

Enabling initiative – Initiative #1: Components of the strategy

Power Generation Advisory Panel Meeting February 12, 2021 Meeting Notes

Caiazza notes are indented and italicized.

Kit Kennedy, Natural Resources Defense Council: The recommendations look directionally correct. With more time, we can drill down and get more specific for actions needed in each. The other big picture point that we have to talk about more is to have date targets and that require strong action. We need to call these out in the most efficient way. We need some more cross panel discussions with the EE&H.

No comment

John Reese, Eastern Generation LLC: I want to capture the flavor of our conversations in the subgroup. There is a broad consensus for reaching 70 x 2030 and it is all about execution. To reach the 2040 goals are harder because of the technology. We have to cast a broad net for that technology to get to the goal.

The presumption is that we can meet a 70% reduction of GHG emissions by 2030 but that overlooks a couple of points. First, we don't know how far we have to go because current levels of emissions using New York's methodology have not been released. The key question is whether the adjustments for methane are so large to make this an unattainable goal especially because, like it or not, natural gas is a necessary component of the present energy mix. Secondly, we do not know enough about renewable energy resources worst case availability to determine whether present technology can make the necessary reductions.

With regards to 2040 goals, no one dares say that the technology might not develop as needed and Reese is no exception. He certainly implies that this may not be attainable.

Emilie Nelson, New York Independent System Operator: Agree with John, the background is very useful. There are other studies that show the need for dispatchable assets for reliability, especially in the winter peaking season.

My primary concern is that the useful background that two people who understand the system are emphasizing is not understood by most of the members of this panel. At the top of the list of the other studies that show the need for dispatchable assets for reliability is the Resilience Study.

Lisa Dix, Beyond Coal Campaign, Sierra Club: I think these are in the right direction and we need to get more specific, especially to the point Emilie made on how we build the grid and the system, and for those technologies that already exist. What is missing is how do the fossil fuel assets get taken off the grid. What is the plan that doesn't allow for new gas plants? We need to get to the work of developing the new technology and working with local transmission in the next 5 years. I think the conversation about the last 5-10% is a distraction. I don't want us to forget about the dirty assets and we need to set high standards for how hit our targets.

The possibility that we may not be able to get the fossil fuel assets taken off on the CLCPA schedule much less sooner than that is not considered. The comment that the "conversation about the last 5-10% is a distraction" demonstrates a lack of knowledge about the problem. The Texas energy system did not consider the last 1% and look what happened. Reese and Nelson are arguing that if the last 5-10% is not considered electric system upsets will occur sooner and more often.

Stephan Roundtree, Vote Solar: I just want to add that we need make this plan focused on existing tech and ways to get it done. Our plan needs to be something we can execute now and 10 years is not a long as it seems. We need to build a plan from the tools we have and what know we can do.

This is a very perceptive comment and I agree with the sentiment. However, I do not see an initiative to plan what we can execute in the next ten years.

Annel Hernandez, New York City Environmental Justice Alliance: We need to focus on existing technology and getting to 2030. The 2030 goal is the key focus and should be prioritized, and ensure that we don't allow for new fossil fuel assets to come online. We also have to think how we can support local community projects, the workforce and the renewables.

The focus on preventing no new fossil fuel assets is a recipe for reliability issues. This comment also shows insufficient understanding of the problem.

Laurie Wheelock, Public Utility Law Project: As we are making these recommendations, we shouldn't get siloed. We should also be paying attention to other advisory panels and their ideas.

My perception is that this comment is suggesting that the recommendations should not include hard and fast requirements such as a mandate for no new fossil fuel assets. It that is the cast I agree.

Bill Acker, New York Battery and Energy Storage Consortium: We can strengthen the point (Aggressive deployment of current renewable energy and storage technologies.) for 2030. The 2040 points are a much longer piece. The first point (Detailed, holistic, modeling within a zero-emissions world to identify needed technologies.) is very important. We have real gaps to get to that. We need to cover other technologies that could support the middle range. I want to make sure people understand that point.

Acker is likely the architect of the concept inherent in the energy storage initiatives that is only a matter of investments to make that resource provide the necessary support for 2030. Because energy storage systems have not actually provided all the services needed, I maintain this is more theory than reality. His description of the first point is correct and his plea that people need to understand that probably reflects my concern that many don't.

John Reese, Eastern Generation LLC: That last 5-10% requires about 50% of the MW in the ground, such as RNG. What will fill the gap? We need to start putting steel in the ground well in advance of 2040. We agree that 2030 is about execution. We can put value on doing the technology piece now so that by 2040, those technologies will be commercially ready and installed.

Reese makes similar arguments to mine that the last 5-10% is critical.

Kit Kennedy, Natural Resources Defense Council: I want to circle back to the point about more specific about these recommendations. We can put them into sub-buckets: more funding, NYSERDA's RFP, transmission needs, interconnection costs for renewables, clean DERs, community solar and other forms of community projects, how can deployment benefit communities and disadvantaged communities, and reexamine our targets of 70 x 2030 to see if they are strong enough.

I agree that the recommendations should be refined. However, the lack of technical expertise on the panel and absence of focus on power generation specific topics makes that a heavy lift for this group.

John Rhodes, New York State Department of Public Service, Director of Panel: The plan is to have our panel to do good work. If it means to make the recommendations better or more specific, we can do

that. We need to make the process and recommendations work for us. Some things have started getting settled and we can continue to make improvements.

I don't think this comment says anything substantive so I will not comment on it.

Lisa Dix Beyond Coal Campaign, Sierra Club: Can we merge subgroup meetings so that we have some kind of decision-making process? Is there a year-to-year prioritization or how do we prioritize the recommendations?

It appears to me that Dix is not on the sub-group that developed this initiative and the draft is not consistent with what she wants so this is a plea to get a hand in the decision on the content of it.

John Rhodes, New York State Department of Public Service, Director of Panel: What if we tried to pull together an executive summary? We have a lot of ideas and the group can then prioritize them. Do people like that idea? (Enough hands to say we can try it.)

The Director of the advisory panel is asking for a summary so the members of the panel can understand the most important initiative. That is kind of scary. If this was prepared then it has not been made available to the public.

Betta Broad, New Yorkers for Clean Power: I still want a better understanding of how much we need to scale up Energy Efficiency downstate. Can we do more analysis with EE&H, for example with geo energy, especially downstate and with winter peaking? (John Rhodes: Don't know but we can try and find out to see if we can do more cross-panel conversations.)

From what I have heard Broad is convinced that load peaks can be eliminated if we improve energy efficiency enough. I disagree and maintain that kind of thinking is a threat to reliability.