

**Agenda Item 4.1: ICS Report to NYSRC Executive Committee (EC)**  
**June 3, 2026, ICS Meeting #317**  
**Prepared for: June 12, 2026, EC Meeting #326**  
**Prepared by: Thomas Primrose (PSEGLI)**

**4.1.1 Winter Fuel Availability Constraints Modeling- Initial Recommendation**

NYISO presented an initial update on Winter Fuel Availability constraints modeling suggesting several enhancements for the 2027-2028 IRM study. NYISO recommended an update to the triggering criteria from fixed load levels to percentage of baseline peak load forecast, as well as a process for the “Available Gas” regression analysis to use a rolling 10-year dataset based on normalized load. “Available Oil” assumptions will incorporate weekly generator fuel survey data from Winter 2019/20 to the most recent winter period. NYISO also proposed to leverage the firm fuel characteristic elections to refine the Zonal allocation of available fuel in Zones F-K (but not direct adoption of the elections themselves). Tan45 impact analysis of the proposed changes IRM-PBC load forecast update, as well as updated fuel availability tiers are available in the attached presentation. NYISO will present final winter fuel modeling recommendations and seek approval of recommended approach at the July ICS and EC for Implementation in the current IRM study.

W. Gunther noted that both the actual and normalized load regression have poor  $r^2$  values and inquired about the reasoning for the 10-year lookback period. NYISO noted that applicability of the 10-year lookback should be subject to continued monitoring for inclusion of enough “cold” winters in the dataset, adding that currently the data includes several “cold” winters. Stakeholders expressed degrees of comfort with assuming pipeline expansion does not add to available gas for 2027-2028 but expressed a need for ICS to re-evaluate inclusion as operational data is available (M. Cadwalader, C. Wentlent, M. Mager, T. Primrose). NYISO will take this back and include details in future presentations. M. Mager pointed out possible inconsistency in using elections for Zonal allocations but not for absolute quantities. R. Gonzales asked for a comparison of current and proposed methodology Zonal fuel allocations.

**4.1.2 2026 Gold Book Load Forecast**

The NYCA summer and Winter coincident peak in the 2026 Gold Book increased 376.2 MW (+1.2%) and 731.8 MW (+3%) respectively from the 2025 Fall Load forecast. Parametric results on load update in isolation suggest a +.25% increase in IRM and slight increase in Winter LOLE as % of total LOLE. (Tan45 impact analysis provided as part of 4.1.1 suggests .55% IRM increase).

**4.1.3 New Generator Inclusion Screening: 2027-2028 IRM PBC**

NYISO presented the methodology behind their generator inclusion screening and results thereof. Of the 18 new projects included in the past four IRM studies, 16 entered during the studied Capability Year with 10 entering service prior to June 1<sup>st</sup>. For the 2027-2028 IRM PBC NYISO recommends inclusion of Alle Catt II Wind (339 MW), Excelsior Energy Center (280 MW), Cider Solar (500 MW), Astoria Energy Storage (100 MW), and Orangeville ESR (10 MW). Sunrise and Empire Wind are not recommended for inclusion in the PBC as their proposed CODs are after June 1, 2027, and recent federal actions add significant uncertainty. The new generator inclusion screening will be re-evaluated for the IRM PBC.

**4.1.4 Modeling Seasonal Generator Maintenance**

NYISO presented a process and impact analysis of a potential enhancement to the 50 MW assumption of fixed summer maintenance in recent IRM cycles. The proposed alternative maintenance outage assessment reviews 5 years of GADS outage data focused on peak (June-August, December-February) periods. The process focuses on outages exceeding 7 calendar days occurring on near-peak load days.

5-year average summer maintenance meeting the outlined criteria totaled 70.8 MW concentrated in Zones A, G, J and K. NYISO initial recommendation is to assign 25 MW of maintenance to each of Load Zones G, J, and K, for a total of 75 MW of assumed summer maintenance during peak periods. Results from winter maintenance analysis indicate that historical data analysis over an extended period is potentially less representative and informative of future expectations at this time due to growing winter risk and new firm fuel elections. In the near term, NYISO initially recommends applying the proposed summer maintenance modeling assumptions to the winter for the 2027-2028 IRM study. Parametric analysis suggests minor upward pressure (<0.1%) on IRM and locality requirements.

Several stakeholders suggested NYISO use historical Zonal values directly instead of rounding and lumping maintenance into downstate zones. J. Adams noted several differences between his annual analysis and the proposed process (time slice of NYISO analysis excludes September, differences in inclusion of maintenance derates, use of 5 years of data). Discussion also occurred about possible double counting of Winter derates in fuel availability constraints, the evolving nature of Winter maintenance with firm-fuel elections, and the need for shifting the maintenance update from FBC (historically) to PBC. NYISO commented that moving the update forward provides more clarity moving from PBC to FBC.

