

**NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Conference Call No. 4 – November 21, 2000**

Members/Alternates Present:

Mr. Tom Baldi (ConEd)  
Mr. Jordan Brandeis (NYPA)  
Mr. Peter Chamberlain (Wholesale)  
Mr. Mark Cordeiro (Municipals) – Chairman  
Mr. Gary Freeland (NYSEG)  
Mr. Michael Hogan (CHG&E) – Secretary

Advisers/Non-member Participants Present:

Mr. John Adams (ISO)  
Mr. Alan Adamson (Consultant)  
Mr. Art Desell (ISO)  
Mr. Greg Drake (ISO)  
Mr. Keith O'Neal (NYPSC)  
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant)

Members/Non-members/Advisers Absent:

Mr. Curt Dahl (KeySpan/LIPA)  
Mr. Larry Eng (NMPC)

Guests

Mr. Ly Dang for Peter Chan (CONED Alternate)

***CLOSED SESSION BEGAN AT 2:00 P.M.***

The main purpose of the conference call meeting was to finalize the MARS base case and discuss any comments on Study documentation.

**C1. STATUS OF ASSUMPTIONS**

**C1.1 NERC GADS** – Due to lack of time and resources, the updated GADS data will not be used for this Study. Both the transition rates as well as the unit maintenance schedules will remain unmodified from the last study (data will reflect the years 1987 up to and including 1996.)

**C1.2 Outside NYCA Load & Capacity Model Update** – Completed. No significant changes were observed in the MARS results with this update. Note that the 1995 load shape is used for all areas, including external to NYCA.

**NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Conference Call No. 4 – November 21, 2000**

**C2. BASE CASE**

- The group reviewed the MARS results and agreed on the final base case (Case C of 11/21 Run Summary), which produced a 17.1% IRM. Cases 0 up to and including Case 2 produced for the last WG meeting will not be rerun, corrected by inference. The last case (Case E) run for the 11/21 meeting was determined to be unnecessary for the Study report, but can be referenced if needed.

**C4. OTHER BUSINESS**

- The agreed to MARS Sensitivity runs are summarized on the following table.

- Higher than criteria reliability	Scenario A: Statewide LOLE = 0.07 d/y Scenario B: Statewide LOLE = 0.10 d/y, no VRs Scenario C: Statewide LOLE = 0.07 d/y, no VRs Scenario D: NYC only = no VRs
- Reduced emergency assistance	No help from PJM
- Internal Limits Less Than Proj.	Reduce limits by 10 %
- No LF Uncertainty	LFU model not used
- No Availability Uncertainty Adder	Assume no availability uncertainty adder
- Extreme load	Assume 90 percentile load (31,500 MW) using 1999 load shape (w/o LFU model)
- Proj. NYC & LI Loc. Capacities	Note: Only if the “actual capacity” / “forecasted peak” is less than 80/93%
- Planned 2001 Capacity Delays	Scenario A: 50% of planned capacity delayed Scenario B: All planned new capacity delayed
- Grandfathered ext. ICAP only	Assume only grandfathered external ICAP
- Special Case Resources	Assume additional 100 MW in NYC
- Compounded Sensitivities	- Statewide LOLE = 0.10 d/y, no VRs state wide - No Emergency assistance from PJM - Assume 90 percentile load (31,500 MW) using 1999 load shape (w/o LFU model) - 50% of planned capacity delayed

**C3. STUDY DOCUMENTATION COMMENTS**

**NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Conference Call No. 4 – November 21, 2000**

- The main body, Appendix A and Appendix B were reviewed. The comments will be incorporated into the documentation and issued to RRS and WG members, by the end of day, on November 29, 2000.

**NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES**  
**Conference Call No. 4 – November 21, 2000**

**C4. SUMMARY OF FUTURE ACTION ITEMS**

- **Action Item CC4-01:** Issue to the WG and RRS the Base Case result, most of the sensitivity results and a Draft of the Study report by 11/29/00.

**C5. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE**

- November 28, 2000 - Conference Call @ 2:00 P.M. (CLOSED SESSION)
- December 5, 2000 - Joint RRS/WG Meeting