

NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Meeting #11 – October 18, 2000

Members/Alternates Present:

Mr. Jordan Brandeis (NYPA)
Mr. Carl Courant (NYPA - Alternate)
Mr. Mark Cordeiro (Municipals) – Chairman
Mr. Curt Dahl (KeySpan/LIPA)
Mr. Larry Eng (NMPC)
Mr. Michael Hogan (CHGE) – Secretary

Advisers/Non-member Participants Present:

Mr. John Adams (ISO) – Partial Attendance
Mr. Alan Adamson (Consultant)
Mr. Art Desell (ISO) – Partial Attendance
Mr. Greg Drake (ISO)
Mr. Frank Vitale (Consultant)

Members/Non-members/Advisers Absent:

Mr. Tom Baldi (ConEd)
Mr. Gary Freeland (NYSEG)
Mr. Keith O’Neal (NYPSC)

Guests

Mr. John Kobuskie for Gary Freeland (NYSEG)
Mr. Ed Schrom for Keith O’Neal (NYPSC)

1. REVIEW & APPROVE MINUTES FROM LAST MEETING

- Minutes for Meeting #10 of October 3rd were approved with revisions.

2. STATUS OF OUTSTANDING ACTIONS ITEMS

- 2.1 **Work Scope for 3 year Study (09-02)** – The transmission study being developed appears to need some minor supplemental MARS to accomplish what was envisioned for this WG to study. Mr. Eng will continue to take the lead on this action item. He will distribute the transmission study work scope and suggest additional work, which can be discussed at our next WG meeting.
- 2.2 **EOP’s as MW & Percent (CC1-2)** – Completed.
- 2.3 **Pursue Agreements To Allow Access To Outside Area Load & Capacity Data (CC2-2)** – Completed.

NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Meeting #11 – October 18, 2000

- 2.4 **Historic Maintenance Schedule Update (CC2-4)** – Not complete.
- 2.5 **Graph and Critique of 5- vs 10-year Unit availability (10-01)** – Completed.
- 2.6 **Develop Cumulative Distribution Curve for Load Uncertainty Distribution (10-02)** – Completed.
- 2.7 **1st Pass MARS Results (10-03)** – Completed.
- 2.8 **Appendix A - 3rd Draft (10-04)** – Completed.
- 2.9 **Draft of Study Report (10-05)** – Completed. Mr. Vitale issued a preliminary draft of the Study's main body of the report and Appendix B. The general consensus was that if a topic is covered in Appendix A, it should not be repeated in Appendix B. It was also suggested that the report discuss the locational capacity requirements in greater detail. This WG is not concerned with setting the locational values but, since they have an impact on this study, they should be discussed in greater detail.

3. REVIEW & DISCUSS OPEN SESSION AGENDA

- Very briefly reviewed Open Session agenda.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

- **OPEN ATTENDANCE OF WG MEETINGS** – The Executive Committee has directed that the meetings remain closed at this time and that participants wishing to listen can continue to do so on a listen-only basis via the phone.

5. REVIEW REMAINING OUTSTANDING ASSUMPTIONS ITEMS

- All the base case assumptions have been identified and approved by the RRS and the EC. The assumptions are as follows:
 - **Generating Unit Ratings:** Update based on 2000 gold book
 - **Planned 2001 Capacity:** Enron 66 MW (LI), NYPA 484 MW (NYC/LI)
 - **Special Case Resources:** Total 170 MW
 - **External ICAP:** 2750 MW (1650 MW Grandfathered, 600 MW HQ to NY, 500 MW HQ to PJM, 500 MW PJM to NY)
 - **Generating Unit Unavailability Factors:** 10 year averages
 - **Availability Uncertainty:** 1% adder
 - **Locational Capacity Requirement:** NYC - 80% min., LI - 93% min

NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Meeting #11 – October 18, 2000

- **2001 Peak Load Forecast:** ISO's Forecast
 - **Load Model:** Based on 1995 actual load shape
 - **Load Forecast Uncertainty Model:** Updated by ISO Staff, includes 1999
 - **Transmission Model:** Updated by ISO Staff
 - **Outside Areas Models:** CP8 Data
- A remaining issue to the incorporation of the assumptions into the model is that there is a potential software/data problem in extending the NERC GADS data (1997 to 1999). If this issue cannot be resolved by Tuesday (10/24/00) the preliminary MARS runs will use the same data as in the previous study.

6. REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT FEEDBACK FROM RRS/EC ON APPENDIX A

- There has been no significant feedback on Appendix A. The assumptions, however, were approved. Comments on Appendix A are due by November 1

7. REVIEW AND DISCUSS 1ST PASS MARS BASE CASE RESULTS

- ISO staff distributed the results of the 1st pass MARS results. It appears from the results that loop flow is still a modeling issue. The ISO staff was asked to make the appropriate modeling changes. Furthermore, the ISO staff was asked to go back and benchmark against last years study and incrementally make the updates, to gain an understanding of the impacts various assumptions have on the IRM. The ISO staff will distribute updated results as they are completed between now and the next conference call meeting on 10/31.

8. IDENTIFY ANY SENSITIVITIES

- The following table is a list of sensitivity cases.

Case	Assumptions
- 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

NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Meeting #11 – October 18, 2000

	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
- 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

9. SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING AND FUTURE ACTION ITEMS

See agenda item 2 above for status of outstanding action items from the October 3rd meeting.

Action Item 11-1: Determine, if possible, the amount of generating capacity that was in NYCA but sold as ICAP externally.

Action Item 11-2: Breakdown of the new capacity additions by area (LI, NYC and other).

Action Item 11-3: 2nd Pass MARS results.

Action Item 11-4: Comments on Report (main body, Appendix A and B)

10. REVIEW OF STUDY MILESTONES

- 10/17 EC Meeting – Report to EC and seek approval of study scope and assumptions.
- 10/31 - ICAP WG review initial Base Case results.
- 12/11 Approval Of Study by Executive Committee

11. OTHER BUSINESS

- No other Business

12. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

- October 31, 2000 Closed & Open Sessions – CONFERENCE CALL
- November 15, 2000 Closed & Open Sessions @ ISO
- December 5, 2000 Joint RRS/WG Meeting @ ISO

NYSRC ICAP WORKING GROUP MEETING MINUTES
Meeting #11 – October 18, 2000