

**Planning Advisory Committee
Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA.
March 24, 2014**

Joe Adadjo	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Brad Bentley	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Denis Bergeron	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Peter Bernard	ISO New England Inc.
Christian Bilcheck	United Illuminating Company
Dave Bradt	United Illuminating Company
Tim Brennan	New England Power Company
Cal Bowie	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Margo Caley	ISO New England Inc.
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
Dave Cavanaugh	Energy New England
Ray Coxe	Mosaic Energy for Brookfield
Greg Cunningham	Conservation Law Foundation
Jonathan Dempsey	Customized Energy Solutions
Stacy Dimou	Emera Maine
Frank Ettori	Vermont Electric Company
Lisa Fink	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Tony Fitzgerald	Carmody Law
Bill Fowler	Exelon Generation
Steve Garwood	New Hampshire Transmission
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Brian Hayduk	New England Power Company
Mike Henderson	ISO New England Inc.
Jim Hyland	MMWEC
Sarah Jackson	Synapse
Jeff Jones	Emera Maine
Bob Keen	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Bill Killgoar	Long Island Power Authority
Shawn Konary	Mirant New England
Robin LaFayette	ISO New England Inc.
Paul Liang	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Paul Lopes	DCAM, Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Barbara Lynch	ISO New England Inc.
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Al McBride	ISO New England Inc.
Bruce McKinnon	CMEEC
Aleks Mitreski	Brookfield Renewable Energy Marketing
Mary Louise Nuara	ISO New England Inc.
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Rose Ann Pelletier	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Rich Pinto	United Illuminating Company
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General Office
Hantz Presume	Vermont Electric Company
Abhinav Rawat	New England Power Company
Jose Rotger	Cross Sound Cable Company/Emera Maine
Bob Russo	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Allison Smith	NESCOE
Joe Staszowski	Northeast Utilities Service Company
Robert Stein	HQUS

Pradip Vijayan	ISO New England Inc.
Haizhen Wang	ISO New England Inc.
Sharon Weber	PPL Energy Plus
James Winn	New England Power Company
Peter Wong	ISO New England Inc.

Item 1 – Chair’s Remarks

Mr. Don Gates welcomed the committee and reviewed the day’s agenda. Mr. Gates stated that it is highly likely that the April 17, 2014 PAC meeting will be cancelled and that all topics that were scheduled for that day will be presented at the April 29, 2014 PAC Meeting. Mr. Gates advised that there are new sets of draft PAC minutes posted and available for review. Please provide any comments on the minutes to the PAC Secretary, Marc Lyons.

Mr. Gates also provided a presentation, NSTAR Cable Rating Update, as notice to stakeholders that the NSTAR is submitting revised cable ratings to ISO New England.

Q – How will this affect the FTR markets? Is this all of the NSTAR cables in the Boston Market?

A – Yes this impacts all the Boston cables.

Item 2 – March 2014 RSP 14 Project List Update

Mr. Brent Oberlin (ISO) provided an overview of the March 2014 RSP 14 Project List.

Q – Can you provide some details behind the reasons for each of the project cost increases or decreases of > \$10M.

A – I do not have the specific information on hand regarding the various cost changes at this time but we can provide a follow up to the PAC on those details.

Q – What components were removed from the Greater Boston project?

A – The new 345 kV lines from Wakefield to Ward Hill and the 345 kV line from Tewksbury to Woburn as well as a new 345 kV cable from Woburn to North Cambridge are no longer required and are moved to cancelled. These are replaced primarily by a new 345 kV cable from Wakefield Junction to Woburn.

Q - On slide 17, what does the NEEWS Line 69 represent?

A – There are a number of smaller projects that weren’t split out of overall NEEWS project and associated with a specific portion (Greater Springfield Reliability Project, Rhode Island Reliability Project, Central Connecticut Reliability Project, or Interstate Reliability Project) so they were lumped together and the 69 represents \$69M total dollars for the lumped projects.

Q – Are they identified on the Project spreadsheet?

A – Yes they are.

Q – Within this presentation the dollar value you quote is summed as Planned projects as well as Proposed projects?

A – That is true.

Q - When to you anticipate coming out with the cost comparisons between the AC and Sealink solution in the Greater Boston area?

Q – Hard to say but we anticipate presenting this to the PAC sometime this summer.

Item 3 – NGRID Transmission Line Asset Conditions Refurbishment and Projects

Mr. James Winn (NEP) provided an overview of the NGRID Transmission Line Asset Conditions Refurbishment and Projects.

Q – Can all the projects on your list be considered an “in kind” replacement?

A – That is true with the exception of the W-175 Line project due to some reliability capacity implications.

Q – In regards to the W-175 line, is the upgrade needed for generator qualification?

A – The need to identify the capacity of this line was identified in the 2007 study referenced on slide 13. National Grid has certified the project such that it can be relied up on in the qualification process.

Comment – There were also infrastructure changes that changed the flows on the line which is also contributing factor to the reconductoring need.

Item 4 – SWCT Solution Study Alternatives

Ms. Helen Wang (ISO) provided an overview of the SWCT Solution Study Alternatives.

Q – If a 2nd fast start unit was installed in the Waterbury area, would you still require the Frost Bridge to Naugatuck Valley area upgrades?

A – Based on the existing and future needs in the area and even with a 2nd fast start unit, we would still probably require the upgrades in the Frost Bridge to Naugatuck Valley area.

Q – While understanding that you are in the initial stages of the area review, do you have a rough estimate of the potential dollar cost for this project?

A – A ball park estimate is around \$400M at this time. That will be refined as the project moves forward and the various alternatives and final solutions are decided upon.

Other clarifying questions were asked and responded to by Ms. Wang, Mr. Oberlin (ISO) and Mr. Bilcheck (UI – TO in affected area).

Item 5 – GHCC Solution Study Alternatives

Mr. Pradip Vijayan (ISO) provided an overview GHCC Solution Study Alternatives.

There were no questions from the committee on this project.

Item 6 - Transmission Interface Transfer Capabilities – Part IV

Mr. Al McBride (ISO) provided an overview of the Transmission Interface Transfer Capabilities – Part IV.

Q – Where can we find a description of the differences between SEMA and RI?

A – That portion of the system is heavily intertwined together so it makes it difficult to illustrate a defined border between the electrical boundaries and the political boundaries. We can say that the accounting of resource location and load location in the presentation was based on the PNode table mapping.

Q - Is Brayton considered in SEMA or RI?

A – Brayton Point is in the SEMA load zone.

Q – How do you reconcile the transfer limits between SEMA/RI and NEMA and SEMA/RI and CT since we can't transfer in both directions (Bill Fowler question).

A – It is important to consider the effects of simultaneous relevant transfers – such as the Import into Boston.

Comment - I suggest you add another set of outage considerations to look at such as potential units out of service due to possible gas pipeline issues.

A – We can take that back for discussion and review.

Comment - You should add West Walpole to Stoughton line out as part of the outage review analysis.

A – We can do that.

Comment – At the next presentation, please provide results for a number of transfer scenarios relevant to the calculation of the SEMA-RI import capability.

A – The results of different scenarios should be reviewed and presented in appropriate detail prior to settling on a reasonable single transfer limit value.

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

Planning Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM

Respectively submitted

Marc Lyons
Secretary, Planning Advisory Committee