutions) .....  .....

Guests Present:

**1. Tangent 45 results**

Frank Ciani (NYISO) presented the tangent 45 results from the final base case. Vice Chair Gregory Chu (Con Edison) stated that Con Edison independently performed the regression using the data points provided by the NYISO. Con Edison concurs with the NYISO tangent 45 results.

**The final base case tangent 45 results were 17.3% IRM, 83.4% zone J LCR, and 103.4% zone K LCR.**

Al Adamson (NYSRC- Consultant) asked for the assumption changes that made the IRM decrease by 0.1%. Mr. Ciani said that Astoria 2 was added, Binghamton Cogen also returned to service, and there was a swap of Ravenswood GTs. (3-4 came back to service, while 3-3 went out of service.) QA findings also had an effect on the result. Chair Erin Hogan (DOS) asked if it was due only to Con Edison and PSEG-LI findings, since GE findings did not affect the IRM as previously determined. Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO) stated that ISO-NE transfer limits were corrected and that had some impact. Greg Drake (NYISO) said that the red-line version of the assumption included all of the changes that resulted in the 0.1% drop in IRM.

Mr. Drake mentioned that while the NYISO is confident in the 17.3% result for the IRM, the NYISO is uncertain about the 2 LCRs because of a data entry issue pertaining to the peak load. Dana Walters (NYISO) said that they have identified that zone J had 10 MW and zone K had 21 MW too high in the peak load entry in

the model. Mr. Walters said that they were uncertain about the direction of the LCR movement. The NYISO surmises that it could be off by 0.1% in J and 0.2% in K. The NYISO will re-run the tangent 45 to obtain the final LCRs. Vice Chair Chu asked if the NYISO will have the results before the Executive Committee meeting, which is the following Friday (11/7). The NYISO said that they will have the new curves by this Friday (10/31). Mr. Adamson said that if the NYISO cannot complete by 10/31, they need to let him know so he can alert EC Secretary Don Raymond by Saturday.

Chair Hogan said we would be approving IRM only at this meeting, not the LCRs. Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics) said that since LCRs also determine the IRM, we may not be able to do that. Vice Chair Chu agreed, but also mentioned that it is very unlikely those small load changes would affect the IRM. As a matter of procedure, we can approve the IRM, pending the curve rerun. Chair Hogan said if 17.3% has changed with the new curves, we would need to revisit this as a group.

**The group approved 17.3% IRM, pending the curve rerun.**

Khatune Zannat (PSEG-LI) asked when the curves will be done since PSEG-LI and Con Edison need to check the regression. The NYISO stated that they would try to get the points to the TOs by Friday noon. **(AI 165-1)**

Mr. Younger wondered if the NYISO has already calculated LHV LCR. Mr. Drake said that since the LHV LCR is determined separately and is based on the final voted IRM, not the base case IRM, it is confusing and premature to provide an estimate of LHV LCR right now. Mr. Younger argued that it is not confusing and it is crucial to a lot of interested party for their planning purposes. He said that it is just a calculation since all of the information needed is already available in the case.

Mr. Adamson asked the importance of the LHV LCR, since it is not a part of this report. Syed Ahmed (National Grid) does not believe that this is important with this group that deals with reliability and would not have been a part of this report anyways. Former Chair Bob Boyle (NYPA) felt that it is helpful to others. Chair

Hogan felt that this should be addressed in the ICAP working group to avoid delays. Mr. Boyle suggested that perhaps we would add a table that shows the UCAP EFORD in different capacity zones. Mr. Adamson said we need to be clear that this does not affect the IRM process and Policy 5. Mr. Drake cautioned that since the procedure for LCRs is a separate one from the IRM, we should not address this in our report. Rick Brophy (NYSEG) cautioned that we be “mission creeping”, where this group ends up with a bloated agenda that make the IRM study even more difficult, especially with the REV (Reforming Energy Vision) proceeding looming on the horizon. Mr. Adamson said that perhaps the group should visit ICS scope next year to ensure we are doing what we need to.

