

**Planning Advisory Committee
Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA
March 24, 2015**

Bruce Anderson	NEPGA
Curt Beveridge	Central Maine Power Company
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
Dave Cavanaugh	NRG
Nancy Chafetz	Competitive Power Ventures
Pradip Chattopadhyay	New Hampshire OCA
Ray Coxe	Mosaic Energy for Brookfield
Ken Dell Orto	Competitive Power Ventures
Spencer Fields	Synapse
Kevin Flynn	ISO New England Inc.
Michelle Gardner	Next Era Energy
Steve Garwood	New Hampshire Transmission
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Mike Hachey	TransCanada Energy
Brian Hayduk	New England Power Company
Tom Kaslow	GDF Suez
John Keene	First Wind
Bill Killgoar	LIPA
Steve Kirk	Exelon
Shawn Konary	NRG
Krista Kisch	New Hampshire Transmission
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Tim Martin	New England Power Company
Al McBride	ISO New England Inc.
Bruce McKinnon	CMEEC
Mary Menino	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Theodore Paradise	ISO New England Inc.
Rich Pinto	United Illuminating
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General Office
Hantz Presume	Vermont Electric Power Company
Cleveland Richards	Vermont Electric Power Company
MQ Riding	Essential Power
Jose Rotger	Cross Sound Cable Company
Lou Sahlou	Massachusetts Public Utilities Commission
Catherine Scott	FERC
Patricio Silva	ISO New England Inc.
Phil Smith	Energy New England
Joe Staszowski	Eversource Energy
Bob Stein	HQUS
Phil Tatro	EIG
Pradip Vijayan	ISO New England Inc.

Item 1 – Chair’s Remarks

Mr. Don Gates welcomed the committee and reviewed the day’s agenda. Mr. Gates advised the committee that the monthly EIPC Update presentation and the EIPC Target 3 Report were posted for committee review. Mr. Mark Babula (ISO) was unavailable to review those items but

requested that questions on either document be forwarded to him for response. Mr. Gates also announced that there will be enough topics to schedule an additional PAC meeting date in April. We are targeting the additional date for April 28, 2015. Once the venue is firmed up, we will make an announcement to the PAC confirming the date and venue.

Item 2 – RSP 15 Zonal Interfaces – Transfer Capability Assumptions

Mr. Al McBride (ISO) provided an overview of the RSP 15 Zonal Interfaces – Transfer Capability Assumptions.

Q – How are we looking at zonal formations for the next FCA? It is creating a lot of uncertainty for the auction inputs.

A – We will document the process and the long term outlook for the zonal boundaries in the RSP.

Q – In the North-South interface, have you accounted for the Northern Pass project?

A – The analysis only included certified project. As such, Northern Pass was not analyzed as part of this review.

Q – Do we set transfer limits based on SPS's on the system?

A – Yes we do and we have for quite some time.

Q – Is VY in the North of the North South interface?

A – It is in the North.

Q – Several of the constraints were part of the Greater Boston Needs Analysis. Once those upgrades are in place, what will the impact be on the constraints?

A – We haven't looked at it yet other than what is in this presentation. However, we expect the project upgrades will address these limitations.

Q - Will you certify the Greater Boston upgrades for FCA 10?

A – We have already listed the projects that will be certified for FCA 10 and the Greater Boston upgrades will not be certified in time for that auction.

Q – Have you considered creating a Western North-South and an Eastern North-South interface?

A – The distribution of resources does not support that at this time.

Q - In the future, could you discuss the Scobie interface limits?

A - We can come back to discuss this.

Q – Could this zonal proposal change in the future?

A – We felt we have done adequate studies and analysis and this presentation supports this. We will continue to review this and receive feedback from the stakeholders.

Q – I request the ISO calculate the cost to consumers of the FCA auctions based on the changing zonal boundaries.

A – We can take that back.

Q – Do you anticipate the zones remaining stable in the future?

A – The primary driver will be the pace, location and size of generation retirements. That will dictate the creation and deletion of the regions zones going forward.

Q – Is Connecticut getting closer to being folded into rest of pool?

A – We will always test Connecticut. If you review last year’s test for FCA 9, you can see the results. If you add in the new resources for FCA 10, you could get a good idea how close Connecticut will come to being folded into rest of pool. We will look at this again this summer.

Q – Was Footprint considered as part of this analysis?

A – It was considered in this analysis.

Q – With the creation of a broader zonal area, are you sending the proper pricing signals to that could impact potential generation retirement or the construction of new resources. Could the prices be excessively diluted as part of a larger zonal region?

A – We are mindful of the pricing signals and we will continue to evaluate it every year as we review the need for additional zones or elimination of zones.

Q - Based on the proposed zones, Rest of Pool is relatively small. Is there a minimum size for capacity zones?

A – We don’t have a definitive MW value for the zonal size, but we would need to discuss and review that in depth if the Rest of Pool became any smaller.

Q -Why aren’t you specifically addressing the Orrington South interface for zonal consideration?

A - We have provided information in the presentation Appendix regarding Orrington South that illustrates why we did not create a zone based on that constraint.

Q – Will the TSA be discussed at the RC on this subject?

A – We will discuss TSA at the April 2nd RC Meeting.

Item 3 – Greater Hartford/Central Connecticut Middletown Sub-Area 115 kV Capacitor Bank Modifications

Mr. Pradip Vijayan (ISO) provided an overview of the Greater Hartford/Central Connecticut Middletown Sub-Area 115 kV Capacitor Bank Modifications.

There were no questions from the committee regarding this topic.

Item 4 – RSP15 Project List Update – March 2015

Mr. Brent Oberlin (ISO) provided an update regarding the March 2015 - RSP15 Project List.

Q – As a result of the FCA process in qualifying resources, when will those projects get placed on this list?

A – We will check on that but it could be when the interconnect agreement is executed with FERC.

Q – On slide 14, will the costs of GHCC projects match the costs approved by the RC PPAs?

A – They should match. However, since the I.3.9 Letter has not been issued yet, they will remain as “proposed”. We will update the Project List for the next presentation changing that status once the Approval Letters are issued.

Q – I believe you should add a category call asset replacement within this table versus reliability issues.

A – I will need to take that back to consider on how that could get added into this list.

Item 5 – Order 1000 FERC Ruling Overview

Mr. Theodore Paradise (ISO) provided a summary update on FERC’s Order 1000 ruling to ISO.

Q - Based on the May 18th effective date, when will we start the solicitation process for projects?

A – I am not sure when we will issue our first RFP. The needs must be greater than three years out. We will look into that.

Q – Will ISO put out a list of projects with a need greater than three years for solicitation?

A – We don’t know how we will address that subject. We will take that back.

Q – Will generation retirements three years out be eligible for RFPs?

A – We are investigating that. We don’t have an answer at this point.

Q – Do you think the NERC standard creates need?

A – I believe the way we are running our needs assessment, I would say no.

Q – Could you explain the opt-in versus opt-out for the states?

A – FERC rejected the opt-in and opt-out for public policy initiatives.

Planning Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM

Respectively submitted

Marc Lyons
Secretary, Planning Advisory Committee