

IWG Meeting Minutes: 6/30/20

Attendees:

DER Industry

<i>Name</i>	<i>Company</i>
Mike Rohan	Northwell Health
Kevin Koubek	Northwell Health
Carlo Lanza	Harvest Power
Jessica Price	The Nature Conservancy
Kris Ingesbrigtsen	Sunrise Power Solution
Daniel Wang	SPower
Greg Sachs	Empower Solar
Romer Beato	Entersolar
Tom Casey	Harvest Power
Bill Feldman	Empire Clean Energy
Shay Banton	Borrego Solar
Chuck Schwartz	Empower Solar
Jean Pierre Clejan	Green Logic
Michael Ruppert	JEM Engineering
Katherine Cox	Borrego Solar
Steve Foley	Sunrise Power Solutions

PSEG LI/LIPA

<i>Name</i>	<i>Company</i>
Mike Simone	LIPA
Pete Mladinich	LIPA
Reigh Walling	PSEG LI Consultant
Anie Philip	PSEG LI
Robert Grassi	PSEG LI
Amrit Singh	PSEG LI
Iram Iqbal	PSEG LI
Nicola Montanaro	PSEG LI
Don Mathew	PSEG LI
France Marquez	PSEG LI
Nizu Al Amin	PSEG LI
Ali Akgul	PSEG LI
Curt Dahl	PSEG LI
Anthony Gorgone	PSEG LI
Mike Heyer	PSEG LI
Diane Blankenhorn	PSEG LI
John Ng	PSEG LI
Thomas Muratore	PSEG LI
James Domozych	PSEG LI
Evan Margolis	PSEG LI
Louis Aguilar	PSEG LI
Shikha Lamba	PSEG LI Consultant

DPS

Name

Company

Jason Pause

DPS

Elizabeth Grisaru

DPS

Introductions

Ms. Philip opened the meeting by welcoming everyone.

Attendance

Ms. Iqbal conducted the roll call and ensured the attendee's names were captured.

IWG Compliance Guidelines

Mr. Grassi reviewed the Compliance Guidelines with participants, including expectations, procedures, policies and topics to avoid which are stated in the compliance document. Mr. Grassi stated that everyone who is on the phone should have executed and acknowledged these guidelines. Asking if anyone has any questions, they should reach out to Ms. Philip. Pricing information, internal cost, marketing strategies, etc. should not be disclosed in meeting.

Meeting Minutes Acknowledgement

Ms. Philip said the meeting minutes for April 7, 2020 IWG Webinar are now posted on the website. Both PSEG Long Island has reviewed them along with industry lead and co-lead.

Direct Transfer Trip Mitigation for Increased DER on LIPA System

Mr. Gorgone presented "Direct Transfer Trip Mitigation for Increased DER on LIPA System." Mr. Sachs asked for difference between reclose blocking and reclose delay. Mr. Gorgone explained that the reclose delay is an intentionally delayed reclose. Reclose block is a pause of the reclose, routing signal to the relay side of the switchgear, letting the voltage delay the reclose until all the DER drops off. Mr. Walling added that the reclose delay means relay will not try to close the breaker until a defined delay time has elapsed since breaker opening. Reclose blocking means voltage is sensed on the feeder side of the breaker and the breaker is blocked from reclosing as long as feeder voltage is present.

Mr. Feldman asked what would be the process for considering the new criteria especially for scenarios where applications were already submitted. Mr. Gorgone replied that PSEG LI completed the technical review and recommendation. PSEG LI plans to incorporate Reclose Delay into the screening requirements. This may not eliminate all DTT for all levels of DER and Reclose Block may still be an option at some substations. PSEG LI is currently in the process of conducting applicable process reviews. The next step is to update technical documents, and the development of applicability rules/implementation time frame. A notice will be posted on PSEG LI website advising SGIP project applicants about the proposed actions being considered with respect to direct transfer trip requirement.

