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Background on Transmission Planning

- U.S. Offshore Wind Generation Trends
- US Transmission Investment
- Current Planning Processes
- Barriers to Interregional Transmission
- Recommendations for 21st Century Transmission Planning
- New York OSW Transmission Planning Context
Major Technological Advances = Reduced Cost of OSW Generation

Issues & Opportunities: Technology & the Growth of the Wind Turbine

BOEM Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Substantial OSW Generation Planned and Needed

Thousands of MW of new clean resources will need to be built to achieve state decarbonization goals—including substantial offshore wind beyond the 30,000 MW of current commitments in eastern U.S.

A key challenge: **ensuring a pathway low-cost, low-impact solutions** for delivering offshore wind energy to onshore grid and population centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Already Contracted</th>
<th>Total Committed</th>
<th>Potentially Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>3,120 MW</td>
<td>5,900 MW</td>
<td>25-40,000 MW by 2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4,316 MW</td>
<td>9,000 MW</td>
<td>10-25,000 MW by 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>4,129 MW</td>
<td>13,900 MW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Transmission Investment is at Historically High Levels

$20-25 billion in annual U.S. transmission investment, but:

- More than 90% of it justified solely based on reliability needs without benefit-cost analysis
  - About 50% solely based on “local” utility criteria (without going through regional planning processes)
  - The rest justified by regional reliability and generation interconnection needs
- While significant experience with transmission benefit-cost analyses exists, very few projects are justified based on economics and overall cost savings

Current U.S. Grid Planning Processes are Siloed

These solely reliability-driven processes account for > 90% of all transmission investments

- None involve any assessments of economic benefits (i.e., cost savings offered by the new transmission)
- Which also means these investments are not made with the objective to find the most cost-effective solutions
- Will yield higher system-wide costs and electricity rates

Planning for economic and public-policy projects: less than 10% of all transmission investments

- NY PPTN process: one of a few well-working exceptions

Interregional planning processes are large ineffective

- Essentially no major interregional transmission projects have been planned and built in the last decade
# Barriers to Interregional Transmission Planning & Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Leadership, Alignment and Understanding</th>
<th>B. Planning Process and Analytics</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Insufficient leadership from RTOs and federal &amp; state policy makers to prioritize interregional planning</td>
<td>6. <strong>Benefit analyses are too narrow, and often not consistent between regions</strong></td>
<td>10. Overly-prescriptive tariffs and joint operating agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Limited trust amongst states, RTOs, utilities, &amp; customers</td>
<td>7. Lack of proactive planning for a full range of future scenarios</td>
<td>11. State need certification, permitting, and siting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Limited understanding of transmission issues, benefits &amp; proposed solutions</td>
<td><strong>8. Sequencing of local, regional, and interregional planning</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> Appendix A of <em>A Roadmap to Improved Interregional Transmission Planning</em>, November 30, 2021. Based on interviews with 18 organizations representing state and federal policy makers, state and federal regulators, transmission planners, transmission developers, industry groups, environmental groups, and large customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal: Transmission Planning for the 21st Century*

Available experience points to **proven planning practices** that reduce total system costs and risks:

1. **Proactively plan for future generation and load** by incorporating realistic projections of the anticipated generation mix, public policy mandates, load levels, and load profiles over the lifespan of the transmission investment

2. **Account for the full range of transmission projects’ benefits** and use **multi-value planning** to comprehensively identify investments that cost-effectively address all categories of needs and benefits

3. **Address uncertainties and high-stress grid conditions explicitly through scenario-based planning** that takes into account a broad range of plausible long-term futures as well as real-world system conditions, including challenging and extreme events

4. **Use comprehensive transmission network portfolios** to address system needs and **cost allocation** more efficiently and less contentiously than a project-by-project approach

5. **Jointly plan inter-regionally across neighboring systems** to recognize regional interdependence, increase system resilience, and take full advantage of interregional scale economics and geographic diversification benefits

New York Power Grid Study and Meshed Offshore Grid Study

PSC and NYSERDA completed the initial report on **NEW YORK POWER GRID STUDY (PGS)**, which consists of 3 proactive components:

- **Utility Study**: local transmission and distribution (LT&D) needs; advanced grid technologies
- **Offshore Wind (OSW) Study**: bulk transmission study to integrate 9,000 MW of offshore wind
- **Zero Emissions Study**: bulk transmission, generation, and storage needed to achieve 70% renewable generation by 2030 and a zero emissions grid by 2040

Building on the PGS, NYSERDA commissioned an evaluation of the options for and benefits of creating a **MESHED OFFSHORE GRID**

