

NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #70

November 1st, 2006

9:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

NYSERDA: 17 Columbia Circle Board Room

Meeting Minutes

Attendees

Members/Alternates Present:

Mr. Curt Dahl (LIPA), Chairman
Mr. Carlos Villalba (Con Edison), Secretary
Mr. Bart Franey (National Grid) - Telephone
Mr. Madison Milhous (KeySpan Ravenswood)
Mr. Steve Jeremko (NYSEG-RGE) - Telephone
Mr. Rich Wright (CHGE) - Telephone
Mr. Rajee Mustafa (NYPA)
Mr. Mark Younger(Slater Consulting)

Advisers / Non-Voting Participants Present:

Mr. Greg Drake (NYISO)
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant) – Telephone
Mr. Al Adamson (consultant)
Mr. John Adams (NYISO)
Mr. John Pade (NYISO)
Mr. Steve Keller (NYDPS)
Mr. Ed Schrom (NYDPS)
Mr. Harry Joscher (PSEG)
Mr. Glenn Haake (IPPNY)
Mr. John Charlton (NYISO)

Guests Present:

Mr. Anping Liu (NYDPS) – Telephone
Mr. Phil Smith (Mirant) – Telephone

1 Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes

1.1 August 2nd, 2006 ICS Meeting (#67)

The group reviewed and commented on the draft meeting minutes from meeting #66. The draft was approved as final.

1.2 July 24th 2006 ICS Conference Call (#28)

The group reviewed and commented on the draft minutes from conference call #28. The draft was approved as final.

1.3 August 8th 2006 ICS Conference Call (#29)

The group reviewed and commented on the draft meeting minutes from meeting #29. The draft was approved as final.

2 Review of Policy 5

Al Adamson updated the group on the AR-1 change that adds the word “emergency” to describe the type of limit that should be use to calculate transfer limits. Phil Smith asked whether this limit was based on the LTE or STE. Mr. Adamson answered that...[I need your input AI]

Bart Franey then asked Al Adamson if there is an official NPCC document specifying the type to limits to use for these calculations. Mr. Adamson responded that there is no formal document but that the methodology for these calculations was based on a conversation with [I need your input AI].... Mr. Franey asked Mr. Adamson if the conversation can be formalized for the group and/or if a document can be issue regarding this change.

The group then proceeded to review Policy five, making some editorial changes directly to the document. In addition, the group agreed to add a statement to say that sensitive information in the MARS model will not be shared.

Greg Drake then asked the group to review the statement that specifies the polynomial order used in generating the best fit curve and to consider removing the statement since the second order polynomial was approved by the ICS for one year only.

3 Review Draft#1 IRM 2007-08 Report

The members reviewed the draft and provided only minor comments at this time.

3.1 Sensitivity

Al Adamson presented a set of sensitivity analyses that he believed the EC would approve for the IRM 2007-08 Study.

Greg Drake asked the group if the isolated case includes removing the UDRs or not. The group responded that the isolated case does not include the removal of UDRs. UDRs are currently modeled like actual capacity in NYCA, and therefore UDR capacity should be maintained intact, even in the isolated case. Mr. Drake agreed not to remove the UDRs themselves but will remove their ties from the dummy area to neighboring pools.

Al Adamson explained that the sensitivity using the last year’s Gold Book load forecast was meant to illustrate the difference between last year’s methodology and this year’s methodology regarding the load forecast. As a reminder, this methodology was established to perform the IRM and LCR studies using the same load forecast.

Mr. Adamson also explained that the sensitivity analysis using a 10% higher load forecast in the neighboring pools was meant to reflect the actual operating assistance from the neighboring pools during emergency conditions. Bart Franey and Carlos Villalba proposed to the group a sensitivity case in which the load forecast was lowered by 10% or by making the LOLE of the neighboring pools equal to 0.1 days/year, since currently the

model represents the neighboring areas as being less reliable than they are in reality. Mr. Franey's concern was based on GE's statement that since the PJM system is modeled as less reliable than it is in actuality, loop flows through NYCA will prevent imports from HQ during emergencies in the current NYCA model. Mr. Franey and Carlos Villalba will follow up with GE regarding this issue.

