

**Feasibility Study for the Q151
74.9 MW Summer / 74.9 MW Winter
Solar Project**

October 18, 2017



Bulk Transmission Planning, Florida

This document and any attachments hereto (“document”) is made available by Duke Energy Florida upon and subject to the express understanding that: (a) neither Duke Energy Florida nor any of its officers, directors, affiliates, agents, or employees makes any warranty, assurance, guarantee, or representation with respect to the contents of the document or the accuracy or completeness of the information contained or referenced in the document, and (b) Duke Energy Florida, its officers, directors, affiliates, agents, and employees shall not have any liability or responsibility for inaccuracies, errors , or omission in, or any business or policy decisions made by any direct or indirect recipient in reliance on, this document or the information contained or referenced therein; all such liability is expressly disclaimed.

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary.....	3
2.	Point of Interconnection (POI).....	4
3.	Model Development	5
3.1.	Power Flow Models.....	5
3.2.	Interface Models.....	5
3.3.	Short Circuit Models	6
3.4.	Generator Interconnection Queue Considerations	6
3.5.	Transmission Service Request Priority List Considerations	6
4.	Analyses Performed	6
4.1.	Power flow analyses	6
4.2.	Short circuit analyses	7
5.	Screening Criteria.....	7
6.	Study Results Option 1.....	8
6.1.	Thermal Results.....	8
6.2.	Voltage	8
6.3.	Short Circuit	8
6.4.	Third-party Impacts.....	8
6.5.	Costs.....	8
7.	Study Results Option 2.....	9
7.1.	Thermal Results.....	9
7.2.	Voltage	9
7.3.	Short Circuit	9
7.4.	Third-party Impacts.....	9
7.5.	Costs.....	9
8.	Study Results Option 3.....	10
	Evaluation of Option 3 was not required due to lower cost successful results in Option 1 and Option 2.	
	10
	Appendix A - Summary of Thermal Analysis Results	10
	Option 1	10
	Option 2	10
	Option 3	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Appendix B - Short Circuit Analysis Results	11
Option 1	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Option 2	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1. Executive Summary

The Q151 customer has submitted an Interconnection Request on Duke Energy Florida's (DEF's) system for a Solar PV station, capable of 74.9 MW Summer / 74.9 MW Winter net output. The proposed facility will be located in Columbia County, Florida with two (2) interconnect options considered. Option 1 connected to the Ft. White to Ginnie 230 kV line, and Option 2 to the Ft. White to Newberry 230 kV line. A third option was considered in case one of these two were not sufficient, and due to a number of subsequent requests near this location. Option 3 would connect both of these lines into a common interconnection substation.

The customer has requested this generation facility be evaluated for Energy Resource Interconnection Service (ERIS) and Network Resource Interconnection Service (NRIS) with a requested Commercial Operating Date (COD) of June 30, 2018. No restrictions for ERIS or NRIS were identified in this study.

The study identified a number of overloads, but none of these were considered attributable to the Q151 Solar Project (74.9 MW Summer/74.9 MW Winter). No significant potential Third Party Impacts (overloads or voltage) were identified.

Cost estimates in this report are based on the facilities that are identified as directly impacted by the generator under study, and do not take into account results that may indicate unrelated existing issues. Additional detailed study may result in changes to scope and cost. The estimates from this Feasibility Study are only Planning estimates (level 5) and may change significantly due to additional information determined from a more detailed System Impact and Facilities Studies to follow.

The conclusion of this Feasibility Study is that Q151 could be connected to either 230kV line without additional network facilities beyond that of the new substation required for interconnection. The estimated cost for a new 230kV facility (interconnecting substation) required to interconnect the Q151 Solar Project using Option 1 or Option 2 is \$11,000,000.

2. Point of Interconnection (POI)

Three POIs were considered in this study:

- **Option 1** – A new three (3) Breaker Ring Bus Substation connecting to DEF's Ft. White – Ginnie 230 kV line.




Figure 1: Diagram of Q151 Interconnection Option 1

- **Option 2** – A new three (3) Breaker Ring Bus Substation connecting to DEF's Ft. White – Newberry 230 kV line.




Figure 2: Diagram of Q151 Solar Interconnection Option 2

- **Option 3 (only if Option 1 or Option 2 are not sufficient)** – A new five (5) Breaker Ring Bus Substation connecting to DEF's Ft. White – Ginnie and Ft. White – Newberry 230 kV lines.




Figure 3: Diagram of Q151 Solar Interconnection Option 3

3. Model Development

3.1. Power Flow Models

Power flow models were built using the Siemens PSS/E power system simulation program and were based on the FRCC 2017 series cases, which were the most recent models available at the time of the study. The model years studied for power flow impacts were 2018/19 Winter and 2019 Summer. The study case models utilized the adjusted base models with the addition of the Q151 Solar Project generation and the required basic interconnection facilities for each option.

