

NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #174

August 5th, 2015

10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

	Present	Tel
Members / Alternates:		
Ms. Khatune Zannat (PSEG-LI)	<input 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 checked="" 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"/>
Mr. Bob Boyle (NYPA)	<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. Richard Quimby (NYSDPS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Edward Schrom (NYSDPS).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Greg Drake (NYISO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Dana Walters (NYISO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Howard Tarler (NYISO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bill Lamanna (NYISO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ms. Vijay Ganugula (NYISO)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dr. Kelvin Chu (GE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Al Adamson (Consultant).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

Ms. Kelli Joseph (NRG)
Mr. James Scheiderich (ECS).....

Guests Present:

Mr. Alan Ackerman (CES).....
Mr. Norman Mah (Con Edison Solutions).....

1. Assumption Matrix Final Version

Chair Erin Hogan (DOS) said that some of the matrix updates included Executive Committee’s decision to keep ECV at 0.95 and thus SCR model values were changed to reflect the new SCR amounts. Summer maintenance was also updated with John Adams’ (NYSRC – Consultant) analysis. Finally, the topology was updated with some minor transfer limit fine tuning from PSEG-LI and TPAS had no additional comments.

Al Adamson (NYSRC – Consultant) reminded members that any changes from now on should be redlined to show the difference between this EC approved version and the version to be used for the final base case in October.

Rick Brophy (NYSEG) would like to receive the final version of the matrix and Chair Hogan said that the matrix will be available on the website shortly.

2. Load Shape Selection Methodology

Arthur Maniaci (NYISO) presented the new method the NYISO implemented to ensure alignment of different load shapes. The reason alignment became more difficult was because of the new capacity zone and its peak that must be aligned for zones G-J along with zone J, K, and NYCA peak.

Mr. Maniaci explained that MARS does the adjustment automatically, internally. In the past, zones J and K locality peak was ensured, and the rest of the zones would be adjusted so that NYCA peak would be ensured as well. With the

introduction of G-J locality, MARS is incapable of making the adjustment so that peaks for J, K, NYCA, and G-J can all be ensured.

The NYISO had to make shape adjustment external to MARS to satisfy all peak requirements for the locality. First step, and is the same as before, was to make sure all locality non-coincident peak is adjusted to the study year forecasted peak. Then the NYISO had to make additional adjustments to zones G through J to ensure that G-J locality peak happens on the day of the peak for G-J locality, while satisfying J, K and NYCA peak.

Chair Hogan was unsure if this adjustment was necessary since the IRM study does not determine G-J locality LCRs. Former Chair Bob Boyle said that this method may be needed if there's a reliability need, but he wasn't sure if there's a current reliability need for G-J locality.

Mr. Maniaci said that this new method is the same as last year's method, even though it is different than the previous years' methodology. He also said that Vice Chair Gregory Chu (Con Edison) questioned last year that the shapes were different and appeared to have been adjusted for the 2002, 2006, and 2007 shapes. The adjustment to the shapes has been explained here by Mr. Maniaci which answered Mr. Chu's question.

Chair Hogan wondered if the NYISO checked to see if the model has not been affected by the shape adjustment. Greg Drake (NYISO) said he would check back. **(AI 174-1)**

Syed Ahmed (National Grid) wondered if there's a need for a white paper/write-up for a "methodology change". Chair Hogan was wondering about the same thing. Mr. Adamson said that this could be included in the IRM report, within the section for load shape discussion. Mr. Boyle felt that Policy 5 should describe this new method. Chair Hogan said that this may be better included in the process guides instead. Mr. Boyle would like to see a numerical example of the adjustment.

Mr. Boyle asked if zone J is the controlling zone for the NYCA peak. Mr. Maniaci does not believe so. Mr. Boyle wondered about the controlling zone in the G-J locality. Mr. Maniaci said that intra-day adjustments are done so that there wouldn't be an over or under abrupt adjustment of the load for the locality. He will return to provide some numerical example of the adjustment method. **(AI 174-2)**

3. Summer Maintenance

John Adams (NYSRC - Consultant) said that he has analyzed days that had 0.9 PU of the peak load would be considered, but we didn't have any days last year at that level. Mr. Adams instead analyzed days that had 0.85 PU of the peak load.

He mentioned that the pattern of maintenance MW below 30,000 MW system load was similar to last year's pattern so he is recommending that we maintain 50 MW as the summer maintenance MW in the model. ICS members agreed.

Mr. Boyle asked if the 2013 chart included all the days in the summer/year. Mr. Adams said that only days that exceeded 0.85 PU of the peak were considered.

4. Parametric Results

Mr. Drake said that this year the NYISO split up the parametric results into "material" and "minimal" changes.

Mr. Drake said last year the model had 1500 iterations, but this year they needed less for the model result to converge.

The changing of study year to 2016 resulted in some maintenance changes typically but there was almost no change this time.

Solar performance was improved but the model didn't see a change because it only affected 30 MW.

Federal power contract sale changes every year, but there was no significant changes to the model.

Cable transition rate had a slight improvement that led to a very small change in the IRM.

Unit DMNC updates led to a tiny change as well, mostly negligible.

For parameters that had a material change on the model, they are considered material if the IRM change is greater than 0.05 percentage points.

