Draft Minutes

New York State Reliability Council

Installed Capacity Subcommittee

Meeting #178 – November 30, 2015

NYISO Corporate Center, Rensselaer NY

Attendees

	Present	Phone
Members / Alternates:		
Rich Wright (CHG&E)		
Dmitriy Kiselev (Con Edison)		
Howard Kosel (Con Edison)		
Sanderson Chery (Con Edison)		
Khatune Zannat (PSEG LI)		
Mariann Wilczek(PSEG LI), ICS Vice Chair/Secretary		
Syed Ahmed (National Grid)		
Bart Franey (National Grid)		
Richard Brophy (NYSEG-RGE)		
John Tigue (NYSEG-RGE)		
Bob Boyle (NYPA)		
Brian Wilkie (NYPA)		
Mark Younger (Hudson Energy Economics, LLC – Wholesale Sellers)	
Mark Cordeiro (PLM, Inc – Municipals & Electric Coops)		
Mike Mager (Couch White – Large Consumers)		
Advisers/Non-member Participants:		
Al Adamson (Consultant)		
John Adams (Consultant)		
Erin Hogan (UIU), ICS Chair	\ <u></u> .	

Kelvin Chu (GE)
Liam Baker (US PowerGen)
Scott Leuthauser (Consultant for H.Q. Services)
Kelli Joseph (NRG)
James Scheiderich (ECS)
Chris LaRoe (Brookfield Renewables)
Greg Drake (NYISO)
Frank Ciani (NYISO)
Dana Walters (NYISO)
Josh Boles (NYISO)
Steve Lemme (NYISO)
Kai Jiang (NYISO)
Bill Lamanna (NYISO)
Carl Patka (NYISO)
Vijay Ganugula (NYISO)
Alan Ackerman (CES)
Tim Lundin (CES)
Matt Cinadr (E-Cubed)

1. Review of Action Items List

Chair Erin Hogan reviewed the action item list with items 170-5 and 176-2 to be closed out.

Item 178-1 was tentatively added for the NYISO to evaluate the multi-year wind shape functionality in 2016. Vice Chair Mariann Wilczek noted that she and incoming Chair Bob Boyle would be meeting with the ISO in the near term to discuss potential white papers for the upcoming year as well as the Action Item list. Suggestions from the group should be sent to her and Bob.

Vijay Ganugula(NYISO) presented SCR test performance for 2016 IRM studies(Action item list 176-2). He was originally scheduled to present the topic at the September 29 ICS meeting but it was postponed. The purpose of the presentation was to provide some additional context behind the SCR model used in ICS studies. The ICS accepted methodology to determine SCR model values is based on prior year's performance data. Mr. Ganugula noted that, similar to 2014, there are no mandatory SCR events, so the SCR model values next year will also rely on the one-hour performance tests. Historically, SCR

performance during one-hour tests is higher than during mandatory SCR events. The ISO is concerned that using only the prior year's data is causing variability in the SCR representation from year to year. He reviewed the historic performance of the last five capability periods for tests versus the last five mandatory tests. He noted in zone J that this difference was 100% vs 66%. Differences ranged from 6.4% to 42.7% across the zones. Mr. Ganugula indicated he would return in February or March 2016 to propose an alternate approach to account for mandatory events. The current thought it to try to take an average of the five most recent mandatory events and tests so there would be a balance. An action item was added for this.

A few points were raised by Jim Scheiderich and Mark Younger. Mr. Scheiderich expressed a concern over the impact of a really bad test performance and the proposal should be balanced in both directions. Mr. Younger noted that this concern could be partially addressed by determining performance on an hourly basis, where a test would count for an hour as opposed to mandatory calls which accounted for more hours. He also noted that the methodology should protect the most recent five events or a minimum of ten or fifteen hours to not get to a point where all the measurement is based on tests and no events.

2. 2016-2017 IRM Study:

2.1. IRM Report Body – Version 4 – For Final Comments

Chair Hogan asked for a page turner for edits/comments on the IRM. Carl Patka noted that there were substantive changes to section 5.2.2, Outside World Model. Greg Drake read proposed changes to the section and footnote. Adjustments were discussed amongst the group to note that the ISO is continuing to evaluate the PJM model and have not yet performed a full and complete review. The NYISO will continue to work with PJM in 2016 to improve the five bubble model for consideration by the NYSRC for possible use in the 2017 IRM Study. Al Adamson asked if there was a written report on the PJM five bubble model. Mr. Patka noted that there was not a separate written report on the PJM five bubble model. The language was being provided in this section as well as the footnote. Mr. Younger thought it was important to keep all these caveats and details in the report should the Executive Committee decide to keep the PJM five bubble model.

