

NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #170

April 1st, 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 type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Mary Ann ??(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), ICS Vice Chair/Secretary	<input 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. 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), ICS Chair	<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. 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"/>
Mr. Al Adamson (Consultant)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. John Adams (Consultant)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Scott Leuthauser (Consultant for H.Q. Services)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Alan Ackerman (Customized Energy Solutions).....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Timothy Lundin (Customized Energy Solutions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Mr. James Scheiderich (ECS).....

Guests Present:

Mr. Dave Ebnosky?

1. ICS Meeting Minutes Process

Syed Ahmed (National Grid) suggested that perhaps meeting minutes could be shortened, and only highlights the issues. He believed that unless there's a vote on the issue, we may not need that much detail on people's opinions and comments during the meeting.

Jim Scheiderich (ECS) understands that sometimes brevity is good, but sometimes the issues can drag on from many months, or even years, and some of the details would be lost if they were not captured in detail in the minutes. He suggested that the current secretary Gregory Chu (Con Edison) could better weigh in on this process and let people know if the process is too burdensome.

Al Adamson (NYSRC- Consultant) agreed with Mr. Scheiderich that it would be important for Mr. Chu to determine if the process needs to be changed.

Chair Erin Hogan (DOS) agreed and in addition, suggested that we should be looking for a back-up secretary in the future, in case the current secretary cannot participate in the meeting.

2. Export Modeling Action Item

Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics) reiterated that from the previous meeting, the NYISO (Wes Yeomans) stated that all of the northeast ISOs will meet to look at the entire MOU (Northeastern Capacity MOU) to ensure proper

modeling. Mr. Younger asked the group to close all the action items related to this, as finally the NYISO has promised to take steps to address this issue, and Mr. Younger has asked a new action item be created to track this progress. Chair Hogan agreed and recommended that “Track the development of Northeastern Capacity MOU and the effects on our IRM study, in particular interface modeling” to be added as a new action item. **(AI 169-1)** Mr. Younger has gracefully accepted the responsibility to head the tracking process. Action item 108-1 and 162-3 is now closed.

3. Inventory of Issues for 2016 IRM study

Chair Hogan stated that the list of the issue should be combined with action items for clarity. She said that the Executive Committee approved the Inventory Issue list at the last EC meeting.

4. Outside world EOPs/PJM Model Study Report

John Adams (NYSRC – Consultant) revisited the background to the “Outside world EOPs/PJM Model” to refresh ICS members’ memories and along with the other members of the working group (Mr. Adamson, Mr. Drake, and Mr. Ahmed) provided to the ICS members a draft version of the study report. The main focus of the report was to determine if we should change the way we model external EOPs/model area. Mr. Adams said that the conclusion reached by the study group is that we should continue to NOT model EOP of the outside world. Mr. Adams said that this is consistent with PJM not considering EOP when they determined their own reserve margin. They don’t even consider demand resources until later to meet the reserve margin.

Mr. Scheiderich stated that at the previous meeting, PJM stated that they were using DR to bring the system back to 0.1 LOLE since the load used to determine their IRM was lower than what would have been in real life. Mr. Adams said that in their investigation they did not encounter any documentation on this practice. In fact, Mr. Adams said that with traditional generation alone, PJM is running long with ~~21.4121.4~~ 21.4121.4% margin for the summer of 2015.

Mr. Adams said that Ontario doesn't include EOP in their reserve margin determination as well, and they don't consider tie benefits, although PJM does. He said PJM models approximate 1.9% (3,500 MW) as tie benefits. Quebec EOPs are targeted to winter load and they are all voltage reduction. Quebec does not even activate VR unless they need it. They also don't count on emergency assistance in their reserve margin studies.

Mr. Ahmed asked for clarification on 5b. (Pg. 8) which is about 2 area model. Mr. Adams said that PJM mentioned that they modeled PJM as one bubble, and the outside world as another bubble. Mr. Ahmed said that it wasn't really clear that PJM was doing this in the report, especially that internal interface ties within PJM is not modeled by themselves. He recommended that breaking up this point into 2, where the first is about 2 area models, the second part is about internal interface ties modeling.