#### **4.1.5 2027-2028 IRM PBC Proposed Topology Updates**

NYISO presented updates to the ratings on several transmission interfaces with no concerns from ICS.

- Dysinger East forward limit: -25 MW
- West Central reverse limit: -100 MW
- Moses South forward limit: -500 MW

NYISO also identified West Central reverse limit as potentially impactful to Winter Risk and recommended a winter reverse limit of 2,750 MW (2,225 MW Annual limit in 2026-2027 FBC).

#### **4.1.6 Seasonal Derating Factor Considerations**

NYISO presented a process and recommendation to develop seasonal zonal derating factors using seasonal inputs and annualize seasonal zonal derating factors based on the seasonal LOLE risks portion from the prior Capability Year's final LCR study base case. This process maintains annual capacity removal or addition in the IRM study process for capacity requirement determination. NYISO also proposes to report the seasonal and annualized seasonal zonal derating factors in the Assumptions Matrix to improve transparency of IRM study inputs. Next steps include seeking ICS approval at the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for inclusion in PBC.

#### **4.1.7 IRM 2027-2028 IRM PBC Parametric Results and Assumptions Matrix**

NYISO presented an updated version of their PBC assumptions matrix and associated parametric results. Material updates include Gold Book load forecast, ROR and LBW shapes, 10-min Operating Reserve Allocation and Level Maintained during Load Shedding, and preliminary SCR modeled MWs. See attached parametric analysis for IRM impacts and non-material changes.

R. Bolbrock asked for clarification on increased SCR enrollments but decreased modeled MWs. NYISO replied that this is correct and is due to updated ACL to CBL translation factors.

#### **4.1.8 Generator Transition Rate Matrices: Impact Analysis**

NYISO presented a parametric impact analysis of the transition to PowerGADS resulting in modest (+.15%) IRM increase when benchmarked for the same 2020-2024 lookback period as GADS OS noting PowerGADS includes some software differences and code enhancements. NYISO also presented impact analysis of 2020-2024 dataset to 2021-2025 dataset. Parametric analysis suggested +1.3% IRM impact, and +1.43%, +2.03%, and +1.59% LCR impact for the J, K, and G-J localities respectively.

NYISO noted that 2025 forced outage levels are significantly higher than 2020 across multiple zones, driven by increased frequency and duration of forced outage events.

W. Gunther inquired about drivers of significant parametric change relative to minor EFORD change presented in 4.1.6, NYISO noted they will take it back. T. Primrose asked if 2020/2025 were notably good or bad years, NYISO replied that 2020 was relatively typical and 2025 had higher frequency and duration of outages (with a handful of issues on large units). G. Jordan noted that the EFORDs may be indicative of an aging fleet. Stakeholders noted that this could also be due to exceptionally high temperatures in 2025 and the demand component of EFORD.

#### **4.1.9 Policy 5 Updates**

ICS discussed the attached draft of Policy 5 edits. The edits include some editorial changes, reference updates (such as PowerGADS replacing GAS Open Source), and more substantive changes to section 3.8 on Standard Error. The updates to section 3.8 increase the standard error criteria from 0.025 to 0.05 and clarify that standard error is the specific stopping criteria in defining number of replications used for MARS analysis and preserve confidence interval reporting as an informational item. The updates also add a footnote to describe MARS standard error calculation in more detail. This item will return for approval at the next EC meeting and a redline is attached.

T. Primrose noted that historically Policy 5 updates are handled informally by ICS (no approval vote) but sought input from ICS. W. Gunther stated disagreement with only the specific item changing the standard error threshold to 0.05, arguing that “with tighter margins, now is not the time to be dulling the pencil” indicating a belief that an accurate answer outweighs computational cost savings. He indicated that increased uncertainty in the LOLE precision could cause EC to add additional conservatism in IRM votes. NYISO expressed support for the proposed revision as a short-term solution, recognizing the need to separately work to develop a longer-term solution and research the underlying issue. NYISO further added that each replication comes with a cost in terms of how many valuable sensitivities can be provided to the reliability council to inform decision making. G. Jordan agreed with NYISO and J. Adams added that cost of compute scales linearly with number of replications, but accuracy scales with the square root of number of replications.

#### **4.1.10 Parametric Process Improvements Update-Approval Item**

This effort focused on the Parametric Improvements Update associated with ICS goal A1.4. ICS approved the Parametric Process Improvements Update at the 4/28 meeting. The presentation is unchanged from the version attached at EC 325. ICS is seeking EC approval at this meeting.

#### **4.1.11 Seasonal Topology Update-Approval Item**

This effort focused on the Seasonal Topology Process associated with ICS goal A1.3. ICS approved the Seasonal Topology Process at the 4/28 meeting. The presentation is unchanged from the version attached at EC 325. ICS is seeking EC approval at this meeting.