

Power Generation Advisory Panel Meeting #2

October 22, 2020

Meeting Notes

Attendees

John Rhodes*
Corinne DiDomenico
Annel Hernandez
Betta Broad
Bill Acker
Cecilio Aponte III
Darren Suarez
Emilie Nelson
Jenn Schneider
John Reese
Kit Kennedy
Laurie Wheelock
Lisa Dix
Rory Christian
Shyam Mehta
Stephan Roundtree

Not in Attendance

All panel members were in attendance.

Meeting Notes

- Updates
 - Approach to Natural Gas
 - Power Gen Panel will focus on transitioning from natural gas to carbon free power while maintaining reliability. Includes exploration of alternatives. Also include leaks in natural gas infrastructure.
 - John Rhodes: We owe a response to the CAC (either yes or we have a better idea).
 - Lisa Dix: We need to let the CLCPA guide our work here, it says that we need to dig in and transition the system away from natural gas and oil through 2040. It is not productive to talk about new technology related to gas. Under the CLCPA can we use new technology fuels that are derived from fossil fuels? We need to keep in mind if what we are doing is legal and in the spirit of the law, and we need to include all the deadlines of the CLCPA. What are technologies that are non-fossil that we can use to replace fossils?
 - John Reese: would like time to think. This really gets at the last %. What are going to be the dispatchable technologies that we can replace natural gas with? Natural gas leakage is very different from the first topic of transitioning away from the NG. It needs to be thought about, but it is a separate issue.
 - Bill Acker: The first part is a key issue. Agree with John that it's difficult, and with Lisa that it needs to be renewable. The need is certain durations of power generation that need to be dispatchable (storage of various lengths, hydrogen/RNG). Need to broaden the topic to a future needs of the grid. The second bullet is not something that we need to address. Not a power generation topic and the system is going to be eliminated.
 - Shyam Mehta: Agree with Bill Acker. Need to address the transition of natural gas. Should fall under the Resource Mix subgroup. Should be limited to renewable

technologies but needs to include dispatchable resources. Should not have to address methane leakage and the second bullet.

- Kit Kennedy: Key topic to take on, getting off gas is CLCPA mandate. The group should take on leaks of natural gas infrastructure, as well as stranded assets. If our panel is best positioned to deal with it compared to other panels, we should take it on. For stranded asset issues and utility business models, how is this being addressed in the panels? John Response: we are likely the only panel that would take that on. It is a major issue that has not been dealt with yet.
- Darren Suarez: Must not forget about distillate fuel. Especially in NYC, we have a dual fuel, both a NG and Heating Oil issue.
 - John Reese: oil infrastructure is easy to shut down from one day to the next, where NG has billions of investments in infrastructure that requires maintenance (not underground).
- Annel Hernandez: Agree with Lisa, the importance is aligning with the CLCPA. The listed technologies are not necessarily carbon free and are sometimes in competition with renewables and allowing power plants to continue operating.
- Rory Christian: Agree, and need to take into account air pollution issues beyond GHGs.
- **John Rhodes Proposal: Yes, on the first bullet to CAC, in the spirit that the CLCPA directs us to move away from fossil fuels, and we are not tied to any of the technology alternatives listed in the presentation and may even dismiss as incompatible with carbon free. On leaks, proposes that this is a big issue, especially as we are still on natural gas. No other panel is better equipped to address this. The Power Generation Panel should take this on.**
 - Bill Acker: What does “yes” mean, what are we delivering? John: we are delivering recommendations, whether they be solutions, principles for future regulations, inventory suggestions, etc. Bill: Do we have resources to do studies?
 - John Rhodes response: NYSERDA has an ongoing study that is on point and DEC has done a lot of thinking on this.
 - Emilie Nelson: supports recommendation. We have already identified the need to transition the NG system and the need for innovation.
 - Annel Hernandez: Echoes importance of energy storage and concern with the impacts of the proposed technologies.
 - Lisa Dix: Agree with Annel. If we take this on, we need to be clear on what the CLCPA actually allows. We cannot make recommendations that are not carbon free.
 - John Reese: The possible technologies need to include long duration storage (100hr battery). There is still a large technology development need.
 - Laurie Wheelock: We could broaden the language to not necessarily be limited to leaks. John Response: The ask is to address leaks, we cannot ignore that.
 - Rory Christian: Not understanding how leaks fit into our work. But we need to address abandoned assets/keep them in mind as we make recommendations.
 - Lisa Dix: This is more of a use issue than a generation issue. This may inhibit the other work that we are doing. Should we recruit the Buildings Panel?
 - John Reese: With heat pump growth, we are going to need to make significant changes to the electricity distribution system. The Power Generation System

INCLUDES the entire transmission & distribution system. We can't ignore a statewide infrastructure issue. That makes leaks our issue.

