

Transmission Planning Advisory Subcommittee and Electric System Planning Working Group
Meeting Minutes
May 3, 2024
WebEx
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

1. Administrative Matters

Ms. Corinne Didomenico (NextEra, ESPWG Chair) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Chair's report

Ms. Didomenico said that she did not receive any correspondence from the Operating Committee (OC).

The meeting minutes from April 1, 2024 were approved.

3. System & Resource Outlook Update

Ms. Sarah Carkner (NYISO) reviewed the presentation included with the meeting material.

In response to a question, Ms. Carkner said today's presentation was consistent with the presentation that was presented to ESPWG on April 30.

Mr. Chris Wentlent (MEUA) said the EPA recently issued a final power emissions rule on April 25. The rule had significant requirements for existing coal facilities in PJM and MISO. In addition, there are stringent requirements for new natural gas facilities. Thus, it could affect the NY generation fleet as well as existing facilities outside NY that the NYISO relies on for imports. Ms. Carkner said the EPA's rule is not included in its report because the NYISO locked down its base case last fall. The NYISO would be looking at it for future study cycles. Ms. Doreen Saia (Greenberg Traurig) suggested the NYISO include a footnote in its report to note the new EPA rule and that it was not included in the base case. Mr. Wentlent encouraged the NYISO to look at it in the interim because the EPA rule could create a new barrier for entry for fossil-based facilities within the next few years and it was important for the NYISO to consider its reliability impacts.

4. Study Scope Under Consideration for Recommendation for OC Approval

1627 Micron Fab 2

Mr. Prasad Shinde (NYISO) reviewed the study scope included with the meeting material. In response to a question, the developer said the project would use system power, but will move towards clean energy for future use. In response to a question, the developer said that with phase 1 and 2 projects combined, Micron would use approximately 1 GW.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

5. Study Scope Under Consideration for Recommendation for OC Approval

1292 Hemlock Hollow Wind

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

1365 Queensboro Renewable Express Circuit A

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

1366 Queensboro Renewable Express Circuit B

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. In response to a question, the developer said Q#1365 and Q#1366 were not alternative projects to each other.

TPAS recommended OC approval.

1116 Blue Hill Wind

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

1322 Holtsville West Storage, LLC

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

1206 NY Interconnection 2

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

1310 QMB1 Energy Storage

Mr. Shinde reviewed the study report findings included with the meeting material. TPAS recommended OC approval.

6. Status of NYISO Studies/Activities

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

In response to a question, Ms. Yan said that the CRIS-only Q#959 EI Oceanside 2 project withdrew from the Class Year 2023 study and withdrew from the interconnection queue.

In response to a question, the only SDUs identified are in the Long Island area and those are new SDUs. The SDU results have been shared with the developers and once the results are finalized, the NYISO would discuss the results with stakeholders at a TPAS in May and then go to the OC.

7. Review of Material Modification Requests

Mr. Andrew Zielinski (NYISO) reviewed the study included with the meeting material. There were no questions.

8. Site Control Requirements in Cluster Study Process – Review of Draft Technical Bulletin

Mr. Thinkh Nguyen (NYISO) reviewed the presentation included with the meeting material.

In response to a question, Ms. Sara Keegan (NYISO) said the NYISO's site control language was much less stringent than what FERC requires in Order 2023 and it remained to be seen if FERC would accept it. In response to a suggestion, Ms. Keegan said the NYISO could review an "option to purchase for 10 years," but noted that there are a variety of accepted site control document type options available to developers.

In response to a question, Ms. Keegan said developers could submit redacted site control documentation and/or designate the document as confidential.

Mr. Bill Acker (NY-BEST Consortium) said the 0.01 acreage requirement for energy storage is more land than what is typically required based on current technology so NY-BEST recommends a quarter of the 0.01 value. The NYISO's proposed number would result in developers seeking an exception and did not believe it was consistent with what other ISOs/RTOs require. Mr. Nguyen said the NYISO's proposed acreage requirement was more lenient than other ISOs/RTOs, and if developers believe that less land is required for energy storage, he advised energy storage developers to provide the NYISO with data and/or documentation to support changing the NYISO's acreage requirement. The NYISO is accepting comments by May 20, 2024 and will return to stakeholders on June 3, 2024.

Ms. Saia requested the NYISO to review's ACE-NY's comments and if their data/information were not sufficient, then it would be helpful for the NYISO to respond and explain what further information would be needed to make the exercise more useful so parties are not shooting in the dark. Ms. Keegan said the NYISO needed more information than a letter requesting that the acreage requirement be lower for a specified technology, such as site plan data, supporting documentation from a manufacturer, engineering analysis, etc.

Ms. Derek Sunderman (Savion) said that the NYISO's acreage requirement was more stringent than MISO, SPP, and Southern company because those entities do not consider energy density in their acreage requirements. A developer can shove as many megawatt hours of energy storage on their 0.01 mw per acre threshold. He added that the lower acreage requirement that energy storage developers were advocating for in NYISO had already been achieved and noted that the Gateway Energy Storage project in California achieved a less acreage requirement of 0.0015 mwh threshold two years ago and that GIA information has already been provided to the NYISO months ago. He asked if Savion needed to resubmit that information to the NYISO. He stated that his company could demonstrate achieving a 0.005 acre per mw threshold currently based on the manufacturer's data sheets. Ms. Keegan said the developer may have shared that information with the NYISO in the context to a specific interconnection request so that information is treated as confidential by the NYISO, but the developer should re-submit it with respect to the NYISO's seeking comments on the draft Technical Bulletin and allow the NYISO to share those comments with other stakeholders. Mr. Sunderman said his entity would re-submit the information as part of a package after the meeting.

In response to a question, Mr. Nguyen said the NYISO was planning to finalize the Technical Bulletin in June.

9. Order No. 2023 Compliance Filing Update

Mr. Nguyen provided a verbal update. The NYISO has begun implementation of the new interconnection process and entities have started with the application process.

Ms. Keegan said the comment period is until May 22 and the NYISO would discuss tariff changes that were made between the last IITF meeting and what was filed with FERC.

She noted that the tariff posted on the NYISO website does reflect the changes, with the exception of Section 32.5 of Attachment B (appendices to the Small Generator process). There was a technical glitch with those tariff sheets that will need to be corrected and refiled in the next week to FERC. There are also a couple of instances of Section 40.13 (Deliverability Study Section), there is a reference to "Class Year" that needs to change to "Cluster Study" so that will also need to be corrected.

Ms. Saia said she submitted a series of questions pertaining to the interconnection process and the NYC PPTN process and they indicated a FAQ was in development to answer those questions. She asked the NYISO to indicate when that FAQ document would be published because it could impact what commenters may want to say to FERC by May 22.

Ms. Saia said there were developer concerns with the Interconnection Agreement and that additional changes were made that went beyond the scope of Order 2023, but were necessary to make the new process work efficiently, it would be helpful for the NYISO to explain at the next meeting how that will get processed. Ms. Keegan said the NYISO did note that in its filing letter, but will see what the NYISO can provide, but it may not happen at the next meeting.

In response to a question about whether the interconnection queue has been retired, Mr. Nguyen said that was correct and that any project that did not meet the transition rule to retain its queue position, the NYISO has sent a withdrawal notice to such projects.

10. New Business

None

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m. The next meeting is on June 3, 2024.