3.2. Interface Models

No interface analyses were performed as part of this evaluation.

3.3. Short Circuit Models

Short circuit analyses performed utilized the FRCC 2017 short circuit model (y17_19sRls-SC1b.sav). The model year studied for the short circuit analysis was 2019.

3.4. Generator Interconnection Queue Considerations

Prior queued generation in the FRCC coordinated queue was reviewed, and it was determined that there are no relevant generator interconnection requests in the study area that were not already built into the FRCC cases.

Generator Interconnect Studies for prior queued generation interconnection requests in the form of Feasibility and System Impact Studies are currently conducted in accordance with FERC rules and are prioritized by their queue positions to determine the assignment of required interconnection facilities and transmission upgrades to accommodate their requested interconnections. In the instances where these studies are not complete, the facilities and upgrades required for these earlier queued requests were not included in the base cases used in this study. To the extent that one or more of these requests are modified or withdrawn, the results presented in this analysis may no longer be valid and/or may change materially. DEF will advise the customer of any changes associated with the preceding GIS requests that may require a re-study of this GIS request.

3.5. Transmission Service Request Priority List Considerations

A review of transmission service requests in the FRCC coordinated priority list was performed, and it was determined that there are no relevant transmission service requests in the study area that were not already built into the FRCC cases.

4. Analyses Performed

4.1. Power flow analyses

Power flow analyses of the cases were performed using the PowerGEM TARA software (TARA) to determine the impact of interconnecting the queued generation to the transmission system in the area. The base and interconnection study cases were compared to determine if the interconnection option created thermal overloads or voltage violations or exacerbated existing thermal overloads or voltage violations. All 69 kV and above branch flows and bus voltages in the FRCC region were monitored.

The following contingencies were observed in this study:

- Selected Category P1, P2, P4 and P7 contingencies within the FRCC region as previously defined by FRCC transmission owners. Selection variations include:
 - All single element contingencies (69 kV and above) in the FRCC region

4.2. Short circuit analyses

Short circuit analyses were performed using PSS/E activity ASCC. All local generators were online for the analysis. Activity FLAT was used to set up the network conditions corresponding to classical fault analysis assumptions. Three phase and single line-to-ground faults were applied at all buses within FRCC and were analyzed using a 3% cutoff criterion. The final results represent all buses within FRCC with a difference between the base case and study case study greater than 3%.

5. Screening Criteria

The following criteria were used for screening **thermal results**.

- Unrelated GSU transformers were excluded from results.
- Transmission system elements operated at less than 69 kV nominal voltage were excluded.
- System-intact overloads must be greater than 100% of rate A.
- Post-contingency overloads must be greater than 100% of rate A.
- Post-contingency overloads that are improved by the interconnection were excluded.
- Post-contingency overloads must have been made worse than the base case by 3% of the affected element's rating or greater.

The following criteria were used for screening **voltage results**.

- Buses in DEF and SECI were monitored for values outside of the range 0.9-1.05 p.u.
- FPL 69, 115, 138, and 230 kV buses were monitored for values outside the range 0.95-1.07 p.u.
- FPL 500 kV buses were monitored for values outside the range 0.95-1.10 p.u.
- TECO 69 kV buses were monitored for values outside the range 0.925-1.05 p.u.
- TECO 138 and 230 kV buses were monitored for values outside the range 0.95-1.06 p.u.
- Turkey Point bus voltage was monitored for values outside the range of 1.01 p.u. and 1.06 p.u.
- St. Lucie bus voltage was monitored for values outside the range of 1.00 p.u. and 1.06 p.u.
- All other monitored areas were monitored for values outside of the range 0.95 and 1.05 p.u.
- Generator buses and buses with nominal voltage below 69 kV were excluded from consideration.
- Absolute change in bus voltage between base case and the interconnection case must have been greater than 0.02 p.u.

The following screening criteria were used for screening the ASCC **short circuit results**.

- Three phase and single line-to-ground fault current on the DEF system had to exceed the interrupting rating of the breaker.
- Three phase and single line-to-ground fault current results are provided to third parties close to this area for their acceptance or rejection of the results based on their own breaker rating criteria.

6. Study Results Option 1

6.1. Thermal Results

NRIS

The NRIS evaluation did not identify any network upgrades to DEF's transmission network to accommodate the full capacity (74.9 MW Summer/74.9 MW Winter) of the Q151 Solar Project. The results for the analysis are shown in Appendix A. Additional analyses will be performed in the future System Impact Study.