- Kit Kennedy: We have 3 panels looking at the phasing out of natural gas. Will need connectivity between the three.
- Annel Hernandez: Before we approve the addition of natural gas infrastructure, need to understand why we are limited to just leaks. **John Response: We are not just limited to leaks. Need to understand more about the issue and get information before 11/5 meeting.**

- Discuss and Resolve Process and Organizational Issues

- Scope of Work Topics/Structure

- Should we split the Resource Mix subgroup? Answer: probably, how should we split it? Should the subgroup decide?
 - Emilie Nelson: If people within the subgroup want to be involved in both sides of the split, it wouldn't increase efficiency to split. There may be a natural split as work gets going, but as of now it doesn't make sense.
 - Shyam Mehta: Let the resource mix group begin and dive into the topics, and then there might be natural consolidation of topics (e.g. natural gas system and downstate peakers). In finding out what things mean and what are the issues within each topic, there will be natural connections and consolidations, or natural splits, for example by region or technology.
 - Lisa Dix: The buckets may be too rigid. If we take the frame of the CLCPA to remove fossils by 2030/2040, the solutions (e.g. getting rid of the NG system) cross all subgroups with equity as foundation to everything. We may lose the big picture when forming our recommendations.
 - Shyam Mehta: Could divide by geography (downstate vs. upstate) or by technology (natural gas, storage, DER). Cannot discuss these issues in a silo, must look at bigger picture.
 - John Rhodes: The intention was never to be rigid/siloed. Everyone owns the issue (both the subgroups and the panel). Having focused teams digging into the issues and figuring out what the major concerns are and what the options are would allow us to have a more educated discussion by briefing the panel as a whole. Subgroups have the duty of making themselves better informed and then inform the panel, but they don't have the rights to make the decisions. Should lead to better panel discussion.
 - John Reese: The quality of facilitation in the subgroup meetings to bring us back to the overall issues, keeping on track (re: equity), could be very helpful in overcoming any segmentation that's occurring.
 - Betta Broad: This way of proceeding makes sense, but interested in hearing where Lisa is thinking we go if this isn't the issue. It could be overwhelming if we don't break down the list into groups.
 - Lisa Dix: Reframe the work that we are doing. Example: one group looks at the natural gas and oil system and how do we transition it. They tackle the issues, the barriers, the solutions, the equity etc.
 - Cecilio Aponte: We haven't had the chance of getting the big questions aligned. Before we can do that, we need to dig down and frame the smaller topics before we can look at what the overarching questions are. Cross pollination of staff across groups will help silos. How do we not lose sight of equity or clean? Could subgroups present back with those two key framing topics in mind? Once

we think about each topic we can reassess. We need to start diving in. What are the questions, what resources do we need?

- **John Rhodes: Let's go to Slide 7 to refresh our memories about how we go to these topics and groups. Staff is working up two-pagers on each topic to get us started. Combined with issue shaping from Panel. Next meeting can kick off the topical work. Does equity need special focus, or should it be addressed in another context?**
- Bill Acker: Support Cecilio. The structure will work, we just need to trust the team. Need level-setting at the beginning about the key questions/challenges the group is dealing with.
- Kit Kennedy: We don't stop with the work in the individual groups, we come back as a larger group to discuss the issues under the CLCPA and build a comprehensive/cross-cutting strategy.
 - John Rhodes: It is not a sequential thing. Talk to the larger group whenever it makes sense. But the construct Kit lays out is what was intended.
- Betta Broad: Barriers should not be its own subgroup. Identifying the barriers in the resource group and innovations group is needed. Like equity, barriers need to be front and center. Need to brainstorm "what are the barriers that we are facing" and start with those. Equity and barriers should be combined.
- Emilie Nelson: Since equity is a major principle, it should be considered throughout. It is therefore useful to have a specific group focused on it. Especially as team members may not have experience with equity. Could benefit from an equity discussion on each topic. We might want to acknowledge that there needs to be a synthesis across the groups before recommendations are made. Should be put in work plan and allow for that time to maximize the possibility that the CLCPA goals are achieved.
- Laurie Wheelock: Recommendations that come from the resource mix could flow through the equity and barrier subgroups. Need to work out the process flow to make sure these principles are in every recommendation.
- Stephan Roundtree: Agree with Betta that equity and barriers need to be implemented across the groups. Don't have a clear definition/meaning/interpretation of equity across the groups. Should this come from the CAC or the Equity subgroup?
- Shyam Mehta: Need to divide work into subgroups. The concern about "siloeing" is alleviated with the fact that the topics cross all subgroups. There will be natural discussion and interaction between the groups. Subgroups may organically change while doing the work. Equity is a fundamental principle and needs to be considered in every topic. Need dedicated subgroup on equity to make sure that we don't lose sight of it.
- **John Rhodes: For the next meeting, we will be kicking off the work with the subgroups that we have for now with the 2-pagers. Panel members are to put in writing their thoughts for the 11/5 meeting. After that, we can decide if there needs to be any changes (Equity and Barriers, whether they should be their own groups or addressed within the context of each topic). We are not committed to this subgroup structure and we can change the structure as needed, and echoing Emilie's point of having explicit time for cross-cutting and synthesizing equity with all of the groups.**

