Final Minutes

New York State Reliability Council

Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #187 – August 30, 2016 (includes September 1, 2016 call)

NYISO Corporate Center, Rensselaer NY

Attendees

		Present	Phone	
Members / Alternates:				
	Rich Wright (CHG&E)		🖂	
	Dmitriy Kiselev (Con Edison)		🖂	
	Howard Kosel (Con Edison)		🖂	
	Sanderson Chery (Con Edison)		🖂	
	Khatune Zannat (PSEG LI)			
	Mariann Wilczek (PSEG LI), ICS Vice Chair/Secretary			
	Lubaba Islam (PSEG LI)			
	Syed Ahmed (National Grid)			
	Bart Franey (National Grid)			
	Ben Caron (National Grid)			
	Richard Brophy (NYSEG-RGE)			
	John Tigue (NYSEG-RGE)		🖂	
	Bob Boyle (NYPA), ICS Chair			
	Tim Lundin (NYPA)			
	Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics, LLC – Wholesale Sellers) .			
	Mark Cordeiro (PLM, Inc – Municipals & Electric Coops)			
	Mike Mager (Couch White – Large Consumers)			
Advise	ers/Non-member Participants:			
	Al Adamson (Consultant)			
	John Adams (Consultant)		🖂	

Ricardo Galarza (PSM Consulting)
Scott Leuthauser (HQUS)
Kelli Joseph (NRG)
Ed Schrom (NYDPS)
Gary Will (FERC)
Alan Ackerman (CES)
Richard Gell (Ontario Power Generation)
Marji Philips (Direct Energy)
Greg Drake (NYISO)
Frank Ciani (NYISO)
Dana Walters (NYISO)
Josh Boles (NYISO)
Nick Whitney (NYISO)
Kai Jiang (NYISO)
Zachary Stines (NYISO)
Stephanie King (NYISO)
Carl Patka (NYISO)
Brian Hodgdon (NYISO)
Wes Yeomans (NYISO)
Ryan Carlson (NYISO)
David Allen (NYISO)
Gloria Kavanah (NYISO)
Pallas LeeVanSchaick (Potomac)

1. Introduction and Request for Additional Agenda Items

Chairman Boyle called the NYSRC Installed Capacity Subcommittee meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on August 30, 2016.

2. Approval of Minutes for Meeting #186

The meeting minutes were approved with no comments.

3. Review of Action Items List

Chairman Boyle noted that the action items would be covered as part of the agenda.

4. Status of Studies and White Papers for 2017 IRM Study

4.1. Emergency Assistance(EA) Model: NYISO White Paper

4.1.1. NYISO Staff Review of ICS Comments and Conclusions(AI#186-1)

Mr. Walters indicated that this was not done yet as Mr. Drake has been focused on the parametric study. Chairman Boyle expressed disappointment that the NYISO had not yet provided a review given ICS members had provided comments two months prior. Chairman Boyle asked the NYISO to have comments read by the next meeting. Mr. Adamson noted that two of the sensitivities are based on the EA analysis and we would still need to proceed.

4.1.2. Analysis of Neighboring CA Excess Operating Reserves

Mr. Whitney reviewed the amount of neighboring control area surplus reserve that was available to NY during the top 30 load days from 2013-2015. Mr. Younger noted that very few of the load days are at a high load level (95% or greater) where LOLE generally occur. Mr. Adamson asked if the NYISO could expand the number of years in the future. Mr. Whitney indicated the prior data is difficult to retrieve but could be done in the future. The NYISO did not make a recommendation for a value to be used, however they did post observed trends. These indicated when the actual load is near 100% of forecast peak load, the available surplus appears to average between 2,000 - 2,500 MW. When the actual load is closer to 87 %- 95% of forecast peak load, the available surplus appears to average between 2,500 - 3,000 MW. Mr. Younger asked the NYISO to look at the MARS model and provide information on when

the LOLE events occurred in relation to the peak (AI#187-1). Mr. Adamson thought the 2,620 MW that the NYISO had proposed in its EA white paper was arbitrary and suggested two sensitivities based on the presentation, one with 2,250 MW and a second at 2,750 MW based on the results of NYISO staff's surplus reserve analysis. He expressed concern that with going to too low an EA limit value, as the statewide IRM could reach as high as 20% which may not be acceptable to the transmission owners and the EC.

4.1.3. EA Sensitivity Cases

ICS members agree with Mr. Adamson's above recommendation that two EA sensitivities be conducted – one with an EA limit of 2,250 MW and one with an EA limit of 2,750 MW.

4.1.4. NJ Transmission Constraints(AI#181-2.1)

Mr. Drake indicated that he had spoken to Mr. Lamanna and it is already included as part of the topology work that had been done. Chairman Boyle asked about the impact to the topology with one Ramapo PAR out of service due to a fire. Chairman Boyle asked Mr. Drake to work with Mr. Lamanna to make an assessment.

