# **Draft Minutes**

# New York State Reliability Council - Installed Capacity Subcommittee (ICS) Meeting #255 –December 3, 2021 Microsoft Teams

Attendees	Present Phone
Members / Alternates:	
Brian Shanahan (National Grid) ICS Chair	
Rick Brophy (NYSEG/RG&E) ICS Vice Chair / Secretary	
Rich Bolbrock (Unaffiliated)	
Clay Burns (National Grid)	
Ruby Chan (CHG&E)	
Sanderson Chery (Con Edison)	
John Dellatto (PSEG LI)	
Howard Kosel (Con Edison)	
Mike Mager (MI)	
Chris Wentlent (MEUA)	
Mark Younger (Hudson Economics)	
Khatune Zannat (PSEG LI)	
Advisers/Non-member Participants:	
Alan Ackerman (CES)	
John Adams (ICS Consultant)	
David Allen (NYISO)	
Leen Almadani (CHG&E)	
Leonard Ashley (IPPNY)	
Josh Boles (NYISO)	
Andrea Calo (CES)	
Ryan Carlson (NYISO)	
Frank Ciani (NYISO)	
Michelle D'Angelo (Con Edison)	
Mark Domino (National Grid)	
Nelson Eng (Con Edison)	
Adam Evans (DPS)	
Bruce Fardanesh (NYPA)	

Grant Flagler (Con Ed Energy)	
Kenneth Galarneau (Ravenswood)	
Ricardo Galarza (PSM Consulting)	
Robert German (DTE Energy)	
Nate Gilbraith (NYISO)	
Ying Guo (NYISO)	
Chris Hall (NYSERDA)	
Karl Hofer (Con Edison)	
Erin Hogan (UIU)	
Yvonne Huang (NYISO)	
Damian Interrante (Unknown)	
Chris LaRoe (Brookfield)	
Scott Leuthauser (HQUS)	
Tim Lynch (NYSEG/RG&E)	
Alan Michaels (NYPA)	
Maddy Moheman (NYISO)	
Matthew Napoli (Con Ed Energy)	
Otito Onwuzurike (NYISO)	
Ben O'Rourke (NYISO)	
Kevin Osse (NYISO)	
Carl Patka (NYISO)	
Rob Pike (NYISO)	
Laura Popa (NYISO)	
Richard Quimby (DPS)	
Michael Ridolfino (Unknown)	
Herb Schrayshuen (Power Advisors)	
Sushil Silwal (Unknown)	

# 1. Roll Call – R. Brophy

• Roll call was conducted.

# 2. Introduction and Request for Additional Agenda Items - B. Shanahan

• No additional agenda items were requested.

# 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes - B. Shanahan

### 3.1. Meeting # 253

Meeting Minutes approved.

# 3.2. Meeting #254

• Meeting Minutes approved with comments.

#### 4. Review of Action Items List - B. Shanahan

- 220-1: Mr. Shanahan had sent out the survey re: Public Appeals to all the TOs and has heard
  back from everyone except PSEG-LI. They will be getting back to Mr. Shanahan prior to the EC
  meeting with their results. Thus far, nobody has reported any public appeals being issued for
  load reduction by the utilities themselves this year. It was noted that on June 30th, the NYC's
  Mayor's office did make an appeal and there was some reduction but this was not to be
  considered as part of the EOP process.
- 233-1: Ongoing for modeling SCR, one of the potential white paper efforts for next year.
- 247-2: On the list because we don't want to lose track of it in the meetings.
- 247-4: The updated scope was presented at the last couple meetings and Mr. Shanahan has incorporated all comments. Will be presented to the EC.
- 249-17: Ongoing for early next year.
- 253-1: Ongoing item for January of next year. Discussed initial results as the last meeting, more analysis of the results is required.
- Current White Paper topic list: Nothing new there.

#### 5. Chair update on recent EC actions – B. Shanahan

# 5.1. Update Status on Public Appeal Questions for TO's (AI 220-1)

Covered this topic during discussion of the Action Items.

