

NYISO Electric System Planning Working Group Meeting

September 13, 2005
 NYISO Washington Ave Ext, Albany, NY

Meeting Notes

Of the 35th meeting of the New York Independent System Operator Electric System Planning Working Group held on September 13, 2005 at NYISO in Albany, NY.

In attendance:

Tariq Niazi - NYSCPB	Ray Stalter – NYISO
Jerry Ancona – National Grid	John Buechler - NYISO
Carl Patka - NYISO	Leigh Bullock - NYISO
Raj Addepalli - NYSDPS	Chris Hall - NYSERDA
Diane Barney – NYSDPS	Larry Dewitt - PACE
Janet Besser – National Grid	Tim Foxen - NRG
Tim Bush – Navigant Consulting	Carolyn Brown - IPPNY
Bill Palazzo - NYPA	Deidre Facendola – Con Edison
Doreen Saia – Mirant	Chris Wentlent - AES
Bob Reed - NYSEG	David Allen
Chris Hall – NYSERDA	Mike Mager – Multiple Intervenors
Paul Gioia – LeBoef, Lamb	Terron Hill – National Grid
Mark Younger – Slater Consulting	Ken Lotterhos – LIPA/Navigant Consulting
Ralph Rufrano - NYPA	Larry DeWitt - PAVE
Bill Lamanna – NYISO	Joe Lewis - Constellation
Jeff McKinney - NYSEG	Tim Foxen - NRG
Mohsen Zamzam – Con Edison	Jim Scheiderich – Select Energy
Ed Kichline – Keyspan Energy	John Watzka – Central Hudson
Harvey Happ - NYPSC	

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Tariq Niazi, Chair of the Electric System Planning Working Group welcomed the ESPWG members to the meeting and stated the agenda.

Review Minutes of July 14 and August 22 Meetings

The July 14th meeting minutes were approved. The August 22nd meeting minutes were deferred to the October meeting.

Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process – Draft RNA

Mr. Bill Lamanna presented the draft reliability needs assessment. NYISO has issued the first draft, with the purpose of soliciting input and review from stakeholders to develop the final RNA. Over the next month, the NYISO will be working with the TOS in developing voltage based transfer limits and mitigation plans that need to be identified. ESPWG will review scenarios. The baseline system, as defined, can be modified taken into account the scenarios. TPAS will be looking for reliability criteria review. This will be forwarded to the Operating Committee for approval.

Mr. Lamanna reviewed the primary analysis tools and provided a summary of the findings and conclusions. He informed the group that there is additional background information in the appendixes; these have not yet been distributed.

The group discussed the need to provide more specific details on the findings. ESPWG members agreed that the draft report does not talk about upgrades to the system, and suggested that this report quantify the magnitude of needs identified. Participants also indicated that the second section of the report needs to backup conclusions/findings reached in the first half. Mr. Ancona asked for quantitative numbers as opposed to adverse conditions. Ms. Saia asked for specifics on why the impacts were so severe. Mr. Ruffano asked if any thought given to future projects that may address issues, other than stating a need without giving an idea of the fix.

Mr. Adams agreed with the group, indicating that the Report would need to show more detailed results of operating under these transfer levels.

Ms. Barney stated that, in response to the transfer limits discussions, she would like to the NYISO to report reliability concerns identified in the analysis. Mr. Lamanna agreed that NYISO would report such findings.

Jerry Ancona stated that the base case has to be the expected case – the first two findings are assuming that all qualitative adverse conditions disappear.

Mr. Lamanna stated that over a 10 year planning horizon there are still resource adequacy problems. He said the group is interested in seeing tables with different scenarios with impact on resource reliability needs. We will look at where we are today and how it varies over the year. After this we look at what is the reasonable base case.

Doreen Saia stated that, at a minimum, the NYISO needs to show that all the findings are in the base case. In the next step it is important to reflect the fact that there may be a market solution that may be more attractive. This is what this process was supposed to unveil.

Ken Lotterhos expressed concern that a merchant solution would be discouraged from coming in.

Mr. Lamanna reviewed the base case scenarios and sensitivity studies. Conclusions reported were:

- Increasing dependence on external resources highlights the importance and criticality of regional planning.
- NYCA resource needs are very sensitive to the level of internal and external resources that can be delivered to NYC and LI.
- Voltage issue in the HV must be addressed or resource adequacy requirements in J and K will increase.
- There are a number of environmental initiatives one impact of which will need to be addressed on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Scheiderich asked for a written description of the alternative network model that more accurately reflects external load flow constraints and deliverability of external resources in conjunction with reduced voltage limits, developed by NYISO

The group discussed NYCA reliability criteria.

The network model was discussed. Mr. Adams stated that the NYISO will go forward with alternative network model as the base case.

Mr. Lotterhos expressed concern on the topological study. He stated that the TOs are looking at a topological representation, which is fine, provided that the TOs have had a chance to look through their topological study. He did not feel there was enough time available to achieve that, and asked Bill Lamanna if the NYISO has gotten an affirmative response from all TOs. Bill stated that they will close the loop with the TOs in a week or two.

Proposed Timeline:

Early Sept: NYISO Issues Draft RNA
Sept/Oct: ESPWG/TPAS Review Draft RNA
Oct. 27th: RNA Presented to OC for Approval
Nov. 9th: MC Presented to MC for Approval

Jerry Ancona presented Base Case.

- RNA Base case should be the expected system including expected changes but not including presumed fixes.
- Base case RNA needs should be quantified by year in terms of:
 - Loactional resources (Mw and Mvar)
 - Transfer limits (From-to in MW)
 - Locational Reactive Resources
- How do we get back to how the system is solved? We need to know if it didn't solve, then by how much. Need quantified needs not concerns.

Development of Cost Allocation Methodology, Cost Recovery Issues and Dispute Resolution Procedures

Postponed to October 18th Meeting

Action Items

A special meeting was requested for October 4th to review comments on, and possible updates to, the RNA. An Email summarizing comments made at the meeting was to be distributed to the Working Group, with a request for follow up comments.

NEXT MEETING: October 4th at the NYS Nurses Association