Minutes of the March 17, 2022 Interconnection Working Group (IWG) Meeting

Attendees:

DER Industry/DPS

Name	Company	Name	Company
Dhruv Patel	NYSEIA	Katherine Cox Arslan	Boreggo Solar
Gregory Sachs	Empower Solar	Michael Porcaro	National Grid
Steve Foley	Sunrise Power Solution	Mark Tintera	DPS-LI
Jonathan Demay	Bloom	Tom Casey	Harvest Power
Carlos Lanza	Harvest Power	Santiago Quijano	Blue Wave Solar
Gurudatta Belavadi	Boreggo Solar		

PSEG LI/LIPA

Name	Company	Name	Company
Anie Philip	PSEG LI	Amrit Singh	PSEG LI
Steven Genzardi	PSEG LI	Alex Majeru	PSEG LI
Don Mathew	PSEG LI	Robert Argiro	PSEG LI
Nick Montanaro	PSEG LI	Ali Akgul	PSEG LI
Anthony Gorgone	PSEG LI	Yuri Fishmen	PSEG LI
Scott Brown	PSEG LI	Reigh Walling	PSEG LI Consultant
Evan Margolis	PSEG LI		
Curt Dahl	PSEG LI		
Jalpa Patel	PSEG LI		
Pete Mladinich	LIPA		

Introduction

Mr. Brown opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and conducting 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 and reminded everyone that in order to participate on this call, that we must have a completed Compliance Guideline for each participant. During the call we will be checking our records and if any are missing we will reach out with a reminder.

1. 9:10 Industry Presentation on NG New England ESS Schedules

Mr. Porcaro from National Grid presented an overview of recent solar installations in New England, noting that there is a large focus in Massachusetts. He continued to present an overview of the National Grid DG process overview in Massachusetts, per MPDU 1468. DG applications are sorted into a category based on the level of study required. In the past few years, an increase in saturation has required a large number of studies on the transmission level, in addition to a distribution level study.

Mr. Brown asked whether PSEG as listed in a chart comparing utilities referred to the Long Island branch or the company as a whole. Mr. Porcaro stated he wasn't entirely sure, but believed it to be PSEG.

Mr. Porcaro presented the National Grid Online Hosting Capacity Map, and introduced a number of problems that need to be addressed when interconnecting new DG customers. When studying ESS, the worst case scenario must be considered: discharge cannot be relied on, and the load of charging ESS must not put the circuit over capacity. He noted that this is not ideal from a planning perspective. To solve this, National Grid has introduced a charging and discharging schedule to grant a level of predictability in load/generation behavior. He acknowledged that this policy has the opportunity to hinder the market participation of developers.

Mr. Singh asked for the size of ESS unit that National Grid is applying the charging and discharging schedule to. Mr. Porcaro clarified that this schedule is applied to each DG that requires an impact study. The size of these developments is typically upwards of 1MW.

Mr. Demay asked how NG studies the impact of solar generation, and how this influences the discharge window specified in the schedule. Mr. Porcaro clarified that the solar generation is taken into consideration, and that the charging and discharging windows are specified based on the load cycle of the system.

Mr. Walling asked if the ESS are required to perform the charging/discharge as specified in the schedule. Mr. Porcaro clarified that it is not mandatory to discharge during the discharge window, but simply that it is allowed during this time.

Mr. Porcaro noted that changes in the load curve over time in combination with a large number of "swings" that occur when an ESS switches modes could result in a breach of system limits. Without a standardized schedule, there are a large number of "swings" that occur in load cycle that complicate the planning process.

Mr. Porcaro concluded his presentation by noting that schedules allow for more efficient use of the available capacity, which enables more projects without requiring otherwise unnecessary system upgrades.

Mr. Walling asked if there is a consideration for null periods in the schedule, where neither charging nor discharging would be permitted. Mr. Porcaro responded that while null periods were considered, NG ultimately did not want to impose this limitation on the developers.

Mr. Singh asked what assumptions were made when studies are made. Mr. Porcaro respond that the main assumption made is that the ESS is capable of full charge and discharge capacity. Mr. Sachs pointed out that seasonal changes in load should be considered when studying DG. Mr. Porcaro clarified that NG studies the four seasons for both charging and discharging scenarios. He noted that there is a potential for mutual benefit if a seasonal schedule is implemented in the future.

