

**Joint Meeting of the
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (NYSRC)
Reliability Rules Subcommittee (RRS)/
Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee (RCMS)
NYSERDA, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany
Thursday, June 4, 2015**

Minutes of RRS Meeting No. 190

RRS Members and Alternates:

Roger Clayton, Electric Power Resources (Chairman)
Larry Hochberg, NYPA (Vice Chairman) (phone)
Roy Pfleiderer, National Grid (phone)
Brian Shanahan, National Grid
Wayne Sipperly, NYPA
Martin Paszek, Con Edison
Pratiba Anand, CONED (phone)
Zoraini Rodriguez, PSEGLI (phone)
Dan Head, CONED (phone)
Brian Gordon, NYSEG (Secretary)

Non-Voting Participants:

Al Adamson, NYSRC Consultant
Liam Baker, US PowerGen
Chris LaRoe, IPPNY
Kai Jiang, NYISO
Mark Capano, NYISO
Kevin DePugh, NYISO
Chris Sharp, NYISO
Paul Gioia, Counsel
Hardeep Kandola IESO
Ovidiu Vasilachi, IESO

RRS Meeting # 190 was called to order by Mr. Clayton at 9:30

1. Introduction

1.1. Executive Session

None requested.

1.2. Requests for Additional Agenda Items

Additional agenda item 6.4 is reserved for the discussion of PRR 121 and specifically for the wording concerning corrective action plan responsibilities.

2. Approval of Minutes / Action Items

2.1 Approval of RRS Minutes #189

RRS reviewed Minutes from the last meeting.

2.2 RRS Action Items List

Action Item 186-5: Completed.

Action Item 188-1,2,3: Change to 6/25.

Action Item 189-1: Completed.

Action Item 189-2: Completed. PRR 121 only.

Action Item 189-3: Completed.

Action Item 189-4: Completed.

Action Item 189-5: Change to June 25.

Action Item 189-6: Waiting for NYISO input to continue. Change to June 25.

Action Item 189-7: Completed.

Action Item 189-8: Completed.

3. NYSRC Reliability Rules Development

3.1 Outstanding PRR List

3.1.1. PRR 123 Rules Re-Labeling

The proposal was not clear so the scorecard is used as an example. The reference format of “**A.2 (R3)**” is the proposed format moving forward. The format is the rule followed by the requirement. RRS/NYISO had no comments or objections.

3.1.2. PRR 124 Rules Re-Labeling

This proposal is to change the Reliability Rule to Purpose which does not fit RRS' objectives. The reliability rule is only the rule not all of the other elements. NYISO issues were about potential confusion and ambiguity over their compliance responsibility. RRS is proposing section per 1.2 that if requirements

are met the NYISO is in compliance. This will be addressed at the next meeting after NYISO provides comments (**Action Item 190-1**).

3.2. Bucket List

No update. C-R7 administration change was added to go through all exceptions to identify if each exception applies to only operations or to both operations and planning.

3.3 NYSRC BPS definition

The A-10 BPS test is different for each ISO. The NYISO presented their application of the NPCC A-10 performance based methodology.. There is a stability portion to the test (screening test and an actual clearing time test) and power flow portion. Three phase faults are applied for 10 seconds at each bus for the screening stability study but most are really only 30 cycles. It was mentioned that New England skips over the screening test because they always use the actual clearing times for the stability study. If the stability portion of the BPS test fails the fault test, it will be considered a bulk bus. It was mentioned that radial generation to that bus will trip but it is not attributed to stability. If the 345kV bus is bulk, it is assumed for the testing the adjacent 115 kV bus that all local clearing relaying will work when analysis is performed on the 115 kV bus because it must be fully redundant relaying when bulk. The bright line criteria for this analysis is that it uses 1310 MW of total generation as the total amount of generation allowed to trip because it is the NYISO 10 minute operating reserves. If the total of all tripped generation is larger than 1310 MW, it is considered an adverse system impact. During the analysis, a 200 degree swing at a generation bus will be considered as a unit trip. For the steady state analysis, voltage swings larger than +/- 9% and facilities loaded greater than 125% of STE rating will be considered wide area impact or impact outside of the local area. For the A-10 test, summer peak cases are used. If BPS is declared, the NYISO also tests one bus away from the BPS defined bus separated by either one line or by one transformer (this includes GSU busses).

3.4. Dual-fueled generator testing & fuel supply

Mr. Gioia reported that the PSC (Diane Barney) stated that only Consolidated Edison has a dual fuel requirement where it is interconnected into the Consolidated Edison gas system.

