

**Planning Advisory Committee  
Teleconference  
January 28, 2015**

Bob Andrew	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Justice Anasah	ISO New England Inc.
Denis Bergeron	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Peter Bernard	ISO New England Inc.
Roger Borghesani	The Electric Consortium
Cal Bowie	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Kelly Cszimesia	New England Power Company
Greg Cunningham	Conservation Law Foundation
Jeff Dannels	ConEd Energy
Dave Errichetti	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Bill Fowler	Exelon
Julia Frayer	London Economics
Steve Garwood	New Hampshire Transmission
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Joel Gordon	PSEG
Ron Hart	Dominion
Brian Hayduk	New England Power Company
Jeff Jones	Emera Maine
Tom Kaslow	GDF Suez
John Keene	First Wind
Bill Killgoar	LIPA
Abby Krich	Boreas Renewables
Robin LaFayette	ISO New England Inc.
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Al McBride	ISO New England Inc.
Mary Menino	Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission
Dawarkesh Nallan	ISO New England
Margaret Neves	Power Engineering
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Rich Pinto	United Illuminating
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General Office
MQ Riding	Essential Power
Eric Runge	Day Pitney
Carissa Sedlacek	ISO New England Inc.
Joe Staszowski	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Bob Stein	HQUS
Veronica Szczerkowski	Connecticut DEEP
Eric Winkler	ISO New England Inc.

**Item 1 – Chair’s Remarks**

Mr. Don Gates welcomed the committee and reviewed the day’s agenda.

**Item 2 – SEMA/RI Market Resource Alternatives**

Mr. Dwarakesh Nallan (ISO) and Mr. Justice Anasah (ISO) provided an overview of the SEMA/RI Market Resource Alternatives.

*Q – In regards to running the N-1 and N-1-1 contingencies in series, don't we give them equal standing in the final analysis?*

A – Yes, but we split it based on the analysis timeline. We perform N-1 first and then we run the N-1-1 analysis. At the conclusion of the study, we incorporate both reviews so we can see the combined needs.

*Q – With the potential injecting of generating units at these suggested locations, are you performing an overlapping impact analysis with all resources on line?*

A – We are not reviewing the overlapping impact analysis as part of the MRA review.

*Q – So this doesn't give a developer an indication if they could pass an overlapping impact test.*

A – That is correct. This analysis only gives an indication of some possible solutions that could mitigate some identified needs in the area.

*Q – Would the Dartmouth generator location be a practical addition Cross Road and Fisher Road MRA location in the area as there is existing generation at the location that could be expanded?*

A – The DFax analysis showed the Cross Road and Fisher Road area as the best location from an MRA perspective. However, we can take your observation for further review.

*Comment – This review does not replace a system impact study.*

A – That is 100% correct. This analysis is a theoretical review which is meant to provide suggestions to some possible area improvements. All standard reviews will be performed if a developer decides to propose a generation or demand side solution to include System Impact Studies, Overlapping Impacts, etc...

*Q - When you put together the solutions for the 74 thermal violations, if those violations were solved would that trigger a new MRA analysis taking those solutions into account.*

A – The purpose of the study is to give a high level overview but a new review would need to be performed to see what violations if any remain and would that change the suggested MRA locations.

*Q – Where do we go from here?*

A – This is only a high level study meant to provide project sponsors some suggestions to possible area solutions. We will not be performing an additional MRA review.

*Q – Can you add some analysis to the MRA that would show how many MWs could pass an overlapping impact in the area? This is with the understanding that a full SIS would need to be performed as well. That would be very helpful to the developers.*

A – We will take that back for discussion.

### **Item 3 – NU Line 372 Reconductor Project**

Mr. Bob Andrew (NU) provided an overview of the Line 372 Reconductor Project.

*Q – Why wasn't this review included as part of the Greater Boston Study?*

A – It is captured as part on N-1 and N-1-1 contingency analysis.

*Q – What was the cost of the Gilmore Bridge repair?*

A - Approximately \$4M

*Q – Is there thermal limitation on the conductors?*

A – When we go with underground lines, the heat doesn't transfer very well as opposed to overhead lines. As such we don't get a tremendous increase of the MVA.

*Q – Would the project outage schedules impact limitations to area generation?*

A – We haven't detailed a project outage schedule yet but as we move forward with the project, we will look more deeply into that issue.

Other clarifying questions were asked and responded to by Mr. Andrew.

#### **Item 4 – NGrid Somerset Switchyard Rebuild Project**

Ms. Kelley Csizmesia (NGrid) provided an overview of the NGrid Somerset Switchyard Rebuild Project.

*Q – On slide 17, it appears you eliminated 2 of 10 lines, However, I don't see that on the physical diagram.*

A – That was an oversight. We can provide an updated diagram that accounts for all 10 lines.

*Q – Who owns the land for the new substation?*

A – We are under negotiations to purchase the land from the current owner and transfer the existing land site to them.

*Q – When is the target in service date and how will that relate to the Brayton Point retirement schedule?*

A – We are shooting for completion in 2018. We are unsure how the Brayton Point retirement will impact our schedule.

*Q – Would the new site be BPS compliant?*

A – Based on our construction standard, we anticipate everything to be BPS compliant.

*Comment – I would like an assurance that the \$45M costs for the new site will include the decommissioning and removes of the equipment at the existing location.*

#### **Item 5 – RSP 15 Transmission Interface Transfer Capabilities – External Constraints**

Mr. Al McBride (ISO) provided an overview of the RSP 15 Transmission Interface Transfer Capabilities – External Constraints.

*Q – Will you look the transfer capabilities for FCA 11 as a result of the reduced load in the Maine area due to mill closures once you can determine the full impact?*

A – Yes we will.

*Q – On slide 4, do we still study at 1000MW for the New Brunswick Tie?*

A – For adverse impacts and needs and solution studies, we do use the 1000MWs as the transfer capability.

*Q – Are you missing the Norwalk to Northport AC line as part of the ties on slide 6?*

A – For the purpose of capacity market proposals, that is bundled as part on the NY AC Ties so it was not included.

Planning Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 11:56 AM

Respectively submitted

Marc Lyons  
Secretary, Planning Advisory Committee