There were no substantive comments in other sections of the report.

Other minor items noted were Mr. Adamson identified a concern over using the term bubble and zone interchangeably. The group decided to leave the leave the term bubble in and define it in the glossary.

In Section 7, Table 7-1, Sensitivity Cases – 2016 IRM Study, Mr. Younger indicated that Case 11 needs to note a Full Tan 45 was performed. The group agreed and a footnote was added to both Case 11 (Huntley Station retirement with related topology) and Case 9 (Use 2014 Wind Shape Model) that a full Tan 45 was performed.

2.2. IRM Report Appendix – For Final Comments

Chair Hogan asked if there were any significant changes in appendix. None were noted by the NYISO. A page turner was performed with ministerial changes noted for John Adams to make in the document.

One item to note was in section (5) retirements, the wording was changed to make note of the Huntley retirement. At the time of the final base case approval, the NYISO had not completed its reliability analysis, therefore the Huntley retirement was not represented in the base case. As a result, a special sensitivity with a full Tan 45 was performed on the impact of Huntley retiring.

There was discussion over Table B.1 – Sensitivity Case Results and the inclusion of the NYC and LI LCRs. Chair Hogan identified that not all of these cases used a full Tan 45. Mr. Drake noted this information has always been included. The group decided to leave the NYC and LI columns in the table as is.

In Appendix D – Glossary of Terms, the definition of bubble was added. Mr. Adamson noted a concern with the definition of Preliminary Locational Capacity Requirement (PLCR) and to include it would change the glossary terms that exist in the reliability rules and manuals. After further discussion, the decision was made to delete this definition and replace the only instance in the text where PLCR is used with the words Preliminary LCR. Chair Hogan noted that the global glossary should be relooked at going forward.

Chair Hogan asked for approval of this report with these changes. No objections were noted to approving the body and appendices of the report.

2.3. Status of 5-Bubble PJM Model Sensitivity Study

Chair Hogan asked the NYISO for the status of results. Mr. Drake reported on the analysis. The NYISO was asked to perform a sensitivity with PJM as a five area representation. He described the details of the study. They started with base case and broke out the bubble from PJM SW based on information the NYISO received through CP8. The information also had topology that included a 1500 MW tie from the new bubble to PJM Central and also an interface between PJM SW and the new bubble. The total generation in PJM remained constant as well as the load but was distributed and split out by the CP8 working group. The new bubble was DOMPENC per PJM. In the base case PJM LOLE was 0.14. No appreciable effect was noted on NYCA LOLE. Mr. Drake noted that in the standard sensitivity case, capacity is added or removed in all zones. The LOLE was the same so there was no need to add or remove capacity anywhere. The conclusion was the IRM did not change. Dana Walter added that they did not run the actual point or do the tan 45 they just confirmed if there was an impact or not.

Mr. Patka expressed concerns that some representatives were not available today for the discussion. Chair Hogan will reach out to NYPA (Bob Boyle), National Grid (Syed Ahmed), LIPA (Curt Dahl), and Rich Bolbrock prior to the Executive Committee meeting.

2.4. GE IRM Data Base Quality Assurance Report(Appendix A, page 47)

Mr. Drake noted there are three separate reviews. The first is GE in table A-15, the NYISO review is A16(was labeled A17) and A18 is the Transmission Owner transmission scrub. Some cleanup was performed on the tables with Chair Hogan noting that neither GE nor the TOs found any meaningful changes that would affect the IRM.

3. Topics for January 7, 2016 Meeting

Ms. Wilczek solicited items from the group and asked if any additional topics be sent to her and incoming chair Bob Boyle. She noted that she and Bob would be meeting with ISO next week. Frank Ciani noted one of the topics is a lessons learned from last year. Rick Brophy noted from the previous year's January meeting, there was a review of study scheduled process milestones and an inventory of issues considered for 2017. Mr. Adamson noted there would be discussion of the potential major whitepapers. Among those possible papers are the PJM model, transmission assistance levels between PJM and NY (is there a maximum limit) and wind shape model.

4. Additional Agenda Items

None were noted.

Secretary: Mariann Wilczek (PSEG LI)

Upcoming meetings:

Meeting 179, Thursday, January 7th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 180, Wednesday, February 3rd at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 181, Wednesday, March 2nd at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 182, Tuesday, March 29th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 183, Wednesday, May 4th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 184, Wednesday, June 1st at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 185, Wednesday, June 29th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 186, Wednesday, August 3rd at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 188, Wednesday, October 5th at NYISO Corporate Center

Meeting 189, Wednesday, November 2nd at NYISO Corporate Center