Planning Advisory Committee
Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA
May 18, 2016

Eric Annes	Connecticut DEEP
Nic Baldenko	United Illuminating Company
Denis Bergeron	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Peter Bernard	ISO New England Inc.
David Beron	New England Power Company
Curt Beveridge	Central Maine Power Company
Alex Boutsioulis	United Illuminating Company
Dave Bradt	United Illuminating Company
John Brodbeck	Marble River
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
Dan Congel	TransCanada Power Marketing
Ray Coxe	Mosaic Energy Insights for Brookfield
James Davis	Dominion Energy Marketing
Stacy Dimou	Emera Maine
Vandan Divatia	Eversource Energy
Mike Drzewianowski	ISO New England Inc.
Frank Ettori	Vermont Electric Power Company
Jeff Fenn	Emera Maine
Spencer Fields	Synapse Energy Economics
Bill Fowler	Exelon
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Monica Gonzalez	ISO New England Inc.
Louis Guibault	HQUS
Mike Henderson	ISO New England Inc.
Jeff Iafrati	Customized Energy Solutions
Eric Jacobi	FERC
Bruce Kay	ISO New England Inc.
John Keene	Sun Edison
Bill Killgoar	LIPA
Andrew Kniska	ISO New England Inc.
Abby Krich	Boreas Renewables
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Tim Martin	New England Power Company
Al McBride	ISO New England Inc.
Bruce McKinnon	CMEEC
Ed McNamara	Vermont Public Utilities Commission
Mary Menino	Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
Chris Morin	Central Maine Power Company
John Moskal	US EPA
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Theodore Paradise	ISO New England Inc.
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General Office
Heather Roberts	RLC Engineering
Alex Rost	ISO New England Inc.
Jose Rotger	Emera Energy
Eric Runge	Day Pitney
Phil Smith	Energy New England
Joe Staszowski	Eversource Energy
Bob Stein	HQUS/PSEG/NRG/Footprint
Brad Swalwell	Tangent Energy Solutions
Phil Tatro	EIG
Brian Thomson	Massachusetts Wholesale Electric Company
Greg Wade	ISO New England Inc.

Item 1 – Chair's Remarks
Mr. Don Gates welcomed the committee and reviewed the day's agenda.

Item 2 – East Shore 345 kV Equipment Asset Conditions Assessment
Mr. Chris Malone (UI) provided an overview of the East Shore 345 kV Equipment Asset Conditions Assessment Project.

Q – What is a dead tank breaker?
A – It is a ground level breaker versus an overhead, live tank breaker.
Q – The two autotransformer, are those a similar age?
A – Yes, they are the original transformer around 43 years old. However, they are in good shape and we believe they do not need replacement at this time.
Q – How long will the associated outage on Line 387 be with this work?
A – Detailed engineering has not been performed yet so I can't say for sure how long any outages would be at this time. Best guess would be roughly a week.

Item 3 – EIPC Update
Mr. Stan Doe (ISO) provided an EIPC Update.

Q – Slide 11 states contingencies on the 115 kV facilities but previous slides states the N-1 contingences were limited to 230 kV and above. Why the discrepancy?
A – We are monitoring down to 100 kV.
Q – Are the NYSO contingencies are just show for example purposes? I'm sure there are several others on the NPCC contingency report.
A - That is true.

Item 4 – Update to the Transmission Planning Technical Guide – PV and Other Minor Updates
Mr. Brent Oberlin (ISO) provided an Update to the Transmission Planning Technical Guide – PV and Other Minor Updates.

Q – Regarding modeling behind the meter PV, is it geographically specific or is it spread out?
A – It is spread out zonally until we get more specific area information.

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

Item 5 – New Generation Interconnection – Clustering Approaches
Mr. Bruce Kay (ISO) provided an overview of the New Generation Interconnection – Clustering Approaches.

Q - For SPP, how many IRs would it take to require a 4 year study window?
A – It varies depending on the amount of IRs and the location. I don't have a specific number of IAs that would correlate to a study window timeframe.
Q – Regarding the cost allocation to rate payers, if one or more of the study customers withdraw from the cluster study project, do they still need to cover their share of transmission line upgrades or construction?
A – Yes, once each customer signs the contract, their deposits would cover their share of the transmission line costs.
Q – Is the cost of the transmission line paid up by each of the project sponsors front as a one-time cost or is it paid over time?
A – I don't know that answer for sure but each of the project sponsors would have needed to put up financial assurance enough to cover their share of the project.
Comment – I believe the "one-off" approach similar to what CAISO used, would be the best approach to use in ISO-NE if we continue with a "clustering" methodology.
Comment – I believe there are other areas within the region other than the current backlog of queue projects in Maine that could benefit from something other than the "one-off or one-time" approach.
Comment – The queue MWs could lead to underbuilding the transmission as it doesn't look toward future generation projects wishing to interconnect on the transmission built for the clustering study.

Item 6 – Transmission Planning Process Guide – Public Policy
Mr. Peter Bernard (ISO) provided an overview of the Transmission Planning Process Guide – Public Policy.

Q – Regarding the use of the words "they may be a PAC meeting" to discuss proposals. Can you expand on that?
A – It allows ISO some flexibility as some projects may be minor and we can inform the committee of the project/proposal via e-mail correspondence.
Q - Is NESCOE in a gatekeeper roll for Public Policies.
A – They are.
Q - Is there a process if the PPTU will be completed or not? What goes into that?
A – The tariff is silent on this aspect. ISO would bring a rough draft of the public policy project along with a cost estimate. A decision will then be made if the project is worthy of continuing. For example, if a project cost is estimated to be $5 billion, there could be a decision not to pursue it if the benefits do not outweigh the cost.
Q – If there are multiple proposals to resolve a single RFP, would each proposal require a $100,000 study deposit?
A – Each proposal would require the $100K deposit because each proposal would require an individual study.
Q – On slide 22, would this include market efficiency as well as reliability?
A – The language regarding the reliability statement is taken directly from the tariff. We will discuss if an amendment to the tariff is needed to make reference to market efficiency.
Q – How much of the monthly updates from the project sponsor on the Public Policy project will be made available to the stakeholders?

A – It depends on the nature of the updates and if they fall under the ISO information policy and potential CEII implications. We will explore this issue further as we refine our process.

Planning Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 1:45 PM

Respectively submitted

Marc Lyons
Secretary, Planning Advisory Committee