The topology and generation additions drove the IRM down by 0.1%. Mr. Adamson wondered why topology and generation were combined in a single parameter case. Mr. Drake said that the NYISO was concerned about having generation addition as a single case because there's only one generator added to the model. One can back into the unit performance and determine its impact on IRM directly. Chair Hogan said perhaps for the generation case the NYISO can avoid reporting the locality results but instead report the NYCA results.

Wind unit performance improved and IRM was reduced by 0.2%. This result wasn't finalized and a new run is being done because the wind shape had to be checked after the shape update that was performed outside of the model (in excel). This was a problem identified by the NYISO QA process.

With less Non-SCR EOPs available, IRM was increased by 0.1%

Updated SCR performance led to an IRM reduction of 0.2%

Transition rates improved and lowered the IRM by 1.3%

Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics) asked how many cases remain. Mr. Drake said that the ones remaining included load forecast and external area representations, in addition to the updated wind shape re-run.

Mr. Drake stated that PJM has a 10,000 MW capacity increase, and their peak load has decreased by 3000 MW. Thus, it is likely that PJM will not have an LOLE issue this year, as opposed to the previous year.

The full parametric results will be discussed at a conference call on 8/14 3PM.
(AI 174-3)

5. Proposed Sensitivity Cases

Chair Hogan stated that cases 1 through 5 are the typical cases the study performs. Other cases are from discussions from previous meetings.

Mr. Younger said that cases 6, 7, 10, and 11 are not relevant. Carl Patka (NYISO) cautioned that case 12 may still be relevant as the EC has always asked for the Indian Point retirement case.

Mr. Ahmed mentioned that we should perform a sensitivity case for PJM as 5 bubble zones.

Mr. Drake said that we may want to consider a different load shape than the 2002 shape because that particular year the shape was flat, whereas recent shapes seem to be more “peaky”. Dana Walters (NYISO) stated that they are still looking at an alternative shape but it will not be available for this year’s study. Chair Hogan wondered if 2013 load would be an appropriate replacement. As a result of the discussion, this sensitivity case will not be considered.

Mr. Adamson asked for the reason for studying ISO-NE forward capacity market as a sensitivity case. Chair Hogan reiterated that in the past NYCA capacity that participated in the FCM came back to NYCA. Recently due to capacity price increases in New England, there were some concerns that NYCA capacity will no longer return to NYCA. Chair Hogan urged members to think about what value to use in the sensitivity case for the next meeting.

Mr. Walters didn't expect the new GE wind shape model will be available. Chair Hogan said that she just wanted to the EC members know that if the software is available and can be tested in time, this sensitivity case may be warranted.

6. PJM Topology Sensitivity Case (5 versus 4 bubble model)

Bill Lamanna (NYISO) said that the NYISO spoke with PJM about the new PJM topology. He said there may be some changes, including some transfer limit number changes. Chair Hogan is hoping that the topology will be worked out by next year for next year's model inclusion. Mr. Walters thought it is premature to assume that the 5 bubble model can be used next year. In fact, Mr. Walters think that we are not ready to perform a sensitivity case on the 5 bubble model at all. Mr. Boyle agreed and felt that this should be postponed until next year with a white paper. He does, however, want to the NYISO to come back and inform the group periodically about the status of the PJM topology.

Jim Scheiderich (ECS) asked about the major driver that led to the change to a 5 bubble model. Mr. Lamanna said there were many transmission and generation changes in PJM that resulted in a change in topology. Mr. Scheiderich believed that these types of changes are typically transmission related. Mr. Lamanna agreed and said there were major transmission lines changes, in addition to translating interfaces for MARS that PJM themselves do not use or study for their own planning purpose that resulted in the topology change.

In the end, the members agreed that 5 bubble PJM sensitivity case should be dropped.

Mr. Boyle recommended an action item so that the NYISO will come back and inform ICS members on the status of the 5 bubble model discussion with PJM.

(AI 174-4)

7. Sensitivity Capacity Changing Methodology

Mr. Drake proposed that adding capacity to ALL zones to make up capacity removed in sensitivity case could be changed to adding capacity to zones south of UPNYSENY ONLY for capacity removed in those zones south of UPNYSENY. This item will be discussed further at a later meeting.

8. Overhead Transmission Outage Working Group

Mr. Drake said that the NYISO has the transition rate matrix to show. Mr. Adamson said we have a working group. Vice Chair Chu agreed with Mr. Adamson that we should have the result discussed at the working group first to avoid confusion at the ICS group discussion due to the technical nature of the topic. If the result is unusual, the working group can work on it before bringing it to the general ICS group.

9. 2016 IRM Schedule

Chair Hogan was concerned that the July EC meeting only gives the NYISO 3 weeks to complete the parametric study next year.

Mr. Younger recommended that if the parametric analysis result cannot be completed by the August ICS meeting, then we can have a conference call when the results are available after the August meeting. He stated that the NYISO should still show as many completed parametric results as possible at the August ICS meeting.

10. Minimum LCR

Mr. Boyle was concerned that “minimum LCR” is not a correct term because in reality at the time the NYISO set the LCR, there may have been changes in the system that warranted a lower LCR than the tangent 45 result. He believed that the proper term should be “indicative” or “estimated” since the LCR is set by the NYISO and is not determined by this group.

The members will revisit this issue at a later date, possibly by the October meeting when the report is being formalized. **(AI 174-5)**

Secretary: Gregory Chu

(Con Edison)

Next meetings:

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