Mr. Sachs asked whether the implications with the electronic and Mechanical relays are different. Mr. Gorgone replied yes and mentioned that there are so many feeders with electro-mechanical relays. They are typically made to close as soon as the breaker trips. To get that reclose delay on the first shot, settings will need to be changed. Most microprocessor delays only need a setting change. Mr. Sachs asked whether the consideration is on a project-by-project basis. Also asked whether there is cost associated with reprogramming. Mr. Gorgone said that a feeder-by-feeder basis evaluation is necessary. Mr. Sachs asked whether the cost estimate for the upgrades would be borne by the developer or whether it would be picked up by utility. Mr. Gorgone replied that PSEG LI just wrapped up the technical

study of the subject. Ms. Philip added that PSEG LI would have to take it back since that process have not been evaluated. PSEG LI just finished the technical recommendation and will have to review the questions for applicability rules and the applicable process.

Mr. Banton asked about screening criteria and the timeframe for completion. Also asked about the impact on Small DERs and the criteria for screening different types of projects. Mr. Gorgone answered that the screening requirement needs to be looked at. There is another presentation follows this presentation, which will provide more information with respect to small DERs. PSEG LI cannot answer right now with respect to small projects; however, our goal is complete the next steps as quickly as possible.

Mr. Sachs indicated that this great news with respect to DTT requirement, but for those projects that still require DTT, we are eager to continue the discussion and identify leased line alternatives, as previously presented (see 22 August 2019 meeting) in IWG future meetings.

DER Feeder Interconnection Limit Considerations

Mr. Montanaro from PSEG LI presented on DER Interconnection limit considerations. Mr. Montanaro went over recommendations to increase DER interconnection limit, which is to implement short term and long-term solutions. Mr. Banton welcomed the change and indicated that it is great news. The question is whether this change will be implemented to the current projects in the queue. Mr. Banton also inquired about the Implementation timeframe.

Ms. Philip indicated that PSEG LI just wrapped up the technical part of the project. Just like DTT mitigation, the goal is to complete the implementation process sooner than later. The next step is to identify applicable process reviews, update technical documents, develop applicability rules and establish effective date. PSEG LI's goal is to implement these changes as soon as possible.

Mr. Banton asked about the short-term solutions mentioned. He inquired whether DER projects would be turned off during contingency events. Ms. Philip said that short-term solution is really a gap solution until the technology advancements are in place. Depending on size and magnitude, some projects will need to be to be part of the operational procedure. If the DER trips during these conditions, that DER facility may have to stay offline until emergency scenario is resolved.

Mr. Foley, concerned about increased cost with if projects as low as 500 KW requires a SCADA communication, asked about the progress of alternative modes of communication. Ms. Iqbal explained that current requirement is to have TLS as primary and 4G as back up for SCADA communication. PSEG LI is looking into the feasibility of 4G as a more cost-effective alternative. We are still in the review process to check and see how 4G performs on case-by-case basis, as there are certain areas where signal might not be as strong.

Mr. Ruppert asked about looking into Pole mount reclosers with SCADA for 500 kW to 1 MW. Is that something PSEG LI will look at? Mr. Montanaro said that right now PSEG LI is not considering implementing reclosers, but can be a possibility in the future. Mr. Ruppert stated that other utilities took out back up requirement for additional protective relays. They found it was more cost effective to do it that way. Mr. Montanaro said that PSEG LI would need to evaluate internally to assess the feasibility and benefits of the proposed option. Mr. Sachs said that this topic would be kept on the agenda for future.

Definitely pros and cons for both sides; utility and developer. Current requirements for SCADA will be discussed.

Mr. Sachs asked about the difference between SCADA now and what PSEG LI is proposing. Ms. Philip said the only difference for the proposed SCADA capability is that the data would be integrated into real time Distribution Operations Platform. Mr. Sachs asked that given the fact that PSEG LI is collecting the data, what PSEG LI is doing with it. Is the SCADA you are currently getting now going to operators? Mr. Sachs asked about how PSEG LI is using the current data being collected over TLS lines. Ms. Philip stated that PSEG LI is monitoring the existing data however, that is integrated with the EMS (Energy Management System). The goal here is to integrate the data as real time information for Distribution Operation Platform to aid in distribution switching sequences. Mr. Sachs summarized for personal clarification, saying that the main goal is to get the data integrated in real time. Ms. Philip said the data is already in real-time, but not integrated to the distribution operations platform. Mr. Walling stated EMS (Energy Management System) platform is for the transmission system. Mr. Gorgone indicated this includes all transmission voltages, and some information on 13 KV distribution feeders.