See: Full [PGS Report](#) and Summary [Presentation](#)
New York PGS: Substantial Renewable Generation and Storage Needs

Analyzed transmission, generation, and storage needed to meet NY’s goals of zero-emission electricity by 2040 and 70% renewable generation by 2030 (drawing on New York Decarbonization Pathways Study)

2040 Results:

- Installed capacity more than double today’s
- **10-15 GW each**: onshore wind, offshore wind, solar, and storage
- Ideally developed in certain areas:
  - Onshore wind primarily in western and northern NY (NYISO Zones A-F)
  - Offshore wind downstate (I, J, K)
  - Solar in central NY
  - Storage in central and downstate NY
- 17 GW of “thermal” backup generation fueled by renewable natural gas (as placeholder for future technologies)
- By 2040, congestion and curtailments point to the potential need for cost-effective bulk transmission upgrades into downstate, NYC, and Long Island … with new PPTN already under way
Long-term: OSW generation integrated into a more geographically-diverse national grid?

As state and regional shares of renewable generation increase, a robust inter-regional grid will become critical to ensure reliability and cost effectiveness

- The geographic scale of the grid needs to (1) reach well beyond the size of large weather systems; and (2) integrate a diverse mix of resources (wind, solar, hydro, ...)
- Local storage and distributed resources will help, but not eliminate the need for broad geographic diversification of uncertain intermittent generation
Atlantic Offshore Wind Transmission Study (AOWTS), a 2-year study effort led by NREL to:

- Evaluate multiple pathways to offshore wind goals through coordinated transmission solutions along the U.S. Atlantic Coast
- Both near-term (by 2030) and long-term (by 2050)
- For various scenarios of electricity supply and demand
- Considering: transmission needs, available technologies, system-wide cost impacts, grid reliability, resilience, and ocean co-use
## National Studies Show Large Benefit of Interregional Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| NREL North American Renewable Integration Study (2021) | U.S., Canada, Mexico           | • Increasing trade between countries can provide $10-30 billion in net benefits  
• Interregional transmission expansion achieves up to $180 billion in net benefits |
| MIT Value of Interregional Coordination (2021)       | Nation-Wide                     | • National coordination of reduces the cost of decarbonizing by almost 50% compared to no coordination between states  
• The lowest-cost scenario builds almost 400 TW-km of transmission; including roughly 100 TW-km of DC capacity between the interconnections and over 200 TW-km of interregional AC capacity  
• No individual state is better off implementing decarbonization alone compared to national coordination of generation and transmission investment  
• Low storage and solar costs still result in significant cost effective interregional transmission |
| Princeton Net Zero America Study (2021)              | Nation-Wide                     | • Achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 requires 700-1,400 TW-km of new transmission  
• Investment in transmission needed ranges $2-4 trillion dollars by 2050 |
| U.C. Berkeley 90% by 2035 (2020)                   | Nation-Wide                     | • The only national study that suggest relatively little interregional transmission would be needed to achieve 90% clean electricity. However, the study’s simulation approach does not utilize more granular and well-established methods to properly value interregional transmission. |
| Vibrant Clean Energy Interconnection Study (2020)   | Eastern Interconnect           | • 40 to 90 TW-km of transmission is built by 2050 to meet climate goals  
• Transmission development can create 1-2 million jobs in the coming decades, more than wind, storage, or distributed solar development  
• Transmission reduces electricity bills by $60-90 per MWh |
| Wind Energy Foundation Study (2018)                 | ERCOT, MISO, PJM, and SPP       | • Transmission planners are not incorporating this rising tide of voluntary corporate renewable energy demand into plans to build new transmission |
| NREL Seams Study (2017)                           | Eastern and Western Interconnects | • Major new ties between interconnections saves $4.5-$29 billion over a 35 year period |

*Source: A Roadmap to Improved Interregional Transmission Planning*, November 30, 2021.
Key Result: A more robust national grid would significantly reduce the total cost of decarbonizing the grid ... but (higher-cost) regional and more local solutions may also be feasible.
In support of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, DOE’s Office of Electricity launched the Building a Better Grid Initiative to catalyze the nationwide development of new and upgraded high-capacity electric transmission lines.

