

**Planning Advisory Committee  
Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA  
June 19, 2012**

Maria Agustin	ISO New England Inc.
Syed Ahmed	National Grid
Peter Bernard	ISO New England Inc.
Curt Beveridge	Central Maine Power Company
Christian Bilcheck	United Illuminating Company, The
Marcia Bloomberg	ISO New England Inc.
Dave Bradt	United Illuminating
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
Pradip Chattopadhyay	New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
Wayne Coste	ISO New England Inc.
Ben D'Antonio	NESCOE
Fernando DaSilva	NextEra Energy
Gaurang Desai	CES
Stacy Dimou	Bangor Hydro Electric Company
Frank Ettori	Vermont Electric Company
Jeff Fenn	Bangor Hydro Electric Company
Steve Garwood	New Hampshire Transmission
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Mike Henderson	ISO New England Inc.
Jim Hyland	Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company
Sarah Jackson	Synapse
Jeff Jones	Bangor Hydro
Steve Judd	ISO New England Inc.
Bill Killgoar	Long Island Power Authority
Steve Kirk	Exelon
Tyler Loggins	ISO New England Inc.
Barbra Lynch	ISO New England Inc.
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Chris Malone	United Illuminating
Jason Marshal	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Gary McAllister	GZA
Al McBride	ISO New England Inc.
Bruce McKinnon	Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
Rich Milici	Eneergy
John Miller	Cross Sound Cable Company
Adam Morrison	United Illuminating
Rose Ann Pelletier	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Paul Peterson	New Hampshire Office of Consumer Advocate
Chris Plecs	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Richard Pinto	United Illuminating Company
Hantz Presume	Vermont Electric Company
Caryn Rexrode	Customized Energy Solutions
Joe Rossignolli	Energy New England
Jose Rotger	Cross Sound Cable Company
Eric Runge	Day Pitney
Meera Shukla	ISO New England Inc.
Allison Smith	NESCOE
Philip Smith	GenOn
Joe Staszowski	Northeast Utilities System Companies
Robert Stein	HQUS/NRG/PSEG/Footprint

James Stetson	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Veronica Szczerkowski	Connecticut DEEP
Pat Tarmey	Massachusetts AG
Gene Taddeo	Northeast Utilities System Companies
Dindo Tiongco	United Illuminating
Carol Wendel	ISO New England Inc.
Helen Wang	ISO New England Inc.
Peter Wong	ISO New England Inc.
Fei Zeng	ISO New England Inc.

### **Administrative**

Mr. Mike Henderson (ISO) welcomed the committee to today's meeting. Mr. Henderson reviewed the day's agenda and advised the committee regarding the availability of various draft PAC meeting minutes and reports that are available for review. In addition, Mr. Henderson reviewed the tentative PAC schedule for the remainder of the year. Mr. Stan Doe (ISO) provided the committee an EIPC update. Mr. Henderson also reviewed the IPSAC and EAG schedule for the remainder of 2012. A detailed review of the RSP 12 Schedule and Process was then given. The Draft RSP 12 will be posted by July 20, 2012. Committee members were advised to provide any comments to ISO on the Draft RSP 12 no later than close of business August 1, 2012.

### **Questions/Comments (PAC in Italics, presenter in Roman)**

#### **Item 2 – 2012 RSP Project List – June 2012 Update**

Mr. Peter Bernard (ISO) provided an overview of the updated 2012 RSP Project List. Mr. Bernard provided highlights of added projects, 13 project upgrades and various cost estimate revisions. Mr. Bernard also reviewed the status of major transmission projects

*Q – Are the values represented in parenthesis cost reduction?*

A – No that represents other co-related projects in the RSP and that is a summed total of the total project cost.

*Q – On slide 13, can you provide some of the savings incurred due to the implementation of the various EE projects?*

A – We don't have the specific values on hand but it is included as part of the RSP spreadsheet.

*Q – What is the driver for doubling the transmission costs in the next 5 years? Is it load growth or something else?*

A – Load growth and future needs are part of it, but it is really a catch up as part of required upgrades of an older transmission system.

*Comment – I believe the increased cost could be due to NERC criteria for N-1-1 requirements. In addition, I believe new right of way costs could be one of the cost drivers.*

#### **Item 3 – SWCT Preferred Solution – New Haven and Bridgeport Areas – Meera Shukla**

Ms. Meera Shukla (ISO) provided an overview of the SWCT preferred solution in the New Haven and Bridgeport areas. Ms. Shukla presented a project background, the solution study for

both the New Haven and Bridgeport areas and a tentative schedule of the next steps in the project.