Mat Milhous and Mr. Franey proposed a sensitivity analysis using the transfer limits that were first proposed by the NYISO, before adopting the last year's transfer limits. These limits are lower than the ones used by the IRM study and according to various members they reflect the conditions of July 17th system conditions.

Curt Dahl proposed a sensitivity that increases the Neptune limits by 90 MW, from 660 MW to 750 MW. Mr. Dahl said that the Neptune line will have an emergency transfer limit up to 750 MW for 4 hours. The 90 MW increase is still subject to verification.

Mr. Franey then proposed a sensitivity analysis that removes the UDRs from the model.

Subsequently, Mr. Dahl and Mr. Franey proposed a sensitivity analysis using a slightly different methodology to obtain the free flowing equivalent. While the current methodology removes capacity from Zones A, C, and D, the proposed one removes capacity from the entire state proportionally to the capacity levels of each Zone. Ultimately, Mr. Franey proposed a sensitivity analysis that removes the transition rates from the cable interfaces in question. The transition rates are tables that describe the availability of these resources.

The member reached a consensus that a sensitivity case that removes the wind resources was not necessary this year given previous studies results of this sensitivity..

4 2007-08 IRM Study Assumptions Matrix – Load Forecast

John Pade went over the August 2nd, 2006 peak load details and breakdown by zone and by company. There were some discussions and questions regarding the load growth and the 1-in-2 and 1-in-3 forecasting methodology differences. Mr. Pade was asked if any of the load forecasts were lower than the NYISO's official forecast. Mr. Pade explained that the NYISO always agrees to use a higher forecast than the LSE's because this encourages them to provide the correct forecast.

John Adams and Mr. Drake reported to the group that preliminary calculations of the LOLE using the methodology that subtracts generation from each of the zones proportionally to generator capacity resulted in an IRM around 12%. Mr. Adams explained that one of the reasons that the IRM was that low was that instead of using one large generator to add and remove generation like in the MOD-MDMW table, this methodology uses a pool of smaller generators. This makes the system more reliable

5 Other businesses

John Charlton updated the group with the latest developments from the ESPWG. Mr. Charlton indicated that the NYISO is analyzing ICF, Levitan, and CERA consultant's bids to develop the 2008 to 2011 demand curves. Mr. Charlton indicated that the group is also working closely with PJM in the RPM model.

John Charlton continued the update by making some observations of hourly and 5 minutes interval data from the NYCA wind energy resources. The NYISO has no

conclusions yet and are still in the process of analyzing the past performance of these resources.

Glenn Haake updated the group in the IITF developments.

6 Next Meeting

December 1st, 2006 Meeting # 71

Secretary: Carlos Villalba

Conference Call #31

November 16st, 2006

1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

NYSERDA: 17 Columbia Circle Board Room

Meeting Minutes

The group reviewed over the phone with the NYISO the preliminary results around the Free Flowing Equivalent point (FFE) of the major assumption changes from 2006-07 IRM study to the 2007-08 IRM study. The group discussed the major drivers to an anticipated lower IRM as follows.

Curt Dahl and Carlos Villalba explained to the group why the changes in the Dunwoodie South interface EFORs lowered the FFE IRM point.

The members found the FFE IRM impact too high due to changes in the new topology and asked the NYISO to perform additional sensitivities to find the topology changes driving these results.

Another observation from the members was that the NE peak load day should be aligned to the NYCA's.

Mayer Sasson expressed a concern regarding the significant impact of the new MARS version in the FFE IRM results and asked for a GE statement regarding the program error.

Conference Call #32

November 21st, 2006

3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

NYSERDA: 17 Columbia Circle Board Room

Meeting Minutes

The group reviewed over the phone with the NYISO additional preliminary sensitivity results around the Free Flowing Equivalent point (FFE).

John Adams and Greg Drake explained to the group the preliminary results and it was identified by the group that the MARS version impacted the FFE IRM in 1.2%.

The group concluded that the starting point for the IRM is the case 22 with the “Proposed FFE with corrections and original contracts structure” and a FFE IRM of 14.1% 1.2% lower than last year. However the NYISO will review the New England bypass topology to determine if it needs to be included.

Carlos Villalba also proposed a sensitivity with Indian Point out of service to capture the possibility of an outage like the one experience in year 2000.