As one of the first steps to support this initiative, DOE is conducting the National Transmission Planning Study in partnership with the PNNL and NREL to:

- Identify transmission that will provide broad-scale benefits to electric customers
- Inform regional and interregional transmission planning processes
- Identify interregional and national strategies to accelerate decarbonization while maintaining system reliability

Builds on DOE, NREL, PNNL expertise and recent studies (see study overview, slides 54-79)
Although existing studies demonstrate the benefits of interregional transmission, they have not successful in motivating improved interregional planning or actual transmission project developments. The reasons include some or all of the following:

- Many studies tend to analyze aspirational clean energy targets (e.g., 90% by 2035 or 100% by 2050) not the actual policies and mandates applicable for the next 10-15 years
  - By not modeling actual state or federal policies, clean-energy mandates, and renewable technology preferences, the studies cannot demonstrate a compelling “need” to policy makers, regulators, and permitting agencies
- The studies are not transmission planning studies that produce specific transmission projects that can be developed to deliver the identified benefits and they do not support an actionable need for specific projects
  - The results of these studies do not connect with RTO planning processes and needs identification
- Studies do not to identify how benefits and costs are distributed across utility service areas, states, or RTO/ISO under different scenarios, as would be necessary to gain support and develop feasible cost recovery options
  - The studies typically do not consider or propose how to recover (“allocate”) transmission costs
- There has not been an analysis of the state-by-state economic impact and job creation from interregional transmission development, reduced electricity prices, and shifts in the locations of clean-energy investment
- Most studies do not propose actionable solutions to address the many barriers to planning processes and to the development of new interregional transmission projects
Offshore Wind Transmission

- OSW Transmission Configurations
- Advantages of Gen-ties vs. Planned Transmission
- Case studies: UK, New England, NY, NJ
- “Mesh Ready” OSW transmission
What will a Cost-effective OSW Transmission Solution Look Like for the Eastern U.S.?

Transmission Elements for Integrating Offshore Wind Generation

- **Upgrades to existing grid**
- **Onshore link to existing grid**
- **Submarine link to shore**
- **Offshore substations (and links, if any)**
Transmission Planning Challenges for Offshore Wind Generation

- The ISOs “generation interconnection” processes are workable for connecting offshore wind with individual genera
ties
  - Though ISOs existing generation interconnection study processes are challenging
    ▶ Generators face long study timelines and highly uncertain network upgrade costs
    ▶ Queue-based processes can reduce competition among OSW developers
  - Does not work well for large-scale OSW developments and offshore grids

- ISO “regional transmission planning” processes often not ready to develop cost-effective plans for offshore grids in a timely fashion
  - ISO regional planning processes are time consuming and often ineffective
    ▶ Frequently undefined for addressing public policy needs
    ▶ Exception: NYISO’s public-policy transmission planning process (PPTPP)
  - Limited ISO and stakeholder expertise with submarine transmission facilities and offshore transmission technology options
  - Developing a cost-effective offshore grid would require:
    ▶ Pro-active, coordinated planning and permitting to develop onshore POIs, mitigate environmental impacts and project risks
    ▶ Phased-in plan that aligns timing of transmission investments with generation development
    ▶ Capturing synergies: offshore transmission to reinforce the on-shore grid
Offshore Transmission Concepts: Radial vs. Networked

Gen ties vs. “planned” OSW transmission alternatives:

- Radial generator tie lines built by OSW generation have been the prevailing approach for early rounds of OSW procurements
- Initially reduces project-on-project risk through joint G+T planning and development
- Planned OSW transmission allows for the long-term optimization of offshore and onshore transmission, in particular POIs
- Mitigates environmental impacts and reduces overall costs for generation, OSW transmission, and onshore upgrades
**Gen-ties vs. Planned OSW Transmission Solutions**

### Factors favoring *gen ties* to individual offshore wind plants with HVAC links
- Modest total development and small incremental steps
  - 400 MW per HVAC circuit only
- Modest distance from shore
  - Ideally less than 40 miles
- Many landing points with robust on-shore transmission
  - Requires 3 HVAC circuits for every 1,200 MW of total OSW development
- Long distances between offshore locations to be interconnected
- Uncertain OSW lease areas
- Easy permitting of landing points and interconnection studies
- Wind developer has significant offshore transmission experience

### Factors favoring *offshore grids* for multiple or large-scale wind plants with HVDC link
- Large size of total wind generation commitment with sizable procurement steps
  - 1,200-1,600 MW per HVDC circuit
- Several plants close to each other but long distances from shore or from sufficiently-robust onshore transmission nodes
- More efficient use of scarce right-of-way
  - Few landing points with robust on-shore transmission
  - Difficult permitting of landing points and onshore interconnection study process
- Meshed network option (offshore redundancy and reinforcement of on-shore grid)
- Independent transmission solutions to create:
  - *more competition* for wind developers through open access to offshore hubs
  - *competition* between experienced offshore transmission developers
Need to Mitigate Risk: Requires Well-Coordinated Generation and Transmission Development

