

Minutes of the May 30, 2024 Interconnection Working Group (IWG) Meeting

Attendees:

DER Industry

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>
Dhruv Patel	NYSEIA	Gurudatta Belavadi	New Leaf Energy
Jonathan Cohen	NYSEIA	Dennis Brown	Summit Ridge Energy
Emily Peck	ConnectDER	Jean Pierre Clejan	Green Logic
Mark Bruckner	Meltek Inc.	Steve Foley	Sunrise Power Solution
Steven Engelmann	Enter Solar	Mark Coles	East Side Solar Holdings
Greg Sachs	Empower Solar		

PSEG LI

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>
Scott Brown	PSEG LI	Amrit Singh	PSEG LI
Martin Weissman	PSEG LI	Evan Margolis	PSEG LI
John Ng	PSEG LI	John Koroglu	PSEG LI
Don Mathew	PSEG LI	Pete Davie	PSEG LI
Yuri Fishman	PSEGLI	Thomas Muratore	PSEGLI
Joseph Abdilla	PSEG LI	Logan Matty	PSEG LI
Robert Argiro	PSEG LI	Cameron Kemme	PSEG LI
Anie Philip	PSEG LI	Steven Genzardi	PSEG LI
Alexandru Majeru	PSEG LI	German Encalada	PSEG LI
Curt Dahl	PSEG LI	John Zimmermann	PSEG LI

DPS /LIPA

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>
Pete Mladinich	LIPA
Jami Nafiul	DPS-LI
Jason Pause	DPS-LI

Introduction

Mr. Brown opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and conducted a roll call.

IWG Compliance Guidelines

Mr. Brown reviewed the Compliance Guidelines with participants, including expectations, procedures, policies, and topics to avoid which are stated in the compliance document.

1. 9:10 Portal Issues

Mr. Brown opened the topic by discussing file upload issues through the portal. Mr. Brown added testing and QA for this issue will take place on June 20th. In the meantime, portal users should email documents that cannot be uploaded.

Mr. Matty added that Power Asset Management is in close communication with IT every day resolve the issue. In addition, for any future portal issues, please email PSEG-LI-PAMInterconnect@pseg.com and take a screenshot and description of the problem.

2. 9:20 Industry – Queue data for projects withdrawn

Mr. Brown opened the topic by asking Mr. Patel what other data points are needed for the queue data other than what is already submitted to DPS.

Mr. Patel responded by asking if more context on the projects status can be included. Answers to questions such as is the project still in the queue? Mr. Patel added that this will give them more details on the project.

Mr. Brown responded by suggesting looking at the hosting capacity map and the data points on the webpage. This could answer these questions and they are updated every quarter.

Mr. Singh emphasized to Mr. Brown's point that PSEG Long Island updates this type of information every quarter.

Mr. Patel responded to clarify that more comprehensive data set is needed to outline project status.

Mr. Brown asked are other utilities providing this type of information.

Mr. Patel responded yes and since the middle of last year.

Mr. Brown asked how Mr. Patel is using this data to form their models and PSEG Long Island would need an internal discussion on how to incorporate this requested information. In addition, how much additional work load is needed to go back to indicate which projects get withdrawn.

3. 9:30 Industry – CESIR Study Options

Mr. Patel opened the topic by going over the CESIR study process. Commented that the CESIR study is only setup for a specific size and ends with a single cost estimate. In a case of an application, Mr. Patel asks if it can be possible to have variety of options. In some cases projects require a massive upgrade which can financially kill the project. Would the developer have the ability to receive other estimates that outline different sizes and costs to avoid these upgrades? In other words, to be more proactive in the approach. It gives the developer more data points to make an informed decision.

Mr. Brown responded by saying PSEG Long Island has provided a formal response and has asked developers to provide break points that terminate projects. PSEG Long Island are looking for this dialogue from the developer to outline scenarios and thresholds. In some circumstances, some circuits are overloaded to the point where no size reductions would eliminate the upgrade costs.

Mr. Patel asked if the CESIR studies are a case by case basis and not an overall threshold.

Mr. Brown responded confirmed that this is still the case.

Mr. Foley added to the conversation and said that some developers apply for multiple locations and need overall clarity.

Mr. Brown mentioned that it is a case by case basis and if a downgrade is needed, that is something we are willing to explore. However, in regards to upsizing other projects, a new study would be required still. Mr. Brown emphasizes that downsizing does not always guarantee lower costs.

Mr. Mathew added that PSEG Long Island has the capability to have one to one dialog with the developer to go over costs.

4. 9:45 PSEGLI - Telecommunications requirements and process

Mr. Brown opened the topic by saying that PSEG Long Island received a lot of feedback on developers having trouble with Verizon. PSEG Long Island does have documentation on the website to start the SCADA process with Verizon. Mr. Brown added that the communication with Verizon should start as soon as possible. Verizon recently established a group that is mentioned on the website and expedites the process for only commercial and non-public sector type of accounts. No school districts are allowed to participate in this process currently.

Mr. Patel commented that the developers have run into issues where the contact provided on the website is unresponsive. The developers are interested to know why we have to open our own accounts for SCADA.

Mr. Foley added that Verizon is a big company and not a single point of contact can see the entire process through. A lot of moving parts makes the process messier.

Mr. Brown responded that PSEG Long Island can possibly setup a call and see if the contact information is correct for Verizon.

Mr. Sachs responded by asking if this can be managed by the utility? It is an industry standard. Would there be an SME for someone from PAM to join the conversation between, us, and Verizon? Maybe PSEG Long Island should create a pricing model to where the developer gets charged for PSEG Long Island setting up the SCADA accounts. What is a fair rate?

Further discussions are needed to explore this, as it would be a new business for PSEGLI.

5. 10:10 Industry – ESS Summary of approaches

Mr. Patel opened the topic by asking if there are any variations of discharging and charging schedules and not to analyze worst case scenarios.

Mr. Patel added the questions what does this analysis look like? What is the industry's priorities?

Mr. Patel continued by saying that charging and discharging schedules need to correlate with price signals. Con Ed, for example, is able to provide this type of complexity. They can define the project operations for the next 20 yrs. and provides this flexibility that we are looking for also from PSEG Long Island.

6. 11:00 End

Mr. Brown closed the meeting by commenting that all the other topics that were not discussed on today's call will be discussed in the next IWG meeting. Mr. Brown concluded that the next IWG meeting will be determined as soon as possible and posted on the website.