AC Transmission PPTN: Updates

Dawei Fan

Manager, Public Policy and Interregional Planning

ESPWG/TPAS

May 22, 2018, KCC



Review Process

- March 30, 2018: posted draft SECO report and preliminary evaluation results
- April 5, 2018: ESPWG/TPAS, summary of the review schedule
- April 6, 2018: reviewed results with all developers in the same meeting
- April 19, 2018: reviewed results with all developers in the same meeting
- April 30, 2018: ESPWG/TPAS
- May 10, 2018: ESPWG/TPAS
- May 22, 2018: ESPWG/TPAS
- June 1, 2018: ESPWG/TPAS
- June 20, 2018: Business Issue Committee (advisory vote)
- June 21, 2018: Operating Committee (for information, not required by Tariff)
- June 26, 2018: Special Management Committee (advisory vote)
- July 2018: draft report delivered to NYISO Board



Agenda

- Responses to Comments
- Next Steps



Review of Comments

- Most recent written comments received by May 14, 2018 were posted
- Some comments were already discussed in the previous meetings
- Today, NYISO will respond to new comments and address additional questions from the previous ESPWG/TPAS
- NYISO will continue to consider stakeholder comments



- How was the replacement of aging infrastructure determined?
 - NYISO response:
 - In the Comparative Evaluation of Alternating Current Transmission Upgrade Alternatives (see PSC Case No. 12-T-0502, et al.), the New York State Department of Public Service Trial Staff Final Report stated, "Of the corridors considered in this proceeding, [New York State Transmission Assessment and Reliability Study] identified several lines needing replacement over the next 30 years."
 - The Final Report specifically identified lines correlating to project proposals, which include, but not limited to:
 - Porter-Rotterdam 230 kV lines: 0-10 years
 - Greenbush-Pleasant Valley 115 kV lines: 11-20 years



 Projects to rebuild the Rotterdam substation over existing gas pipelines should be rejected.

NYISO/SECO response:

- SECO identified rebuilding Rotterdam substation over existing gas pipelines as a risk. The risk mitigation measure is to relocate the gas pipelines near the Rotterdam substation within the existing property. While regulatory processes have to be followed to permit and implement the relocation, this was not considered as a major risk given that the relocation involves only a small segment of the pipelines.
- Projects T025, T026, T027, and T028 have also proposed an alternative location for the Rotterdam substation, which would not require the relocation of the gas pipelines.



Project Design Information Request

Can NYISO make the detailed project design information including EMF calculation available?

NYISO response:

- In order to make the requested information available, the NYISO needs to remove confidential information.
- When the review is complete, the NYISO will make redacted project submittals available to market participants who submit a CEII request form and execute the CEII NDA, as applicable.

- Would NYISO consider a more comprehensive viewshed analysis? NYISO/SECO response:
 - The PSC need order called for Developers to minimize tower structures and heights. A comprehensive viewshed analysis may be required in the Article VII process by the DPS, if deemed necessary.
 - Since a viewshed analysis is not required by the NYISO's tariff and all proposed projects use the same ROW, the important factors for the NYISO's evaluation of the potential visual impact are the structure heights and number of structures, and how projects compare to each other.

SECO's analysis of structure height increase for TO22 and TO23 is likely based upon different data for existing structure heights and ground elevation than what NEETNY used for preliminary design. NYISO/SECO response:

 The existing structure heights used in SECO's evaluation are from the information provided by National Grid, which is the utility that owns the structures. The structure height differences were calculated by comparing the structure height in the PLSCadd model provided by developers and the existing structures being removed.



- T029 and T030 have better N-1-1 performance due to the Middletown upgrades. This should not be considered as a distinguishing factor.
 - Middletown upgrades were proposed by NAT/NYPA as elements of the TO29 and TO30 projects. The better N-1-1 performance is attributable to the proposed Middletown upgrades.

How did SECO develop the cost estimates for the Middletown upgrades?

NYISO/SECO response:

- Conceptual estimates based on available information
- Replacing the Middletown 345/138 kV transformer
 - Replace the foundation and oil containment system for the new transformer
 - New transformer ratings NOR: 720 MVA, LTE: 836 MVA, STE: 956 MVA
 - Additional cost added for work including bus work, conduit, cables, protection modifications
- Reconductoring 138 kV line from Middletown to Shoemaker
 - The length of the line segment is 0.88 miles
 - Remove the existing 2-bundle 1033.5 ACSR conductor and install new 2-bundle Bluejay 1113 ACSS conductor
 - Replace the insulators and associated conductor hardware
 - Existing structures assumed to have adequate strength to support the new conductors



Next Steps



Next Steps

- Please provide additional comments to <u>PublicPolicyPlanningMailbox@nyiso.com</u>
- NYISO will review the draft AC Transmission Public Policy Transmission Planning Report with ranking and selection recommendation at the June 1, 2018 ESPWG/TPAS meeting



Questions?

We are here to help. Let us know if we can add anything.



The Mission of the New York Independent System Operator, in collaboration with its stakeholders, is to serve the public interest and provide benefits to consumers by:

- Maintaining and enhancing regional reliability
- Operating open, fair and competitive wholesale electricity markets
- Planning the power system for the future
- Providing factual information to policy makers, stakeholders and investors in the power system



www.nyiso.com