- **Request for interpretation of the Law. Do we want someone from Counsel to present the guidelines of the law to have shared clarity? Is that an ask?**
 - If there something that is readily available, then great. But we shouldn't wait to start the work.
 - Darren Suarez: There is already work looking at an evaluation of equity in the EJWG. Looking at NYSERDA's most recent RFP and its inclusion of equity.
 - **John Rhodes: Share interim definition of Disadvantaged Communities**
- Lisa Dix: Should we vote? Are we officially keeping Equity and Barriers as their own subgroups?
- Next steps: 2-pagers from staff, and Panel Members writing down our thoughts on the topics and getting to work. On November 5, we can make more formal decisions.
- Lisa Dix: Is there an expectation that the subgroups meet before the next meeting? Are we going with the 4 groups?
- John Rhodes: May be challenging with the timeline, but if people want to, we can. Will have 4 subgroups until decided otherwise.
- John Reese: **There is a lot of work, so we should start having the subgroup meetings before 11/5 if calendars are going to be friendly. (echoed by groups, Betta agrees. Jenn agrees.). State team will organize calendar invites.**
- Lisa Dix: How will these groups be facilitated? Is the State team taking the lead in agendas, meeting invites, etc.
 - Rory Christian: each subgroup should be left to its own devices, rotate moderators, and various work styles and needs. Resource Subgroup – let's trade emails.
 - **John Rhodes: Let's designate a State lead for each subgroup to play Chief of Staff. We won't have voting/non-voting members on the panel. Consensus is goal. However, if we cannot reach consensus, everyone can share their views and we can decide the best way to move forward.**
- Discuss and Resolve the engagement we want with others
 - **Darren Suarez: Add me to CJWG**
 - **Rory Christian: Add me to CJWB**
 - **Cecilio Aponte: Add me to Siting**
 - **Betta Broad: Add me to Siting**
 - **Stephan Roundtree: Add me to Siting**
 - **Lisa Dix: Add me to all Power Gen subgroups. Add me to Siting and Building Electrification cross panel groups and Just Transition.**
 - **Bill Acker: Add to potential barriers and Siting**
 - **John Reese: Add me to Building Electrification**
 - **Emilie Nelson: Add me to Building Electrification and Transportation Electrification and Siting**
 - **Jenn Schneider: Add me to Transportation Electrification**
 - **John Rhodes: Will recirculate matrix to confirm additions.**

- Must have one forum with the public. Who do we want to engage? Timeline is tight.
 - Cecilio Aponte: what do we expect? Are we presenting our draft recommendations and asking for feedback?
 - John Rhodes: We need to figure this out. We should do more listening than speaking, but we need to give them something to react to. Need to discuss structure (do we give people speaking times, may have a lot of input).
 - Darren Suarez: January seems aggressive (Lisa agrees.) but forever at the same time. But we need a date. The PSC has a model for public forums. Structure, before COVID the Commission had meetings. Would publish questions beforehand and allow for comment and have 5 minute time. What are other agencies doing?
 - Bill Acker: January 2021 Public Forum is a good idea. (John Reese agrees.) What is the engagement prior to January? Are the current subgroup meetings public or do they operate under Chatham House Rules (what happens in these meetings stays within the group)? Are subgroups public? Everyone on the panel has places to get feedback, encourage them to get that feedback prior to January.
 - **John Rhodes: We operate with transparency and panel meetings are public. The subgroup's products and communication such as written materials to the Panel and for the CAC will be public. But subgroups meetings should be considered working group meetings and will not be public.**
 - Rory Christian: Is the January 2021 forum the only one we have planned?
 - John Rhodes: That is the requirement, but we can decide to have more. We can also decide to hold audiences with specific stakeholders/panels.
 - Lisa Dix: We could have the subgroups decide where we have gaps in our knowledge and then go out to specific stakeholders.
 - Most supportive.
 - John Reese: We would benefit from hearing from stakeholders on the big issues. Everyone should be listening to those sessions, not just the stakeholders.
 - Darren Suarez: Subgroups should identify these gaps and bring them back to the larger group. Combination of both Lisa's and John's suggestion.
 - John Rhodes: Nothing prevents this panel from inviting stakeholders to speak to us. The subgroups will drive this effort and invite the rest of the panel and even other panels.
 - Lisa Dix: Subgroups decide where gaps are and bring back to group for decision about whether stakeholder engagement is needed.
 - Bill Acker: Lisa's idea allows us to avoid overlap of invitations.
 - **Emilie Nelson: This should be an early priority – for November 5. The subgroups can decide this, make a list, and share in the 11/5 meeting so we won't overlap.**
- Finalize Work Plan
 - **John Rhodes: Will send updated version tomorrow, please provide feedback by 10/28.**
 - Overview of Various Studies (recent and current) underway at State Agencies
 - Grid Modernization Study included in slides.

November 5 will be a working meeting.

- What should the agenda be? John will circulate a starting agenda items (i.e. topics, information gaps, subgroup meetings) at the beginning of next week and the panel members will provide edits and comments.)
- Lisa Dix: Facilitation resources?
 - John Rhodes Response: I need to check back in on this.
- SharePoint will be used for panel member exchanges on documents rather than email.