

**Joint Meeting of the
New York State Reliability Council, L.L.C. (NYSRC)
Reliability Rules Subcommittee (RRS) /
Reliability Compliance Monitoring Subcommittee (RCMS)
Thursday, May 3, 2018**

Minutes of RRS Meeting No. 225

RRS Members and Alternates:

Roger Clayton, Electric Power Resources (Chairman)
Larry Hochberg, NYPA (Vice Chairman)
Zoraini Rodriguez, PSEGLI/LIPA (Secretary)
Brian Shanahan, National Grid
Brian Gordon, NYSEG
Michael Roszkowski, Con Edison
Martin Paszek, Con Edison
Dan Head, Con Edison
Sal Spagnolo, NYPA

Non-Voting Participants:

Al Adamson, Consultant
Jim Grant, NYISO
Mark Capano, NYISO

Guests:

Paul Gioia, NYSRC Counsel
Aaron Markham, NYISO
Vijay Puran, DPS

RRS Meeting No. 225 was called to order by Mr. Clayton at 9:30 AM.

1. Introduction

1.1 Executive Session

None requested.

1.2 Requests for Additional Agenda Items

None requested.

2. Approval of Minutes / Action Items

2.1 Approval of RRS Minutes No. 224

RRS reviewed and discussed the Minutes from the last RRS meeting. Some details were included in the Minutes, thus requiring another round of review before it can be made final.

2.2 RRS 224 Status Report to EC

Mr. Clayton presented to the RRS a copy of the ‘RRS 224 Status Report’ which he develops for the purpose of summarizing, at the next Executive Committee meeting, what RRS has done at its prior meeting.

2.3 RRS 224 Action Items List

Action Item 224-9: This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-8: This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-7: This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-6: This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-5: On agenda. This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-4: On agenda. This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-3: Mr. Markham presented the “RRS Major Emergency Discussion” power point slides which contain detailed information on all three Major Emergency events to RRS.

Mr. Markham informed RRS that ISONE did a presentation on these events at the stakeholder meeting. The cause of the March 14th event was a fault in the ISONE system that resulted in delayed clearing at both Phase II and Mystic 9. This was due to an undervoltage relay. The relay setting on this relay has since been adjusted. ISONE is still working with Mystic 9 to determine if they need more relay adjustments specifically that will allow fault ride through.

Mr. Clayton asked if RRS can get a copy of the ISONE presentation. Mr. Grant will share the ISONE presentation with RRS [AI-225-1].

NYISO did exactly what they are supposed to do in handling these “beyond criteria” events, however the question is should these events be included in as part of the design

criteria? NYISO will get back to RRS on how to handle these “beyond criteria” events in the future. [AI-225-2]

This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-2: Mr. Clayton informed IPEPNY at the last EC meeting and is awaiting their response. This action item is completed.

Action Item 224-1: On agenda. This action item is completed.

Action Item 222-5 & Action Item 222-4: This action item is retired after the following discussion and replaced by a new action item.

Mr. Paszek reported that based on his conversation with internal groups; there were about 360 MW of behind the meter resources in NYC. Almost 200 MW of it are solar and the rest are battery cells and wind. He also expressed Con Edison’s concerns on how to develop an Underfrequency Load Shedding (UFLS) list, specifically with behind the meter resources manipulating the actual load on the feeders. Ms. Rodriguez shared the same sentiments from PSEGLI/LIPA’s point of view.

She also added that the PSEGLI/LIPA is also having issues in managing the load forecast since behind the meter resources act as load modifiers and get deducted from the load forecast.

Mr. Clayton suggested that “Action Items: 222-5 and 222-4” be retired and replaced with a new one, that will include all TOs in the discussion on the impact of behind the meter resources to their respective companies [AI-225-3].

Action Item 83-8: There was nothing new reported. The status remains as ‘Ongoing’.

3. NYSRC Reliability Rules Development

3.1 PRR List

3.1.1 PRR Outstanding List

None

3.2. PRRs for EC Final Approval after Posting

3.2.1 PRR 140 – A.1 (R1) Establishing NYCA IRM Requirements

No comments have been received. RRS agrees to recommend to the EC to adopt this as final.

3.2.2 PRR 141 – A.2 (R1, R2) Establishing LSE IC Requirements

RRS briefly discussed minor changes to PRR 141, but later agreed to take it as final and recommended to the EC to adopt it as final.