## **2. Parametric Analysis Approval**

Mr. Adamson said the EC does not approve this table, but we need to approve this table for the report. He said that this was based on the 17.4% “final” preliminary base case. He asked if the NYISO felt that the change from 17.4 to 17.3 is due to the load forecast. The NYISO agreed. The load forecast will be reduced from +0.4 to +0.3.

Mr. Drake asked if we should add more parameters that had 0 affect, but nonetheless is present in the base case. Mr. Adamson commented that will be fine.

**The group approved the parametric analysis table.**

## **3. Sensitivity Cases**

Members have some disagreement about the classification of Demand Response “limited” as EOPs, for cases 9 and 10. Chair Hogan said that it is just the way we would model it in the base case. John Adams (NYSRC- consultant) stated that Limited MW is considered EOP by PJM. They could only call those during an emergency with a limit on number of calls. Mr. Adamson pointed to the table 5-1 in the report that “Extended” and “Annual” MW are economic program type, where “Limited” is an emergency program type.

To avoid confusion, Mr. Adamson said that base case has Extended and Annual MW, and case 9 added Limited MW to the model.

Mr. Ahmed said that we should add a footnote in table 7-1 that limited PJM DR was explained in table 5-1. **(AI 165-2)**

Chair Hogan said that we should consider removing 1,367 MW note in case 4-no wind capacity. Mr. Adamson doesn't think it will hurt having that in the table, but he was ok with the removal. This amount is described in the appendix in detail.

Mr. Ahmed is still concerned with the note "min. PJM LOLE =0.15" in the report. He felt we needed proper explanation before we can put that in the report. Chair Hogan felt that case 8-10 do not have consistent description in table 7-1.

Mr. Adamson said that we can look at the limited MW as a mechanism to lower PJM LOLE to an acceptable level from the original 0.88 LOLE. He did agree that 0.15 LOLE is an arbitrary number.

Mr. Boyle suggested that we would just reference the table 5-2. The confusion here is that case 8 cannot have PJM LOLE=0.88 because it is not a target for adjustment, but the result of not modeling PJM DR.

Mr. Brophy at the end said that we should just enter "Target PJM LOLE=0.15" for case 9 and "Target PJM LOLE=0.1" for case 10.

Table B-1 in the appendix has, in the past, been grouped in categories. The categories will be removed. **(AI 165-3)**

#### **4. IRM Report Body**

The group reviewed the report in its entirety through a page turner.

Chair Hogan said that we should add (ICS) in the first paragraph. She also thought the phrase "provide parameters" to be misleading, as the group oversees the IRM study.

Vice Chair Chu said that we should delete response in demand response resources, as we refer them as demand resources later on in the report.

Locational Capacity Requirements should be capitalized.

Mr. Adamson said that the executive summary is not used as an introduction. He usually start again at section 1, introduction.

Vice Chair Chu suggested that we remove duplicate resource in “demand resource resources”.

Section 4 Study results base case will be filled in with the new curves by Thursday night (10/30)

Mr. Adamson asked for the Monte Carlo error analysis section from the NYISO. Mr. Ciani does not believe this will be available by Friday. **(AI 165-4)** Mr. Drake suggested that the 1,000 simulated years should be changed to 1,500 instead. Members agreed.

In section 5.2.3, there were two “slightly”s.

Mr. Boyle said that 5.2.2 there were two different wind capacities between this section and the sensitivity table. Mr. Drake said that 1,457 MW are the amount participating in the capacity market. We should be consistent with assumption matrix. Vice Chair Chu said we can spell out “a new wind project”. Mr. Boyle said what if we have more units than one. Vice Chair Chu suggested that we can put a reference to the new wind generation table if there will be more than one.

Chair Hogan said it is unclear to the readers that UDRs are actually confidential. A sentence will be added to the paragraph for “confidential elections”.

Chair Hogan recommended that in Outside World Area Demand Resources section, remove “plans”. Vice Chair Chu also suggested that we should probably call out “a large amount” of capacity retiring since we know that amount of MW.