- Bundled development of OSW generation and radial transmission by single companies, mitigates offshore risks but faces increasing on-shore risks
  - Reduces offshore project-on-project risks through coordination in joint planning and construction of OSW generation and transmission tie line
  - After “low-hanging” onshore interconnection points are utilized, this approach faces increased permitting risks and risks related to the costs and on-time completion of expensive onshore upgrades

- Planned offshore transmission (e.g. NJ, Europe) can address project-on-project risks:
  - Staggered transmission and generation project completion timelines (e.g., developing the offshore grid in segments that can completed in time for interconnection of individual generating plants)
  - Strong performance and completion incentives (rewards or penalties) for both transmission and generation developers to meet project deadlines
  - Allowing generation developer to participate in transmission procurement (with the condition that the transmission will be open access)

If only gen ties are used initially, scale procurement to 1200+ MW and add options so the lines can later be connected into a meshed OSW grid
Analyzing the Benefits of Planned Offshore Transmission

Studies of OSW transmission alternatives found that well-planned transmission (and procurement) can offer substantial advantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements examined</th>
<th>A planned approach can...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total onshore + offshore transmission</td>
<td>Lower overall long-term costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Onshore transmission upgrades</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Substantially lower onshore costs</strong> and project development risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offshore transmission</td>
<td>• Slightly higher offshore costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses over offshore transmission</td>
<td>Reduced losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on environment and fisheries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possibly substantially lower impacts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on generation &amp; transmission competition</td>
<td>Increased competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization of constrained landing points</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improved landing point utilization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling third-party customers</td>
<td>Improved third-party participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples: Brattle-Anbaric OSW transmission studies for [New York State](https://www.nyiso.com) and [New England](https://www.iso-ne.com)

**NY Power Grid Study**: routing 5-7 GW of OSW into NYC with high-capacity HVDC lines (that can be meshed to increase reliability) offers the best solution
Example: UK study of current and “integrated” OSW transmission approach for 18-41 GW by 2030-40

Results: if planning starts now, the “integrated” solution reduces estimated transmission costs by 19% and the number of landing points by 50-70%. Delaying planning by only 5 years reduces 2050 benefits by half.

Source: download (nationalgrideso.com)

- HVAC
- HVDC
Reducing the number of offshore platforms, cabling, seabed disturbance, and cables landing at the coast reduces impacts on existing ocean uses and marine/coastal environments to the greatest practical extent.

Avoiding high-costs of onshore upgrades reduces total costs and risks.
Planning ahead avoids expensive and time-consuming onshore transmission upgrades

Already-selected New England projects connecting to Cape Cod face up to $787 million in onshore transmission upgrades,* and continuing this approach for even the next 3,600 MW of procurements could lead to an additional $1.7 billion in onshore upgrades.

Planned off-shore transmission can significantly reduce the necessary onshore upgrades. Given the difficulty of permitting and building new onshore transmission, a planned approach also reduces the risk of cost overruns and delays.

* ISO-NE’s Feasibility Study for interconnecting three projects totaling 2,400 MW to Cape Cod (QP 828)
NYSERDA’s Offshore Wind Integration Study

NYSERDA’s OSW Study assessed bulk transmission needs for 9,000 MW of offshore-wind generation by 2035

- “Onshore” assessment” to identify points of interconnection (POIs) and on-shore bulk-power transmission upgrades
- Development of offshore buildout scenarios from wind energy areas to selected POIs
  - Analyze offshore transmission to connect OSW plants
- Preliminary permitting and feasibility study of offshore cable routes and onshore landing points

Findings:

- Integrating 9,000 MW of OSW is feasible without major near-term bulk transmission upgrades if: 5,000-7,000 MW of OSW can be routed into NYC (so only 2,000-4,000 MW connect to the grid on L.I.)
  - New transmission from Long Island likely needed by 2030-35 (PPTN is already initiated)
  - Significant uncertainty about POIs and lease areas (OSW Study vs. contracts vs. other studies)
- Requires careful planning of OSW procurement, battery deployment, coordinated routing and permitting, and well-planned integration into local NYC grid (possibly through local “OSW hubs” as proposed by ConEd)
- Pursue options that allow for a more flexible and reliable “meshed” offshore grid
There are a limited number of robust POIs for connecting offshore wind to the onshore grid and limited access routes to these POIs.

If each OSW project builds its own gen ties to the onshore transmission system (without coordination), viable landing sites and cabling routes will become constrained. A well-coordinated planned transmission approach can make better use of the limited landing sites.

