

Transmission Planning Advisory Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
January 4, 2022
Conference Call
10:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

1. Administrative Matters

Mr. Scott Leuthauser (HQUS, TPAS Chair) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Chairman's report

Mr. Leuthauser said that he did not receive correspondence from the Operating Committee (OC).

3. Study Scopes Under Consideration for Recommendation for OC Approval

Q#826 Astoria Energy Storage 1 SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. Ms. Diana Hernandez (NYISO) reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

Q#1011 Vineyard Wind II SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. The project is an alternative to Q#1010. In response to a question, the developer said the project had not received an award from New York State. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

Q#1142 Minerva BESS I SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. It was noted that the project was initially proposed with a project size of 600 MW but now has a project size of 300 MW. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

Q#1167 CPNY SIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. In response to a question, the developer said the project received a Tier 4 contract from New York State. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

Mr. Howard Fromer (Bayonne) asked if the transmission line would be studied with the as-found system with existing generation or with additional resources consistent with the developer's plan. Ms. Hernandez said it would be studied with existing generation. Mr. Younger noted that the developer's Tier 4 contract is premised on the line delivering renewable generation or pumped storage facility. Mr. Thanh Nguyen (NYISO) said the NYISO's tariff directive is to perform interconnection studies to make sure the transmission line will not cause reliability violations and if it does cause reliability

violations, then system upgrades will be identified. He explained that it is not the objective of interconnection studies to evaluate a transmission line with the assumption it will only use renewable generation. The interconnection studies do not tie the transmission to any specific generation in its analysis.

Mr. Fromer raised concerns regarding the potential impact of studying the project without limiting the generation over the line to renewable generation per the developer's contract. Mr. Kevin Lang (City of NY) disagreed and said the NYISO is studying a project and not a contract. Ms. Saia noted that Mr. Fromer's concern was an important issue, but it was more of a deliverability matter, but not part of Attachment P. Mr. Younger said it was important that the developer could achieve what it claimed to do in its Tier 4 contract award and that it be captured somewhere in the NYISO's planning process. He noted that with this contract, a portion of Gilboa would no longer be able to be dispatched for reliability reasons, but instead would be dispatched to balance the delivery of these unnamed intermittent resources. Gilboa's value as a resource would be diminished and that needs to be covered in a NYISO study (RNA, Economic, Public Policy, etc.), even if not as part of an interconnection study process. Mr. Carl Patka (NYISO) suggested that Mr. Younger submit any specific questions that he had to the NYISO and those could be discussed at ESPWG.

In response to a question, Mr. Nguyen said the proposed line would be studied as self-scheduled by the developer and not under the control of the NYISO. Ms. Saia said that was being presumed for this study, but there are no rules for HVDC lines and that the ultimate rule may be different. Mr. Nguyen said that was correct. Mr. Chris Wentlent (MEUA) said if the project self-schedules and it is tied to Gilboa, that could cause issues because NYISO Operations may prefer to dispatch Gilboa differently in real time. He said several other reliability considerations that should be thought through even if it is outside the scope of interconnection studies.

In response to a question, Mr. Nguyen said the TDI Champlain-Hudson project (Q631/Q887) does not meet the NYISO's inclusion rules for this study's base case, so it would not be represented in the base case for this study scope.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

Q#1194 Crane Brook Solar SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

Q#1288 CPNY-X SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. Mr. Younger noted that the project was clearly listed as a Class Year Transmission Project and asked for clarification whether the project was identical to Q#1167, but being evaluated under two different OATT sections – Attachment P and Attachment X. The developer said that was correct. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

In response to a general question, Ms. Hernandez explained why the projects discussed today at TPAS would be unlikely to join Class Year 2022. Mr. Younger asked how this project and the other project awarded a Tier 4 contract –TDI’s Champlain-Hudson project – would be studied together. Mr. Nguyen said the cumulative impact would be studied as part of a sensitivity under Attachment P. If TDI Champlain-Hudson accepts its cost allocation in Class Year 2021, then it would be captured in the base case under Attachment X for studies post-dating completion of Class Year 2021. Mr. Younger also noted that the project cannot receive CRIS if under Attachment P, but can receive CRIS under Attachment X.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

4. Study Reports under Consideration for Recommendation for OC Approval

Q#1079 Somerset Solar SRIS Scope

The developer provided a brief description of the project. Ms. Hernandez reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

5. Status of NYISO Studies/Activities

Status of Class Year 2021

Ms. Wenjin Yan (NYISO) reviewed the document included with the meeting material.

In response to a question, Ms. Yan said Q#786 Ravenswood Energy Storage withdrew from the Class Year.

In response to a question, Ms. Yan said the NYISO would share the preliminary SDU presentation to TPAS and OC in May 2022, but Class Year 2021 developers would be provided the information in the April timeframe. She noted that if the Connecting TO does not provide the high-level cost estimates, the NYISO would provide that information.

Expedited Deliverability Study (EDS 2021-01)

Ms. Yan reviewed the document included with the meeting material.

6. Review of Material Modification Determinations and Modification Requiring a New Interconnection Request/SIS Request

Mr. Nguyen reviewed the document included in the meeting material.

7. Status of Feasibility Studies in Progress

No updates.

8. New Business

None

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. The next meeting is on February 1, 2022.