Mr. Ahmed suggested that a reference to be provided in the report. Jim Scheiderich (ECS) suggested we move this statement to the section before this to prevent association of DR due to retirements. Chair Hogan felt it is ok if it is left in the same section.

Table 5-2 has 2015 IRM, and should be called NYCA IRM. An extra column is needed to refer to the sensitivity cases that the scenarios are tied to.

Mr. Ahmed would like the statement about environmental initiatives to be less negative, in section 5.4. Mr. Ahmed felt that there's a possibility that initiatives may reduce IRM, versus increasing it, as discussed by Peter Carney (NYISO) at a separate meeting.

Vice Chair Chu stated that section 7, the new in "a new multiple load shape" should be removed because it is not new this year.

Figure 8-1 needs to be updated.

**Comments due to Mr. Adamson by Thursday (10/30). (AI 165-5).**

## **5. IRM Report Appendix**

Mr. Adams brought to the group's attention that table A-5, LFU model, Zone K had incorrect percentages for bin 6 and 7. Chair Hogan also mentioned that the lower table of "low-med" "Hi-med" should be removed.

Mr. Ciani said that because of the different versions of MS Word being used by Mr. Adams versus the NYISO, there are some formatting issues. Those will be corrected.

By 11/5 error analysis result should be sent from the NYISO to Mr. Adams.

All comments for the Appendix are due to Mr. Adams by 11/14 **(AI 165-6)**

Mr. Adams will send out the revised Appendix to ICS by 11/19 **(AI 165-7)**

Chair Hogan is requesting that in the future, the NYISO should just send the spreadsheet/charts/tables, instead of images. This will allow Mr. Adams to perform minor changes easily. Mr. Drake said that since the LFU table came from Arthur Maniaci (NYISO), he has to get him to provide an update.

Vice Chair Chu pointed out that Ravenswood GT 3-3 should be in the retirements on page 22, instead of GT 3-4. Mr. Adams will verify if the capacity is correct for unit 3-3.

Figure A-6 through A-9 (availability) needs updating.

Maintenance charts need to be updated as well.

Mr. Scheiderich pointed out in table A-9, Volney East has a delta but is not shown in the table.

Mr. Drake will go back and look at the topology, since Mr. Adams said that the topology in the report showed 6/30/2014, but in the assumption matrix it is different.

Appendix B.2 will be consolidated. Most of the regulation explanation came from the RNA.

MLCR will be added to the glossary, as defined in Policy 5.

Vice Chair Chu asked why in the PJM-SENY MARS topology, the reverse direction from J to J4 and J4 to PJM East has no rating listed. In the model there are transfer limits for both leg of the topology, he said. Mr. Younger said there should not be a reverse flow from J to PJME, due to no injection rights. Mr. Drake said that GE said that this is the proper way to represent the system. Mr. Younger said this is not correct. He pointed out J to J4 should be 0. Mr. Drake question that, because in an emergency where PJM is critically short, they would get power over HTP from zone J.

Mr. Younger argued that the same reason that Neptune has 0 rating going from zone K to PJME applies to HTP. Mr. Ahmed also mentioned that Cross Sound Cable only flow MW from New England to zone K, but since K cannot sell to Connecticut, that direction should have a limit of 0.

Vice Chair Chu said that this is a study under emergency situation, so if the power can flow those direction, regardless if they can sold in the market, we need to model as it would run during those situations.

## 6. Special Sensitivity Case

The members felt that HTP reverse limit from J to PJME of 0 MW should be tested under a special sensitivity case. Without injection rights, Mr. Younger stressed that we must identify any impact this may have on the IRM. **(AI 165-8)**

Secretary: Gregory Chu

*(Con Edison)*

---

Next meetings:

Meeting 166, Monday, December 1<sup>st</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 167, Monday, January 5<sup>th</sup> as a conference call

Meeting 168, Wednesday, February 4<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 169, Wednesday, March 4<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 170, Wednesday, April 1<sup>st</sup> at NYISO HQ

Meeting 171, Tuesday, April 28<sup>th</sup> at NYISO HQ

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