#### 6. Agenda Item

# 6.1. Special Sensitivity for Neptune UDR - Y. Huang

- Ms. Huang reviewed the background and modeling of the Neptune cable for the 2022 IRM. The NYISO and NYSRC agree that the outage is material. A special sensitivity with Tan45 analysis has been conducted on the 2022 IRM Final Base Case with the extension of the transformer outage on the Neptune cable the import limit on the Neptune cable was reduced from 660 MW to 375 MW.
- The transformer outage was extended because the transformer delivery date has been delayed.
- According the outage notice the outage will end and the transformer will return to service on August 1, 2022, the way the NYISO modeled it in the special sensitivity was that the reduction applied to the entire summer. Ms. Huang explained that it is more conservative then what you would see from the outage notice but they felt it was prudent to try to capture it in the event the outage was further extended.
- The special sensitivity results showed an increase to the IRM of 0.5%, the J & K LCRs also increased (+0.30% & +4.70% respectively).
- A description of the issue, the results of this Neptune outage special sensitivity case, and the
  reason for opting to run the sensitivity will be presented to the EC for its consideration and
  decision as to whether to adopt it into the IRM Final Base Case.

- Plans are that two versions of the IRM Study Report and Appendices will be presented to the EC at their December 10 meeting. The original version and the version with the special sensitivity case incorporated into the report.
- Mr. Gilbraith noted that absent any new information between now and the EC meeting on Friday, it will be the NYISO's intention to recommend the Final Base Case with the Neptune sensitivity. They believe that is the most prudent course for reliability.
- Ms. Hogan asked whether the UCAP numbers would change given the outage change for Neptune. Ms. Huang explained that they are modeling this outage as a transmission interface reduction so it didn't actually impact the UCAP on the system. Ms. Hogan clarified her question, she wanted to know if it changed the UCAP requirement. Ms. Huang said yes, the UCAP requirement went up because you have a reduced transfer capability that brings UCAP into the system. You need to up the requirement in order to balance that. Ms. Hogan thought it would be important to include how those numbers would change for informational purposes, make sure we have the complete picture. It is important to see order of magnitude, how the incremental changes occur, and to develop historical knowledge of the relationships of all these variables could be informative in the future. M. Younger stated that it is an impact going forward and it is not going to change the EFORds that get applied to units for next summer. It will be a proportional move from the original base case value. Ms. Hogan said in that case we could just say that there will be *de minimis* changes in UCAP value of this special sensitivity. She is just trying to make sure the historical record is there.
- Regarding the Neptune Outage Special Sensitivity Tan45 results Curve and Points, Mr. Kosel said that if the NYISO could send them the shift removal table, they could make the change, run it, and verify they get the same 0.1. No need to re-mask if that is the only change. LIPA would also like to get the data and verify. NYISO agreed to send ConEd and LIPA the data. No problem anticipated in verifying the NYISO's results prior to the EC meeting. Mr. Shanahan didn't think we needed a special meeting to document that ConEd and LIPA have completed their verifications unless there was a significant problem with them. He said he could circulate that information to ICS members and participants to confirm it is satisfactorily completed. Mr. Shurayshuen, EC Secretary, asked that he be notified as well so he could distribute it to EC members. Mr. Shanahan made the task an action item 255-1: "Need to distribute results of the TO quality assurance review next week."

# 6.2. IRM Body and technical document – J. Adams

- The Technical Study Report Draft V3, updated for Special Sensitivity, was sent out late Thursday, December 2 by J. Adams.
- Mr. Shanahan did a page-turner review with an emphasis on the latest changes.
- Additional edits were made at the meeting to correct/clarify some of the language/punctuation/footnotes/tables etc. in the report.
- Mr. Adams said that if Mr. Ciani could send him a revised version that incorporates the changes discussed today he could insert the updated 8.1 graphic and send it out as the latest draft.
- Mr. Adams discussed making two versions of the study and appendices, the first based on prespecial sensitivity data/results/FBC and a second incorporating the special sensitivity data/results/tables/updates/FBC etc.
  - Group discussed how best to coordinate the two versions of the study/appendices for the EC's December 10th meeting. The NYISO stated that they would be able to do the necessary work in time for the EC meeting. However, it is possible that there will not be

