

**Planning Advisory Committee  
 Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA  
 May 19, 2016**

Syed Ahmed	New England Power Company
Bruce Anderson	New England Power Generators Association
Denis Bergeron	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Curt Beveridge	Central Maine Power Company
Cal Bowie	Eversource Energy
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
David Cavanaugh	NRG Power Marketing
Ray Coxe	Mosaic Energy Insights for Brookfield
Greg Cunningham	Conservation Law Foundation
Ben D'Antonio	NESCOE
James Davis	Dominion Energy Marketing
Vandan Divatia	Eversource Energy
Stan Doe	ISO New England Inc.
Amro Farid	Dartmouth
Jeff Fenn	Emera Maine
Lisa Fink	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Kevin Fougere	Quanta Technologies
Bill Fowler	Exelon
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Joel Gordon	PSEG
Prescott Hartshorne	New England Power Company
Mike Henderson	ISO New England Inc.
Jim Hyland	Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company
Jeff Iafrati	Customized Energy Solutions
Sarah Jackson	Synapse Energy Economics
Jeff Jurgensmier	ISO New England Inc.
Tom Kaslow	GDF Suez
Bill Killgoar	LIPA
Andrew Kniska	ISO New England Inc.
Rich Kowalski	ISO New England Inc.
Abby Krich	Boreas Renewables
Marc Lyons	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
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Theodore Paradise	ISO New England Inc.
Marianne Perben	ISO New England Inc.
Paul Peterson	Synapse Energy Economics
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General Office
Hantz Presume	Vermont Electric Power Company
Alex Rost	ISO New England Inc.
Jose Rotger	Emera Energy
Eric Runge	Day Pitney
Phil Smith	Energy New England
Bob Stein	HQUS/PSEG/NRG/Footprint
Brian Thomson	Massachusetts Wholesale Electric Company
Greg Wade	ISO New England Inc.
Peter Wong	ISO New England Inc.

### **Item 1 – Chair’s Remarks**

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

### **Item 2 – Methodology for Base Case Assumptions – Follow Up**

Mr. Marianne Perben (ISO) provided an overview of the Methodology for Base Case Assumptions – Follow Up.

*Q – On slide 10, is this gross load or net load?*

*A – Gross load*

*Q – Are the curves developed through a Monte Carlo program?*

*A – No it is not, it is a probability curve.*

*Q – How do you look at the expectation of generation outages as part of the curve?*

*A – We base it on the historic outage rate of the generation in the area.*

*Q – Have you factored imports on the ties into Connecticut?*

*A – Not at this time but we will consider imports later.*

*Q - Are you basing the load probability from the CELT report? How do you factor in a peak day load?*

*A – We are using the values from the CELT and peak loads are accounted for within the probability curve.*

*Comment – We should represent actual peak load versus CELT peak loads. Also, think about a potential shift in the times of peak loads and shortage events.*

*Comment – The forced outage rates could be revised when Pay for Performance goes into effect. That could cause a change in the calculation methodology.*

*Comment – You should look at the shoulder month’s maintenance outage periods and you factor a risk assessment.*

*Comment – I do not believe that ISO has made the case for the use of the 5.4 E-05 value.*

*Q - How does this discussion pertain to interconnection studies?*

*A – We don’t conduct needs assessments in the same way as we develop interconnection studies. But it’s something we can look at going forward.*

Several stakeholders expressed appreciation for ISO’s efforts on this topic.

There were several clarification questions on the meaning of the various probability curves as well as how those curves were derived, that were responded to by Ms. Perben and Mr. Rich Kowalski (ISO).

### **Item 3 – 2016 Economic Study Scope of Work**

Mr. Mike Henderson (ISO) provided an overview of the 2016 Economic Study Scope of Work – Scenario Analysis.

*Q – What additional sensitivities will occur in Phase II of the study?*

*A – Inter-hour ramping and simulated FCM clearing prices to name a few examples.*

*Comment – I don't see the need for exclusive use of natural gas combined cycle resources as the base unit for generator replacement of retiring resources or to meet projected ICR as part of scenario 1.*

*Q - Should we consider additional storage as part of scenario 3?*

*A – There is a lot of storage assumed in scenario 3 but what if there is more generation than storage. That is why we need to consider prioritizing the order of generation cuts such as the imports, solar, wind, etc...*

*Q – Does GridView do negative pricing?*

*A – I do not believe so. We assume bids are incremental threshold price and we will start cutting resources when pricing falls below \$5.*

*Comment – I believe we will need to use nameplate MWs for Maine wind in order to understand the size of the transmission build out in the area.*

*Q – Why aren't you using the ISO existing wind data versus computer simulated wind data?*

*A – We are using a 2006 load shape as a base line and the recent existing wind data does not go back that far and we need to use the computer simulated wind data from 2006 to match our 2006 load shape.*

*Q – Are there any assumptions on the amount of MWs associated with the PEVs being studied?*

*A – I can find that out and present it at the next PAC meeting.*

Planning Advisory Committee meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM

Respectively submitted

Marc Lyons  
Secretary, Planning Advisory Committee