Mr. Walling notes that IEEE 2018 guidelines require that any DER requires the capability to be disconnected from the system.

Mr. Sachs asked if NG has the ability to trip DER remotely. Mr. Porcaro clarifies that NG can manually trip the DER from an operating control room.

2. 9:55 PSEGLI to comment on Industry NYS-SIR Differences & Updates – Cost Breakdown table per Sept 20, 2021 meeting

Mr. Sachs brought up the desire from industry to see an in depth cost breakdown. Mr. Brown addressed industry concerns on the different accommodations provided by different utilities, noting that PSEG charges less for studies than other utilities. Ms. Cox-Arslan asked how the cost estimates provided by PSEG are calculated, and whether it is based on legacy prices. Mr. Brown clarified that these calculations are made based on current prices, though there is a potential for a degree of lag in these prices. Mr. Sachs asked about the availability of previously available information document(s) that developers found useful. Mr. Brown said that this would be looked into.

3. 10:05 Industry Presentation on ConnectDER Overview & Con Ed Experience

Mr. Maher presented the new design of the ConnectDER, noting some improvements. The goal of the ConnectDER is to augment the meter socket with the goal of serving as an integration point for DER. Mr. Maher notes that the preferred method of distribution for these devices is that the customers purchase the ConnectDER directly, and in some cases install it themselves. Most ConnectDERs currently deployed were retrofitted to existing residential solar. Mr. Maher listed the benefits of the ConnectDER, including eliminating the need for line side taps, a reduction in truck rolls and time onsite, and a quick and low cost installation.

Mr. Maher gave an overview of ConnectDER's work with Con Ed. Mr. Singh asked the number of connections present on the ConnectDER, concerned of the case where multiple DERS are present. Mr. Maher clarified that the ConnectDER is a one point interconnection, and managing multiple DERs would require additional wiring.

Mr. Sachs asked whether the latest version of the device is able to handle 80 amps. Mr. Maher responded clarifying that the latest version is only capable of 60 amps, though 80 amp capabilities are in development.

4. **10:35 PSEGLI SCADA and leased line support. Verizon Avail group introduction**

Mr. Brown announced the introduction of the Avail group to interconnection process. He noted that PSEG recommends developers work with the Avail group. The Avail group is familiar with the PSEG system, and this transition may improve the developer's coordination with Verizon. Mr. Brown noted that revised documentation on SCADA and DTT will be on our SGIP website providing the new AVAIL contact info.

Mr. Demay asked about potential Verizon restrictions that had the possibility to delay projects in the past. No meeting participants had insight into this concern, and Mr. Brown referred Mr. Demay to Verizon and the Avail group for more information.

5. **10:40 Industry Presentation on cost sharing 2.0 introduction, overview, Q&A, questions**

Mr. Patel presented the new cost sharing guidelines being implemented by New York State. The goal of the new cost charging mechanism is to fairly allocate the costs among developers, and eliminate the "first developer cost", where one developer would bear the burden of infrastructure upgrades that provide headroom used by other developers who do not share the cost of upgrades. The utility will calculate the specifics of the cost sharing based on both the incurred costs and additional capacity.

Mr. Brown asked what the timeline would be for deciding the share of the costs will be paid by the first developer. Mr. Patel answered that this would be determined within the CESIR period.

Mr. Patel introduced the qualifications for cost sharing, which include both a minimum cost of $250,000 and that the upgrades benefit more than just the first developer.

Mr. Foley asked whether there is a plan to disclose cost sharing plans with developers in order to quickly find fellow cost sharing developers. Ms. Cox-Arslan noted that this information will be available, with the goal being frequent updates that spur development projects.

Mr. Singh asked how feeder reconfiguration would be considered in this process. Mr. Sachs noted that focus groups could be implemented to help these concerns among others.

Mr. Patel asked what the PSEG Long Island timeline is for implementing cost sharing. Mr. Brown responded that the goal is putting in place a policy by the end of the year, and briefly explained some of the challenges involved with developing this process.

6. **11:10 End**

Mr. Brown asked for final comments, and some brief final comments were made, and the date of the next meeting, being June 16, 2022 was announced. This date was later changed to June 30, 2022