- a final report/appendices with the special sensitivity incorporated produced in time for the EC's meeting but they will have enough information provided to approve an IRM.
- Eight members of the EC were on the call were asked for their view on the proposed approach. The EC members that offered their opinion were okay with the EC having all the necessary information available re the special sensitivity and a FBC based on that as they discuss and approve an IRM, with the understanding that a completed final report would be produced shortly after their meeting which could then be filed at FERC.
- After further discussion by the ICS, it was determined that updated version of the Technical Study that includes the Special Sensitivity would be ready in time for the December 10 meeting, just not in time to meet the posting deadline. The Appendices would come a day or two later. That updated study version would be the only version presented to the EC.

## 6.3. IRM Appendices report – J. Adams

- The Appendices were posted with the meeting materials but does not reflect anything related to the Special Sensitivity at this point it is fully updated. Mr. Adams noted that there are a lot of changes in the Environmental section. The NYISO also made a number of updates to the document.
- Page-turner review with an emphasis on the latest changes, included discussion on which
  portions will need to be updated due to incorporating the Special Sensitivity.
- Additional edits were made at the meeting to correct/clarify some of the language.

# 7. 2022 White Paper / Study Prioritization Topic Discussion - B. Shanahan

- Mr. Gilbraith said that going into next year the NYISO will have a lot on their plate ranging from a load shape proposal coming from NYISO to the AC Transmission study. They are also looking at how Loss of Load Events occurred in other areas and the mechanics of what went on there, and if we need to adjust our EOPs to account for what happened in real-life load shedding events. Between those and the High Renewables Phase III that was prioritized by the EC and potentially any support they have to provide for Extreme Weather he thinks their work load is going to be relatively full on white papers. He said if folks do have suggestions on items they would like discussed after January when we formally select our white papers, Mr. Gilbraith asked that they be sent to Mr. Shanahan and to the group so we can get those out there. He will try to post in advance and circulate to the group what he thinks they will be working on next year based on all the feedback they have received this year and the things they have deferred or lined up for next year already then we'll have our discussion in January.
- Mr. Younger asked how soon the NYISO planning to kick-off the post-IRM sensitivities on
  what impact the reversion to historic operation across G to H as well as the GTs going out
  and then the other run that looks incrementally at the impact of the AC upgrade. Mr.
  Gilbraith said it was noted and on their list. Before they had said they had to prioritize the
  Y49 run first and then they would start building that case after and targeted early February
  to have results that was their original timeline and he doesn't think it has changed.
- The takeaway from this is that Mr. Shanahan and Mr. Gilbraith will be providing a list of the existing topics we will be working on for next year prior to the next ICS meeting so can get a sense of what we are already looking at. Mr. Shanahan doesn't see where there is going to be any real room at this point to kick-off an entirely new study.
- Prior to the next meeting Mr. Shanahan will work with the NYISO concerning the scope for the Phase III High Renewable study that is part of the RC's 2022 corporate goals. The target

date for that study (white paper) is over the summer of 2022 (July). He would like to have a scope for review by the ICS at the next meeting.

- O Mr. Younger said he supported studying renewables given their importance in the future. He asked if we have scenarios that are different from what we have already run that we need to model. He said that we are going to wind up with new load shapes, part of what we should end up with for those new load shapes is a better method of incorporating BTM solar. That could certainly change our results, even with the analysis we've done so far. He's at a loss for what Phase III is supposed to cover that we haven't already covered. Mr. Kosel thought it was supposed to include Storage in the scope. Mr. Younger said it depends on whether we have a good storage modeling capability.
- o Mr. Shanahan said the he thought one of the key things is looking at the CLCPA and why don't we model this, for example, with the 2030 target. In the past we added renewables but did not take out other existing sources of energy. He thinks that looking at the 2030 scenario as accurately as possible, reflecting generations changes that would result, would be appropriate. It would be interesting to see the IRM impact of that.

# 8. Additional Agenda Items

None

### **Next Meeting**

Meeting #256 - Wednesday, January 5, 2022, 10 am - Microsoft Teams