3.3. PRRs for EC Approval to Post for Comments

3.3.1 None.

3.4. PRRs for discussion

3.4.1 Voltage control with GSU LTCs

As a follow up to last month's action item, Con Edison got the perspective that other TOs are not interested in creating a voltage control with GSU LTCs rule. Therefore, Con Edison modified their Transmission Planning Criteria to add the following wording "Consequently, new generation facilities shall incorporate Under-Load Tap Changing (ULTC) capability on its Generator main power Step-up Transformers and Under-Load Tap Changing (ULTC) capability on the associated Light & Power Transformers." to address this issue.

Mr. Paszek reported that this revised criteria was presented at TPAS. They did receive some questions from the generation sector.

At this time, Con Edison withdraws their request for a voltage control with GSU LTCs rule from RRS.

3.4.2 Review response to NYSRC request for N-1-1 permissible actions

Continuation from last month's meeting discussion, Mr. Clayton asked Con Edison as to why this requirement is currently an issue for Con Edison.

Mr. Paszek explained that Con Edison's planning design is not to remove an element from the system. He also pointed out that their previous concern was the loss of supply and not possible loss of radial feed. In the Operations world, this is an acceptable move but in the Planning world, the implication is that it is acceptable to reduce the connectivity of the network.

In this particular case, Mr. Paszek said that they could add another bay to avoid the possibility of losing one supply. He also added that Con Edison is fine if RRS decides to accept NPCC's response. They may adjust their Transmission Planning Criteria again.

All TOs offer their opinions and discussed how each TO approaches this event in Operations versus Planning world. After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Clayton pointed out

that this is not a load shedding situation, more of a topology situation.

As a result, Mr. Clayton asked all TOs to come back at the next meeting and decide as to whether a PRR is needed or not to address this concern [AI-225-4]. Should RRS be more conservative on this connectivity issue? The question is do we want to put a risk of opening a breaker as a solution, thus weakening the system.

3.4.2 Tariff revision to permit inverter based resources as synchronized reserves

NYISO provided the NYISO's Proposed Tariff revision to permit inverter based resources as synchronized reserves.

Mr. Adamson pointed out the NYSRC rule states that E-1, R3.1 "*Synchronized Operating Reserve - At least one-half of the ten (10) minute operating reserve will consist of unused resource capacity which is synchronized and ready to achieve claimed capacity, or resource capacity which can be made available by curtailing pumping hydro units, or canceling energy sales to other systems.*" does not include the "inverter based resources as synchronized reserves. Should we include the new term in our rules? The rules also refer to the word generation vs. resources.

NYISO said they have no technical concerns about this tariff but admitted that they cannot speak to it. Mr. Clayton then asked as to the reason behind this move from the NYISO. NYISO responded by offering the following reasons:

- To provide more reserve
- To provide revenue opportunity

Mr. Clayton asked if Mr. Grant could get somebody from the NYISO to come to RRS and explain the technical justifications of this tariff. Can the inverter based resources operate the same way as the spinning metal? And how would NYISO measure their ability to perform ~~this~~? [AI-225-5]

4. NPCC Directories

Mr. Adamson reported that RRS voted "Yes" for PRC 002, BAL-002-2 and "No" to PRC- 012.

5. NERC SARS/Organization Standards

5.1 NERC Standard Tracking

Mr. Adamson reviewed the NERC Reliability Standard Development Tracking Summary (dated 3-23-2018) with RRS.

6. Additional Agenda Items

6.1 REV Potential Impact on NYS BPS Reliability

Mr. Clayton reported that a meeting was held at the NYISO a couple of weeks ago. The results of the meeting were documented on the “DER Workshop” document. The idea of this meeting is to raise awareness and see if we need to create new RRS rules. He pointed out that this is a long haul project. There is a fundamental change in the network and we need to be ready for it.

Mr. Clayton also mentioned a joint utility effort from NY. Mr. Paul Haering (~~?? Not sure if I spelled this right~~) of Central Hudson is taking the lead on this effort. NYISO will participate in this effort as well, and preparing the material such as technical studies, etc. NYISO will also keep abreast of any REV developments.

7. Reports

7.1 NYSRC EC Meeting Reports

There were no other additional RRS items to report.

7.2 NYSRC ICS Meeting Report

Mr. Adamson reported that the ICS continues with the process of developing the 2019 load shape model, since some assumptions have change. All assumption should be completed by June 2018 and completed by the EC July meeting. By then the preliminary IRM number will be calculated. He did not expect big changes since transmission topology has not changed.

The meeting ended at 1:00 PM.

8. Next Meeting No. 226

Thursday, May 31, 2018; 9:30 AM @ NYSERDA, 17 Columbia Circle, Albany.