

# NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #177

October 27th, 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dr. 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), <b>ICS Chair</b> .....	<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. Dana Walters (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Howard Tarler (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Josh Boles (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Steve Lemme (NYISO) .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO).....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Bill Lamanna (NYISO) .....	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mr. Vijay Ganugula (NYISO).....	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Guests Present:

Mr. Alan Ackerman (CES)..... .....   
Mr. Matt Cinadr (CES) ..... .....

**1. Topology**

Dana Walters (NYISO) stated that the NYISO has performed model runs with the new topology changes that included PJM wheel balance change on the ABC line and there were no noticeable differences. Former ICS Chair Bob Boyle (NYPA) stated if the new topology accurately modeled the transfer capability, there should be no need to limit emergency assistance into NYCA.

Chair Erin Hogan (DOS) said that for next year’s study, the topology discussion needs to be much earlier.

Dr. Syed Ahmed (National Grid) stated that ICS gets very limited opportunity to review the topology since we need to approve it very soon after TPAS approval. Chair Hogan said that it may be appropriate for the NYISO to provide a draft topology before it goes to TPAS. This would enable some discussion before TPAS approves it.

Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics) suggested that the NYISO should run a tangent 45 on the new topology possibly in parametric study since the topology is so significant this year and it changed the results dramatically. Mr. Younger also stated that ICS need to start the discussion about appropriate level of external emergency assistance very early in next year’s IRM study cycle, possibly January. Chair Hogan stated that she was concerned about implication that if tangent 45 results turned out to be a certain way, ICS would change the parameter to get to the desired results. She suggested that emergency assistance level should be looked at the end of the IRM study to avoid delay in the study.

## **ICS members approved the new topology with PJM wheel balanced**

Mr. Younger asked how the model enforces a balanced (net 0) flow, given the group interface has a limit. Vice Chair Gregory Chu (Con Edison) said that it isn't about net 0 flow, but rather it made sure that all 3 legs of the ABC lines flows at a maximum of 1000 MW only. Mr. Boyle (and Vice Chair Chu previously on the conference call) questioned the limitation at 1000 MW since in reality 1500 MW total can be flowed over the combined ABC lines, which would include 1000 MW wheel obligation and 500 MW emergency assistance when available. ICS will discuss proper ABC topology setup for next year's study. **(AI 177-1)**

### **2. Final Base Case Tangent 45 IRM**

**ICS members approved the final base case tangent 45 results of 17% for IRM, and the indicative LCRs are 80.9% for J and 102.6% for K.**

### **3. Sensitivity cases**

Due to concerns that LCRs were not adjusted during the sensitivity runs and showing misleading results, ICS members agreed to remove the LCR columns in table 7.1 sensitivity cases.

Returning to discuss Load Forecast for the final base case, Arthur Maniaci (NYISO) said that 2 columns were added in the load forecast presentation. On slide 14 columns 9 and 10 were added to compare 2015 Gold book load forecast values versus 2016 forecast in column 8, and the differences are shown in column 10.

Mr. Adamson asked about downstate versus upstate load growth. Mr. Maniaci said that upstate had more load than last year by about 0.3%. Mr. Adamson wondered if the NYISO can explain why 0.1% IRM increase, since this year downstate load is NOT increasing compared to upstate. John Adams (NYSRC –

Consultant) said that SENY was growing faster than upstate, which explains the IRM small increase.

**ICS members agreed with the final load forecast used in the IRM base case.**

For the New England forward capacity sale sensitivity cases, Chair Hogan wondered if the replacement MW to bring the case back to 0.1 was done in all zones or only in the zones the sales occurred. Frank Ciani (NYISO) confirmed that MW was added in all zones. When Mr. Boyle asked if UCAP/EFORd is recalculated when the MW is sold, Mr. Ciani said for the federal contracts that were sold, the amount of UCAP/EFORd is recalculated.

Chair Hogan found that more capacity we sold to New England, the lower the IRM, which seemed counterintuitive. Mr. Drake said that this is because MW was replaced by adding them to all zones. The location matters in this case. This is the standard sensitivity method to bring the system back to 0.1 LOLE. Chair Hogan and Mr. Younger were not convinced that this is the best way to identify New England sale's impact. Mr. Drake suggested that a possible methodology may be to match the MW amount added based on the load forecast. Mr. Boyle suggested that we should take MW out based on sales, and then adjust the model like as is, and then establish 0.1 from there. Chair Hogan said that we would tackle the sensitivity methodology problem at the next IRM study cycle.

Mr. Drake said that wind data has been obtained, but the new beta version of MARS with the ability to model multiple wind shape has not been run to see if it works. Vice Chair Chu stated that without out ensuring that the model is running properly, it is premature to provide IRM impact on the sensitivity case for the Executive Committee. Mr. Drake believed that they could have some numbers for the Executive Committee. Mr. Younger cautioned that in the past we have shown sensitivity case results from unproven model changes and people have used the incorrect information. Mr. Walters is worried that there could be a problem with the program, even if the data entry is done correctly and the program runs fine. Chair Hogan suggested that the NYISO perform the sensitivity run and provide

the results to the Executive Committee with the caveat that the answer may not be accurate and they can choose to include or not include in the report.