*Q – Are the DR MW values shown on slide 8 through FCA 6?*

A – Yes

*Q – Were the New Haven Harbor peaking units included as part of the needs assessment?*

A – Yes

*Q – What generation unavailability is being referred to that is the driver of the needs assessment in the area?*

A – Various scenarios and contingencies were discussed that illustrated the need when one or more of the area generation was out of service.

*Q – Was a full needs review performed for the entire Bridgeport to New Haven railroad corridor versus the piecemeal approach illustrated in this preferred solution?*

A – We are not proposing a complete rebuild of these lines at this time. The costs and right of way issues make it too prohibitive.

*Comment- Pertaining to slide 36, I do not believe the backing down or a breaker trip of New Haven Harbor in a N-1 situation and preparation for a N-1-1 contingency, is a viable alternative to resolving the area loss of line issues. I request that ISO meet with PSEG to discuss this issue further.*

*Q – What is the cost of separating the DCT in the area as an alternative for tripping or backing down New Haven Harbor?*

A – We will take that back to check the cost estimate for that alternative. ISO will also review this proposed alternative further.

Several additional technical and clarification questions were asked and responded to by Ms. Shukla and Mr. Chris Bilcheck from UI.

#### **Item 4 – Net Installed Capacity Requirements, Indicative Future Net ICR and Operable Capacity Analysis for 2012 Regional System Plan – Maria Agustin**

Ms. Maria Agustin (ISO) provided an overview of the resource adequacy studies and ICR and OpCap values that will be included in RSP 12.

*Q – Why are you using the term, resource adequacy study? There is no defined term in the tariff that refers to that.*

A – It's just a generic reference we use to describe the studies ISO performed supporting the ICR and OpCap values that will be used in RSP 12. Please recognize that resource adequacy studies are necessary for compliance with NERC and NPCC requirements and to identify system needs.

*Q – In regards to the ICR calculation, will those values and methodology be reviewed through the committee process prior to being filed with FERC?*

A – That will be presented at the Reliability Committee at a later date but prior to the FERC filing.

*Q – On slide 10, is the 36,309 MW just generating capacity resources or does it also include capacity imports?*

A – It includes imports.

*Q – Also on slide 10, the 50/50 load forecast column, does that relate to reconstitution of load to account for EE resources?*

A – No, It's the gross load forecast without EE.

*Q – In regards to the forced outage rate used to determine ICR, ISO uses the 5 year annual average for all resources in the system. Could ISO do analysis of the 5 year outage rate compared to the outage rate at the times of the peak? Could ISO investigate using this methodology going forward?*

A – ISO is still conducting our analysis regarding this methodology and those results will be presented to the PSPC upon completion.

#### **Item 5 – 2012 RSP Representative Locational Forward Reserve Requirements – Fei Zeng**

Mr. Fei Zeng (ISO) provided an overview of the Locational Forward Reserve Requirements that will be used in RSP 12. The values shown in the presentation are indicative and will not be the actual values used for the reserve market procurement.

*Q – In regards to the SWCT loads, the peak loads for the day are the native load. How are the exports factored into the modeling?*

A – We include import/export in each constrained zone. If it is an export, we deduct the amount on a daily basis.

*Q – On slide 31 regarding the NEMA/Boston summer data, what historical data will be used for 2012 summer requirements and the same for summer 2013? How will the transmission work in the Salem Harbor area and the impact on future years?*

A – We will take that back for further investigation.

#### **Item 6 – 2012 Economic Study Scope of Work – Wayne Coste**

Mr. Wayne Coste (ISO) provided an overview of the scope of work for the 2012 Economic Studies. The project background was provided and provided updates for each of the requested 2012 economic studies from Synapse regarding renewable resources and low carbon alternatives and End User Alliance for an evaluation of retirements of base load units.

*Q – What are the assumptions for MPRP?*

A – The MPRP interface ratings have been discussed at the PAC and PSPC. All of the underlying assumptions will be reviewed on slide 23 of this presentation.

Several clarifying questions regarding the various charts and graphs were asked and responded to by Mr. Coste.

**The PAC meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.**