

April 28, 2015
ICS Meeting
Inclusion Date Decision

Option 1: Include new generating units in the MARS database that are expected to be in-service before June 1st of the study year.

Pros – Allows for potential construction delays of a project. Assures that the same capacity resources are modeled for the entire critical summer period.

Cons – If the new capacity has a lower EFORD rate than the average in the Locality(ies) and the NYCA then excluding the new capacity might result in increasing the IRM slightly.

Option 2: Include new generating units in the MARS database that are expected to be in-service anytime during the study year.

Pros – May more closely reflect the expected installed capacity for the capability year.

Cons – It is unclear how the reserve margin calculation would be revised to address a new unit being added after the start of the summer peaking period. The issue of which capacity resources to assume when setting the IRM and how to perform the capacity shifting in the IRM/LCR calculations are particularly problematic.

Option 3: Include a new unit regardless of the date and derate those that are expected after June 1st. For example, if a unit is scheduled to come in at or before June 1st, 100% of its capacity would be included for the entire summer peaking period through the study year. If it is scheduled to come in at or before July 1st, only 75% of its capacity would be included for the remainder of the study year. August 1st, 50%. September 1st, 25%. Finally, if the unit is scheduled to come in after October 1st, 0%.

Pros – Not ignoring a potential unit, but reducing the concern the unit may be delayed by derating its capacity.

Cons – As above, it is unclear how the reserve margin calculation would be revised to address a new unit being added after the start of the summer peaking period. The issue of which capacity resources to assume when setting the IRM and how to perform the capacity shifting in the IRM/LCR calculations are particularly problematic.