4.2. Parametric Study Results(AI#186-3)

Mr. Drake provided the parametric results.

4.3. Tan 45 Analysis and Preliminary Base Case IRM(AI186-3)

Mr. Drake indicated that the Tan 45 were not available as they were still undergoing internal review. Chairman Boyle noted it was needed prior to the EC meeting. A teleconference was set up at 9am on September 1st for review of the values. Mr. Adamson asked for the values prior to the call in order to prepare the parametric IRM impact comparison table which is provided to the EC for approval, as well as used in the IRM report.

Note – The ICS held a teleconference on September 1st. Mr. Drake reviewed the parametric results as well as the Tan 45 for the preliminary base case (one with Fitzpatrick and Ginna in, and one with Fitzpatrick and Ginna out). The results were sent to the ICS members. Mr. Drake noted that with Fitzpatrick and Ginna out the LCRs for Zone J and Zone K had increased. He did not have an explanation at that time but was still looking into it. Mr. Drake indicated they will return to the October 5th ICS with an explanation. Mr. Adamson sent out a table with the parametric IRM impact comparison from the Final 2016 IRM to the Preliminary 2017 IRM. There was a 0.9 % increase from the 2016 NYCA IRM of

17.4% to a 2017 IRM preliminary base case of 18.3%. Mr. Adamson explained the process he used to normalize the values. ICS members requested the Tan 45 curves and the points used. The NYISO indicated it would be sent out. These were distributed on September 2nd.

4.4. Proposed Sensitivity Cases

4.4.1. Shifting Capacity Approaches (AI#170-7)

Mr. Younger asked for one of the sensitivity cases to use the same shifting methodology that is used in the IRM base case. It was decided that a Ginna and Fitzpatrick retired case will be run with the normal sensitivity method as well as using the A, C and D shifting methodology. Chairman Boyle noted that the final version of the proposed cases will be available on the call on September 1st.

5. Locational Export Capacity Proposal(AI#186-5)

Mr. Boles noted that the proposal is driven by the inefficient market impacts and based on his understanding that ICS would not be accounting for any locality exports in the 2017 base case, he stated that the interaction between the market rule and IRM setting process should be further explored prior to the base case setting for the 2018 IRM. He provided a brief overview of an ICAP WG presentation from August 23rd. He indicated that the approach is to determine the amount of exporting capacity that needs to be replaced from a resource in upstate to maintain the same level of reliability. Mr. Boles noted that the NYISO will be filing in the ISO-NE proceeding to ask for relief and to not approve the rules for 2017. Mr. Lundin asked if this approach would be extended to PJM. Mr. Boles indicated that they would be looking at that in the future. Ms. Joseph noted that enforcing limitations that can't be reflected in the model is a fundamental disconnect between the model and the market and asked for some MARS runs. Mr. Younger asked about a 50/50 split between Zones F and G to ISO-NE. He continued that the 50% from G provides no reliability benefit but the 50% from F provides some reliability benefit and it could impact the LCRs. Mr. Boles noted that he and Mr. Drake would discuss this as there would be many ways to represent this before a study could be run. Mr. Boles will be returning to the September 19th ICAP WG with an updated proposal and tariff revisions. Mr. Boles will return to the October 5th ICS for further discussion.

6. MARS Model

Mr. Chu from GE was available via the phone to answer questions raised by the ICS members on the MARS model capabilities in the context of emergency assistance, loop flows and the ability to model to

enforce flows on different transmission lines. Questions were asked by Messrs. Adams, Younger, Kosel

and Ms. Joseph. Mr. Chu outlined the steps that the model uses to provide and receive outside

assistance. He noted that the model does not have the capability at this time to force a certain amount

of flow to go through a particular interface.

7. 2017 IRM Study Assumptions Matrix Update

Mr. Drake provided an overview of changes made since the last review and noted the only remaining

open item is the Peak Load Forecast which will be available in October. He did note that the topology is

still being reviewed and there could still be some revisions there.

8. 2017 ICS Meeting Schedule

Mr. Adamson provided the EC approved schedule from which the subcommittee meetings were

developed. The July 5th (Wednesday) meeting date will be moved to a day in the previous week due to

concerns with the July 4th Holiday and availability of members and NYISO. Note - The NYISO confirmed

that it can be moved to June 28th.

9. Status Reports:

9.1. External Control Area MOUs

Mr. Boles reported that an MOU had been signed with IESO that will allow capacity imports starting in

November with an 89 MW limit. There have been no meetings with the other four parties on the larger

MOU discussion.

9.2. Status of Alternative Methodologies for Determining LCR

It was reported that the NYISO hired Navigant Consulting to coordinate the study and there will be no

changes made to the 2017 IRM or LCRs as a result.

10. Additional Agenda Items

None.

Secretary: Mariann Wilczek (PSEG LI)

Upcoming meetings:

6

Meeting 188, Wednesday, October 5th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 189, Wednesday, November 2nd at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 190, Monday, November 28th at NYISO Corporate Center