ERIS

The ERIS evaluation did not identify any restrictions for an ERIS interconnection for the full capacity (74.9 MW Summer/74.9 MW Winter) of the Q151 Solar Project.

6.2. Voltage

There were no identified voltage violations that were attributable to the interconnection of the Q151 Solar Project interconnection.

6.3. Short Circuit

Short circuit analyses indicates that the proposed interconnection would not cause impacts greater than 3% to area substations. The short circuit results are tabulated in Appendix B.

6.4. Third-party Impacts

The thermal analysis revealed no significant potential third-party impacted facilities. Short circuit analysis did not reveal any potential third-party substations with a short-circuit impact greater than 3%.

6.5. Costs

<u>Required upgrades for basic physical interconnection:</u>	<u>Est. Costs</u>
Three terminal 230 kV ring bus substation	\$11,000,000
Total Estimated NRIS Cost:	\$11,000,000

These estimates are preliminary planning estimates, and details specific to this project discovered in the System Impact Study and Facilities (design engineering) Study phases may significantly increase or decrease these estimates.

7. Study Results Option 2

7.1. Thermal Results

NRIS

The NRIS evaluation did not identify any network upgrades to DEF's transmission network to accommodate the full capacity (74.9 MW Summer/74.9 MW Winter) of the Q151 Solar Project. The results for the analysis are shown in Appendix A. Additional analyses will be performed in the future System Impact Study.

ERIS

The ERIS evaluation did not identify any restrictions for an ERIS interconnection for the full capacity (74.9 MW Summer/74.9 MW Winter) of the Q151 Solar Project.

7.2. Voltage

There were no identified voltage violations that were attributable to the interconnection of the Q151 Solar Project interconnection.

7.3. Short Circuit

Short circuit analyses indicates that the proposed interconnection would not cause impacts greater than 3% to area substations. The short circuit results are tabulated in Appendix B.

7.4. Third-party Impacts

The thermal analysis revealed no significant potential third-party impacted facilities. Short circuit analysis did not reveal any potential third-party substations with a short-circuit impact greater than 3%.

7.5. Costs

<u>Required upgrades for basic physical interconnection:</u>	<u>Est. Costs</u>
Three terminal 230 kV ring bus substation	\$11,000,000
Total Estimated NRIS Cost:	\$11,000,000

These estimates are preliminary planning estimates, and details specific to this project discovered in the System Impact Study and Facilities (design engineering) Study phases may significantly increase or decrease these estimates.

8. Study Results Option 3

Evaluation of Option 3 was not required due to acceptable cost effective solutions identified in Option 1 and Option 2.

Appendix A - Summary of Thermal Analysis Results

Option 1

Winter 2018 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			
Summer 2019 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			

Results potentially impacting 3rd parties to be resolved under the FRCC process.

Winter 2018 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			
Summer 2019 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			

Option 2

Winter 2018 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			
Summer 2019 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			

Results potentially impacting 3rd parties to be resolved under the FRCC process.

Winter 2018 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			
Summer 2019 Results Meeting Impact Criteria – % Loading				
Monitored Facility	Contingency Name	Base	Study	Delta
N/A	N/A			

Appendix B - Short Circuit Analysis Results

Option 1

PSS®E ASCC SHORT CIRCUIT CURRENTS (V @ 1.0 pu)				Base Case		Study Case			
Bus #	Bus Name	kV		3φ (I1) Amps	SLG (3I0) Amps	3φ (I1) Amps	SLG (3I0) Amps	%Δ 3φ	%Δ SLG
151004	Q151_POI	230	DEF	8233.2	4977.7	8471.3	5026.0	2.89%	0.97%
3174	GINNIE	230	DEF	8134.0	4793.9	8313.6	4828.6	2.21%	0.72%

Base Case: "y17_19sRls-SC1b.sav" with all FRCC generation in-service.

Study Case: Base case plus Q151_Option1. 3 Position Ring Bus 6.1 Miles from Ft. White to Ginnie 230kV line.

Option 2

PSS®E ASCC SHORT CIRCUIT CURRENTS (V @ 1.0 pu)				Base Case		Study Case			
Bus #	Bus Name	kV		3φ (I1) Amps	SLG (3I0) Amps	3φ (I1) Amps	SLG (3I0) Amps	%Δ 3φ	%Δ SLG
151004	Q151_POI	230	DEF	7678.7	4707.4	7916.9	4757.0	3.10%	1.05%
3163	FT WHITE S	230	DEF	8744.4	5394.6	8946.8	5437.6	2.31%	0.80%

Base Case: "y17_19sRls-SC1b.sav" with all FRCC generation in-service.

Study Case: Base case plus Q151_Option2. 3 Position Ring Bus 5.9 Miles from Ft. White to Newberry 230kV line.