Mr. Younger pointed out that PJM did mention that we are not modeling south and west external tie supports to PJM. He stated that while we didn't model PJM in its entirety which led to a shortage of capacity, they don't model internal constraints. He said the lack of internal constraints probably understated the amount of reserve they need. Mr. Ahmed said that we should point this out specifically in the report. He does not agree, however, in making statements about increase/decrease of their reserve margin due to them not modeling internal constraints. Mr. Adamson would like to go back and revise the report together with the working group. Chair Hogan and members have suggested some additional changes to the language for clarity which will be seen in the final version of the report. This report will be approved by the next meeting.

Mr. Ahmed asked if NPCC CP-8 group actually modeled the entire PJM RTO region. Mr. Adams said they do. Frank Ciani (NYISO) said that CP-8 did not model SERC region. Mr. Ahmed asked if the data is shared with us. Mr. Ciani said that there's an agreement with PJM to share data so we can obtain the data if necessary. Mr. Adamson thinks we should model the same way NPCC does their modeling. Chair Hogan wondered if the NPCC model has all of the intricacy (like grandfather rights of transfer capability). Mr. Ciani said he wasn't sure. Chair

Hogan thought perhaps we would need to stay with the method from last year (including annual and extended DR) until we have all of the needed information to model the entire PJM RTO accurately, at least for this year. Mr. Adamson said that the NYISO in previous discussions is looking to perform some runs in April using the recommendation and he is expecting the EC would be looking to have the recommendation implemented for this year's base case study. The NYISO agreed to run the following cases: last year base case with full PJM RTO and if the LOLE is still much higher than 0.1, introduce PJM's external tie assistance from MRO-US and RFC-OTH. Chair Hogan would like to see the results first, before the group makes a decision to use this method for this year.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, No underline

Mr. Younger has a concern with recommendation #2. He was uncertain with the necessary steps to bring an outside area's high LOLE back to closer to 0.1. He was uncomfortable with adding fictitious capacity to lower LOLE, if that's the intent. Mr. Adams said that was not the intent. Mr. Ahmed felt that recommendation #2 set the lower bound of LOLE but we need to think about if we model a specific way for an external area and its LOLE was still too high, we need determine if the result makes sense. Mr. Adamson clarified the proposed process to first model the entire PJM RTO with all available resources. If the region is still much higher than 0.1 LOLE, then the demand resources would be considered to lower the LOLE. Chair Hogan added that imports from their neighbors should be added as well, before demand resources are added. Mr. Younger doesn't have a problem with the concept but would like the language clarified in the report.

Mr. Ahmed cautioned that the practice should be generic so that other external areas would also be covered. He also suggested perhaps in the future we may need a sensitivity case to see the impact of their internal constraints. Mr. Ciani said that the NPCC CP-8 model that contains a lot more detailed regions takes 10 hours to complete a run. Mr. Adamson said that we probably shouldn't include changes to all of the regions yet. Mr. Ahmed said if we are not including changes to ALL of the other areas, we need to state that in the report.

ICS will need to provide comments by next week Monday. **(AI 170-1)**

5. Inclusion Date Analysis

Chair Hogan felt that there may not a consensus reached on this topic, and while she would rather err on the side conservatism, she foresaw a possibility that this group may have to present the views to the EC for their determination.

Chair Hogan volunteered to write up a summary of all the point of views, and will ask the group to vote on their preference. **(AI 170-2)**

6. Multiple Wind Shape Status Report

Mr. Drake said that GE is working on a way to do this in the model. He would run some sensitivity cases when the upgraded model is available. He also said that the NYISO would try to average the available production data and see its effect on the model, in parallel to GE's model upgrade.

7. Procedure to Align Base Case with Final IRM

Mr. Drake said the NYISO will present some slides at the next meeting for this topic.