Consolidated Edison has a planning requirement for new generation to have dual fuel. They do not have testing requirement or a requirement for the quantity of on site fuel.

Proposal is to consider requiring all new generators to have all dual fuel capability plus testing and an on-hand fuel requirement. IPPNY stated that the NYISO has already made improvements in the market system which has resulted in dual fuel performance improvements. Dual fuel is a good reliability benefit but is a rule enforceable outside the NYISO process. IPPNY mentioned that there must be fair and equitable treatment and used New Jersey as an example. Mr. Baker will be sending an email to explain the unfairness issue and the NYSRC's lack of authority to create a dual fuel requirement towards fuel assurance (**Action Item 190-2**).. Mr. Clayton stated that the initial focus is Consolidated Edison but the statistics may identify problems beyond the downstate area. There was a comment that the NYISO has minimum oil burn requirements but last year some units could not provide and should direct more testing requirements (storage,

performance, and capability) toward that process. Mr. LaRoe accepted an action item to provide the reference to the efficacy of existing NYISO market rules.(Action Item 190-3).

Mr. Clayton mentioned that the NYISO is working on provided statistics into last year's events to help understand what caused the problems experienced so that it is too early to develop any direction on developing future reliability requirements.

3.4 PRR 128

Proposal of PRR 128 was introduced. New definition not subject to interpretation. Page 2 excluding all radial elements . Mr Paszek agreed to revise the definition based on comments received (Action Item 190-4).

3.5. RRC Manual V35 draft 2-18-15

Introduction will change and the re-labeling of the rules will need to be performed once PRR 123 & PRR 124 are resolved.

4. NPCC Directories

4.1 Directory 1 Discussion

Mr. Clayton attended the RCC meeting NY list approved. Directory #1 is under review. Red line is from draft 2 to the new version. The question was raised about faults to be applied to non BPS elements and many stated not. Tables 1, 2, and 3 have many changes. Comments are due by July 12 on new draft of Directory #1. .

5. NERC SARS/Organization Standards

5.1 NERC Standard Tracking

No updates.

6. Additional Agenda Items.

6.1 Policy 1 Revision Plan

Posted version did not include some editorial changes but new posting will be held for changes into 1-9.

6.2 Discussion of NYSRC Exception #6

IESO introduced a nw exception request for a SPS system. Situation likes to have a new Beauharnois exception for the generation contingency. Sanders SPS exception 6 is active and being used currently with NYPA as the transmission owner. The facilities in this exception are co-owned by Hydro One and NYPA. IESO is registered with NPCC but now not a market

participant of the NYISO. NYPA does not have any issue against this new proposal but is not in the position to propose this new exception. The first step of the exception process is to submit this to the NYISO with documentation to show no reliability impact. NYPA is willing to review this documentation when received. Neither NYPA or NYISO is in the position to submit an application for this exception. There may be a need to change the current exception policy to allow adjacent utility's to apply for an exception. It is a A1 facility under the NYISO. L33 and L34P lines only are co-owned not the SPS to the generation.

Regardless of the exact details, this exception must be recommended on its merits and this situation will be explained to the EC to help move it forward. IESO mentioned a study that showed that Saunders or Beauharnois have exact same impact. IESO should look at the existing Policy One to understand the exception application process. Mr. Clayton will review this with the EC to determine if Policy 1 should be changed to allow a neighboring non-market participant to submit an exception application or to have some existing market participant to submit (**Action Item 190-5**). IESO will contact Hydro Quebec and/or Ontario Power Generation (OPG) to see if they will apply for the exception.

6.3 Annual Code of Conduct form

Fill in and send in as soon as possible. Give to EC member.

6.4 PRR 121 Corrective Action Plans

Corrective action plans are usually provided by the transmission owners for NYISO studies that are used to meet the requirements. The NYISO is concerned over accepting full responsibility for this requirement when the transmission owners provide the corrective action information. Mr. Adamson read his narrative on how this should be changed to incorporate Transmission Owner self certification within 90 days following project review to make sure they do what was promised.

7. Reports

8.1 NYSRC EC Meeting Report

PRR 127 approved for posting and post 1-8 policy.

8.2 NYSRC ICS Meeting Report

ICS is working on the assumptions and modeling for the 2016 IRM study. The PJM representation was expanded to include western areas.

Meeting ended at 13:16.

Next Meeting #191

Next Meeting #191: Thursday, June 25, 2015; 9:30 am @ NYSERDA, 17 Columbia

Circle, Albany