The clearest example of this is the cable approach route through the Narrows to reach POIs in New York’s inner harbor.
Lower Impact: Planned HVDC Grid

Note: Phase 1 is already contracted using HVAC cables. NYSERDA since has provisionally awarded two additional projects for 2490 MW, interconnecting into the Astoria (using HVDC) and Barrett substations.
Pro-active PJM Solicitation of OSW Transmission for NJ

- PJM’s first-ever transmission solicitation under its State Agreement Approach (SAA):
  - Solicitation for transmission solutions for NJ’s public policy need to integrate up to 7,500 MW of OSW generation (net of prior procurements)
  - Bids can address individual elements (Options 1a-3) or offer complete solutions
- Received 80 innovative proposals from 13 bidders are currently evaluated by PJM and the NJBPU

Illustration of “Options”

Option 1a - Onshore Upgrades on Existing Facilities
Option 1b - Onshore New Transmission Connection Facilities
Option 2 - Offshore New Transmission Connection Facilities
Option 3 - Offshore Network

Source: https://www.pjm.com/planning/competitive-planning-process.aspx
PJM Summary of bids: 20220308-item-08-nj-osw-saa-update-proposal-overview.ashx (pjm.com)
Design, Benefits, and Costs of Meshed HVDC OSW Transmission

Study estimates $60 million of annual meshed link benefits (plus outage mitigation, onshore reliability, resilience, and operational benefits)

NYSERDA’s Meshed Grid Study:

- Procuring OSW plants with “mesh-ready” offshore HVDC substations adds only approximately $40 million (1%) to the total cost of a 1,200 MW plant
- HVDC offshore substations can be (later) be meshed at a cost of $120-240 million per link

NYSERDA Draft RFP for 2022 OSW Solicitation (for at least 2,000 MW) requires each proposal to utilize HVDC technology and meet mesh-ready standards
Takeaways
Implications for U.S. OSW Transmission

U.S. offshore wind development will require substantial offshore and supporting onshore transmission infrastructure

- The ~30,000 MW of committed off-shore wind development in the Eastern U.S. will require **1,500 to 3,000 miles of offshore transmission** plus significant onshore reinforcements

- For example: to integrate 30,000 MW with radial 220kV HVAC gen-ties for every 400 MW of wind generation (up to 30-60 miles offshore) would require about **3000 miles of offshore cables to 75 landing points** with associated onshore grid reinforcements

- Planned off-shore grids for larger wind plants and to optimize onshore grid capabilities—such as used in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and proposed for NJ and MA—would yield scale economies, more resilient meshed grids, and only about **1500 miles of cables with 25 landing points**

- Proactive planning is necessary to **identify the most attractive POIs** with acceptable environmental impact and cost-effective upgrades to the onshore grid
Advantages of Pro-active Planning for OSW Transmission

Planning transmission solutions for OSW generation offers distinct disadvantages over OSW procurements that leave transmission solution with individual generators:

- Less cost-efficient POIs selected through uncoordinated generation interconnection processes
- Increased environmental impact on seabed and shoreline to reach POIs
- Reduced competition for transmission and off-shore wind generation
- Higher onshore transmission costs and higher total costs in the long run

A planned approach is better suited to support the large scale of states’ OSW goals:

- Reduce number of cables and landing points
- Reduced need for onshore transmission upgrades through pro-active planning
  - Select more optimal POIs consistent with long-term needs (even if not lowest-cost in short run)
- Consider competitive solicitations for OSW transmission and POIs (e.g., 7500 MW by NJ BPU)

“Mesh Ready” Procurements: create options that utilize ROW efficiently and allow evolving from gen-ties to a meshed offshore grid
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Brattle Reports on Regional and Interregional Transmission Planning and Benefit-Cost Analyses

- Well-Planned Electric Transmission Saves Customer Costs: Improved Transmission Planning is Key to the Transition to a Carbon-Constrained Future
- Toward More Effective Transmission Planning: Addressing the Costs and Risks of an Insufficiently Flexible Electricity Grid
- The Benefits of Electric Transmission: Identifying and Analyzing the Value of Investments
- The Value of Diversifying Uncertain Renewable Generation through the Transmission System
- A Roadmap to Improved Interregional Transmission Planning
- Transmission Planning for the 21st Century: Proven Practices that Increase Value and Reduce Costs

Summarizes proven approaches to quantifying various benefits
Additional Reading on Transmission


Coming Next:

April 20, 1:00 p.m. ET
Weather Impacts Offshore New York, and Southern New England
Branden Capasso and Donald Bullen, WRI

Visit wind.ny.gov to register

We want your feedback! Send suggestions for future webinar topics to offshorewind@nyserda.ny.gov.