8. Revised ICS Scope

Rick Brophy (NYSEG) said that comments were received and the procedure was revised. The group had no additional comments and it is approved by ICS members. [The EC will be requested to approve the scope.](#)

9. Review of EISPC Paper

Mr. Adamson said that the EC Chair Mayer Sasson (Con Edison) had comments on the economic analysis that was made in the paper. ICS was asked to review

the paper and determine if there are “best practices” the group can adapt in the IRM study process.

Mr. Adamson said that the paper does not disagree with the current NYSRC IRM study procedure or the current LOLE criteria. Policy 5 provides the procedure to update study assumptions every year. ~~NYSRC and~~ NPCC independently reviews the IRM study report annually and have found the process and results compliant. ICS has always been open to consider alternate study procedures~~various studies~~ when deemed appropriate. Mr. Adamson will circulate the best practices~~recommendations~~ to ICS members. Chair Hogan would like to see the best practices~~recommendations~~ in the paper, instead of having a separate document. **(AI 170-3)**

10. ELR/CLR Investigation

Mr. Drake said the NYISO is still trying to get more data to fill the table. He said that ELR MW numbers are available, but they are still trying to get CLR numbers.

Chair Hogan wondered if we need this for the base case. Mr. Younger does not anticipate any more than a sensitivity run once the data is obtained. He was mostly concerned about underestimating the capacity limitation of these resources. He stated that some resources have yearly limitations, which won't affect the model much, but there may be resources that simply cannot operate more than 4, 6, etc. hours.

Mr. Drake pointed out that gas turbines are already derated in the model, so we would need to exclude those units from additional derates.

11. Transmission Outage WG – Transition Rate Matrix

Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO) said that on February 19th the working group met, and the group reached an agreement. Dr. Jiang circulated the agreement write-up at the

last ICS meeting. The first part of the write-up is about the proposed methodology. The second part is a schematic of the Chateauguay configuration.

Chair Hogan asked the overall ICS group if everyone concurred with the write-up recommendation. There were no objections. As a result, ICS is asking the NYISO to proceed with the proposed method and create the matrix and conduct MARS runs. Dr. Jiang and the NYISO are asking for 3 months and there were no objections. **(AI 170-4)**

12. IRM Study Guide

Mr. Adams presented an outline of the proposed IRM study guide. He recommended elimination of the appendices from Policy 5 and move them into the study guide. This would stream line Policy 5. For example, section 2 of the outline "Description of Model Inputs" would be from Policy 5.

Mr. Adamson wondered if the study guide is designed to expand on the various aspects, or was it to replace what we see in Policy 5 appendices. He wondered if we would need to say the study is based on Policy 5 AND IRM Study Guide. Chair Hogan felt the guide is designed to give more details about the study process, and is designed to provide knowledge transfer when current experts are no longer involved in the group/study process. Mr. Adamson wondered if in the future if we would include the guide as a part of Policy 5. Chair Hogan pointed out that summer maintenance process was never included in any of the documents. Mr. Adamson saw the study guide as an extension of Policy 5. To alleviate Mr. Adamson's concerns, Chair Hogan recommended that we would create the IRM study guide this year, while keeping Policy 5 as is for now.

13. Treatment of Export Limit Zones

Mr. Younger stated that the NYISO will file with FERC the findings in June and he believes the NYISO will not recommend any changes.

14. Assumption Matrix

Mr. Drake said there were no updates at this time, but he believes that by next meeting we would have updates to the assumption matrix because the Gold Book will be out by April 28th.

Secretary: Gregory Chu

(Con Edison)

Next meetings:

Meeting 171, Tuesday, April 28th at NYISO HQ
Meeting 172, Wednesday, June 3rd at NYISO HQ
Meeting 173, Wednesday, July 1st at NYISO HQ
Meeting 174, Wednesday, August 5th at NYISO HQ
Meeting 175, Wednesday, September 2nd at NYISO HQ
Meeting 176, Tuesday, September 29th at NYISO HQ
Meeting 177, Tuesday, October 27th at NYISO HQ
Meeting 178, Monday, November 30th at NYISO HQ