Cases 11 and 12 (PJM LOLE at 0.24 and external assistance level) will be removed.

Case 13 had incorrect IRM values. Dr. Kai Jiang (NYISO) said that IRM should be 15.8% and that was a typo.

Some Executive Members would like to see a 5-bubble PJM representation sensitivity case. Mr. Walters stated that the reason the NYISO was uncomfortable with 5 bubble model is because PJM was unable to provide a reason for the increased transfer limits within PJM. Some EC members said that if NPCC is using the 5 bubble model, we should at least look at a sensitivity case. Chair Hogan asked about the amount of work needed for the sensitivity case. Mr. Drake said that there's no resource to perform this sensitivity case. If the EC decides that it is necessary, there will be a delay of two weeks. Mr. Drake said the NYISO did not have confidence in the result from the pre-summer attempt to model 5-bubble PJM region. Mr. Adamson said that the main driver for PJM representation should be the LOLE of 0.14, not number of bubbles. He suggested that an option would be to model PJM without internal transmission limit to see the impact on NYCA IRM as an alternative. This would be the lowest amount of IRM due to PJM impact, if the 5 bubble model cannot be modeled in time. Vice Chair Chu was especially concerned with the statement of the NPCC PJM representative that the 4 bubble representation might have been a mistake. If so, will ICS stay with the possibly flawed 4 bubble representation for the foreseeable future? He felt that a 5-bubble sensitivity case can provide valuable insight if the group have to adapt this model in the future. When Chair Hogan asked if the results can be left out of the report, Vice Chair Chu agreed that the result does not need to be in the report. Mr. Adamson is afraid that others may misuse the result, regardless if it is in or out of the IRM report. Khatune Zannat stated that the NYISO has already set up the 5-bubble model before since the results were looked at before the NYISO was uncomfortable with the results, so there shouldn't be too much trouble to put together the case. The only difference was that 5-bubble model didn't include all of the new parameters. Mr. Walters

said that there were a lot of changes since then and they would need to be included in the model.

Chair Hogan will send out an email to the Executive Committee and start a conversation about the limitations/concerns of the sensitivity case. Chair Hogan took a consensus poll on the three options: 5-bubble, 1-bubble PJM representation, or do nothing. She will present the poll result to the EC members.

#### **4. Assumption Matrix**

Mr. Drake will change page 11 Table to “rerate” instead of “proposed” unit for Bowline to avoid confusion.

#### **ICS approved the assumption matrix for final base case**

#### **5. IRM Report**

Mr. Adamson asked members to provide additional comments by Thursday (10/29). On Friday, Mr. Adamson will have updated the report and provide that version to the EC. The 3<sup>rd</sup> and final version will include EC comments and will be available at the next ICS meeting (11/30).

Mr. Adamson was not comfortable with “indicative” LCR. “Preliminary” LCR was agreed by the members.

Mr. Adamson went through the changes in the report, page by page.

Vice Chair Chu asked if the external area LFUs have been updated. Mr. Ciani said they did with CP-8 data. Vice Chair Chu said the report needs to indicate that, even if the NYCA LFU values remained the same.

Dr. Ahmed and Chair Hogan suggested that the report should state the LOLEs for zones J and K with Indian Point unit 2 and 3 out. The LOLEs were provided earlier this meeting by the NYISO.

Mr. Adams said that about 70% of the appendices are done. He will send the completed version to the NYISO before disseminate the document to ICS members before the next ICS meeting.

Mr. Drake said that the quality assurance report will be provided for report inclusion by next week.

## **6. Transmission Outage Working Group**

Vice Chair Chu reported that the working group has completed its assessment for modeling overhead transmission line outage in MARS. There was no material impact on the IRM when outages were included on the Chateauguay line. The report was circulated to ICS members. The working group is recommending that outages on overhead line should not be included in the IRM study at this time. Currently there is a lack of actual outage data to properly model overhead outages as well, in addition to the lack of IRM impact witnessed in this study. The report included MARS input (transition rate matrix) and run results.

Mr. Boyle asked if Transmission Availability Data System (TADS) has sufficient data to do outage modeling. If not, does it make sense to start gathering the data now. Vice Chair Chu said TADS does not have detail information needed to generate transition matrix to model in MARS currently. He also does not believe it is worth the time and effort to capture the data. Even if NYCA has captured all of the transmission outage data, without external area modeling their outages as well, the impact would not be captured accurately since MW can flow through those areas to get back to NYCA and support load.

## **7. January 2016 ICS Meeting**

ICS will have an in-person meeting instead of a conference call on January 7<sup>th</sup> 2016.

Secretary: Gregory Chu

*(Con Edison)*

---

Next meetings:

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

---