Mr. Sachs asked for an example on contingency procedures in terms of DER units, citing a storm or hurricane for example. Mr. Montanaro stated PSEG LI has good reliability, and when a circuit is restored, it will be offline until fully restored, with the goal of restoring customers first. Mr. Sachs wanted to clarify that DER units were not being shut off preemptively in anticipation of a major event. Mr. Montanaro confirmed this notion. Ms. Philip clarified that current practices associated with Storm/Hurricanes and the shutting down of facilities (if applicable) for safety and protection will not change. Mr. Sachs asked about the hosting capacity map, and asked if a revision is coming based on what Mr. Montanaro presented. Ms. Philips said PSEG LI is on schedule by the end of the year to complete with the hosting map implementation.

Interconnection Online Application Portal: Interface Presentation

Ms. Philip stated that as per the request from the last IWG meeting, PSEG LI has prepared a presentation on the Interconnection Online Application Portal interface. Ms. Blankenhorn from PSEG LI provided an overview of the Interconnection Online Application Portal. Mr. Mathew presented the details and functions of the new Interconnection Online Application Portal.

Ms. Iqbal added that PSEG LI would be conducting training sessions for industry personnel, mostly probably virtual interactive sessions so that everyone has enough time and the appropriate knowledge before launching the portal later this year. Mr. Sachs expressed his interest for the portal launch, and wanted to know a target 'go-live' date. Ms. Iqbal stated that currently it is expected to go online by October 2020.

Mr. Sachs wanted clarification of the difference between an organization and an independent developer, and also asked about pre-application. Ms. Iqbal said pre application is not new, which Mr. Mathew confirmed. Ms. Iqbal continued that the developer pays the fee, submits a pre-application, and PSEG LI has a specific time period to respond.

Mr. Sachs mentioned that some utilities have the option to sign forms electronically, others have customers upload a scanned signed document, and asked which of these processes the portal would contain. Mr. Mathew mentioned that currently, documents must be signed physically and uploaded to

the portal as a PDF, but added that PSEG LI will take it back and look into it. Mr. Sachs mentioned an idea where there could be a tab on the screen to show which Appendix a customer is filling out in real-time. Mr. Mathew and Ms. Iqbal said they will take it back from the meeting. Mr. Sachs asked about process of application revision on the portal. Mr. Mathew replied that customers have the opportunity to revise applications on the portal then resubmit before closeout phase.

Mr. Sachs asked about the robustness of the inquiry system in the portal, since it is meant to replace PAM Solar email communication. Mr. Mathew said that currently, all questions and responses are saved, but it does not create a thread of messages. Ms. Iqbal said the goal is to minimize the use of PAM solar email communication (not to eliminate) however, for years this is working very nicely. Ms. Iqbal wanted to clarify that just because a question is asked on the portal does not mean a response will be immediate, and that response time depends on when the question is received, to ensure we follow the first come first serve process without providing any preferential treatment. Mr. Sachs also mentioned about distribution of information/inquiry to multiple departments after receiving the application.

Ms. Iqbal commented that PSEG LI will do their best to train DER community beforehand in order to minimize issues after going online, however once the portal goes online, PSEG LI will make themselves available for any inquiries or concerns both through emails and dedicated hotline. Mr. Foley asked if the portal was ready to be used as it is, even though it is missing some functionality, and asked if previous applications can be viewed in the portal in addition to new applications. Mr. Mathew indicated at this point active projects are being considered, but we will take it back to see what it takes to include all projects.

Ms. Blankenhorn said she needed significant comments back as soon as possible from industry, citing the need to go through all proper security checks. Ms. Philip proposed two weeks as a fair timeline for PSEG LI to get back to comments and questions, and all agreed. Mr. Sachs said anyone on the industry side is welcome to send him comments and questions, which he will consolidate and present to PSEG LI on or before July 10th, 2020.

Ms. Philip asked if there are any timelines for portal training. Ms. Iqbal said PSEG LI is targeting for training by the third week of August, if not earlier, as to ensure the training is thorough for everyone in the industry.

Ms. Philip thanked all presenters and expressed appreciation for all comments and feedback.

Meeting Adjourned