

**Planning Advisory Committee
Doubletree Hotel, Westborough, MA
August 9, 2012**

Syed Ahmed	National Grid
Mark Babula	ISO New England Inc.
Curt Beveridge	Central Maine Power Company
Christian Bilcheck	United Illuminating Company, The
Denis Bergeron	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Chris Bernard	Northeast Utilities Service Companies
Jon Black	ISO New England Inc.
Cal Bowie	Northeast Utilities Service Companies
Dorothy Capra	NESCOE
M.L. Chan	ML Consulting Group
Pradip Chattopadhyay	New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
Wayne Coste	ISO New England Inc.
Ray Coxe	Brookfield Energy Marketing
Ben D'Antonio	NESCOE
Fernando DaSilva	NextEra Energy
Stacy Dimou	Bangor Hydro Electric Company
Stan Doe	ISO New England Inc.
Jack Elder	Northeast Utilities Service Companies
Dave Ehrlich	ISO New England Inc.
Jeff Fenn	Bangor Hydro Electric Company
Lisa Fink	Maine Public Utilities Commission
Kevin Flynn	ISO New England Inc.
Tom Foley	ISO New England Inc.
Bill Fowler	EquiPower, Granite Ridge Energy
Steve Garwood	New Hampshire Transmission
Don Gates	ISO New England Inc.
Michael Giaimo	ISO New England Inc.
Mike Henderson	ISO New England Inc.
Toby Hu	ISO New England Inc.
Jim Hyland	Massachusetts Municipal Wholesale Electric Company
Sarah Jackson	Synapse
Eric Jacobi	Connecticut DEEP
Eric Johnson	ISO New England Inc.
Steve Judd	ISO New England Inc.
Steve Kirk	Exelon
Abigail Krich	Boreas Renewables
Bill Lampkin	Massachusetts DEP
Lisa Linowes	Wind Action
Tyler Loggins	ISO New England Inc.
Marc Lyons	ISO New England Inc.
Gary McAllister	GZA
George McCluskey	New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
Bruce McKinnon	Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative
Tim Morrissey	Dominion Energy Marketing
John Moskal	U.S. EPA
Bill Nugent	NECPUC
Brent Oberlin	ISO New England Inc.
Carolyn O'Connor	HQ US
Richard Pinto	United Illuminating Company
Fred Plett	Massachusetts Attorney General

Walter Poor	Vermont Department of Public Service
Hantz Presume	Vermont Electric Company
Francis Pullaro	First Wind
Caryn Rexrode	Customized Energy Solutions
Joe Rossignolli	Energy New England
Eric Runge	Day Pitney
Joe Sahl	Massachusetts DOER
Bryan Sanderson	NEITC
Allan Scarfone	Northeast Utilities Service Companies
Akarsh Sheilendranath	ISO New England Inc.
Patricio Silva	ISO New England Inc.
John Simonelli	ISO new England Inc.
Philip Smith	GenOn
Joe Staszowski	Northeast Utilities Service Companies
Robert Stein	HQUS/NRG/PSEG/Footprint
Pam Stonier	Vermont Department of Public Service
Veronica Szczerkowski	Connecticut DEEP
Jeff Turcotte	ISO New England Inc.
Matt Valle	New Hampshire Transmission
Pradip Vijayan	ISO New England Inc.
Sharon Webber	PPL Energy Plus
Carol Wendel	ISO New England Inc.
Eric Wilkinson	ISO New England Inc.
Eric Winkler	ISO New England Inc.

Administrative

Mr. Mike Henderson welcomed the committee to the meeting and reviewed the day's agenda in addition to the agenda of the September 13, 2012 RSP 12 Public Meeting. Mr. Stan Doe (ISO) provided an EIPC update. Mr. Henderson advised that there will be a series of DOE Congestion Study Webinars on August 7, 16, and 21, 2012. Mr. Henderson also stated there will be an IPSAC meeting on August 27, 2012 and reviewed the schedule of EAG meeting for the remainder of the year. Mr. Henderson announced the availability of several NEEWS reports that are posted for review and comment.

Questions/Comments (PAC in Italics, presenter in Roman)

Item 2 – RSP 12 Comments and Page Turn

Mr. Henderson provided an overview of the Draft RSP 12 and stated that he will be using the posted RSP 12 Comments Matrix as a reference for discussion purposes regarding participant comments received on the draft RSP. The substance of comments were discussed and will be subject to further review by ISO, including review by the technical editor.

Comment – Please add a reference number section within the Comment Matrix to ease the searching within the main RSP 12 document.

A – The comment matrix indicates both the section number and draft RSP page number for your reference. In addition, originally received comments were posted for your reference.

Comment – Please note the operator issues regarding their lack of flexibility in regards to electrical issues that arise in switching fuel sources for the dual fuel generators.

A – ISO-NE is generally okay with that comment.

Comment - In regards to public policy in development of resources, be explicit on what ISO considers and does not consider in development of the RSP.

A – ISO-NE does not formulate regional policy. Governmental policies however affect the development of infrastructure throughout the region, as summarized in the RSP. The RSP studies inform regional stakeholders that include governmental officials.

Comment - A summary page of the major projects and their costs would be helpful as a supplement to the very detailed RSP list.

A – ISO can add a brief summary that is similar to the one provided as part of the June RSP Project List.

Comment - Under Comment 105, ISO stated that one of the underlying needs for the Greater Boston Upgrades is a need to increase transfers into Boston. This was not what was conveyed to the PAC in prior presentations or the Needs Report, that the needs were to address various overloads identified in studies. But there was no stated need to increase imports. To the extent there is a need to increase supply into the area, the markets should be given that information, and a signal sent to those markets. Other analyses in the RSP - including the LFRM and Resource Adequacy assessments, as well as the most recent Transmission Security Analyses supporting FCA-7 ICR values, do not indicate such a need.

A - The transmission assessments supporting the Boston Study use different assumptions and standards than do the LFRM, LRA or TSA assessments. It was also stated that signals are being sent with dynamic delists requests for Demand Response being rejected in FCA #6.

Comment – I disagree with the characterization of Boston Need in the draft RSP, and that if there is a need for more supply in the area, the markets should be given an opportunity to respond before transmission is committed.

A - Subsequent to the PAC discussion, the Greater Boston Area Transmission Needs Assessment (July 8, 2010) was reviewed with the stakeholder. ISO agreed while that the assessment does not explicitly state that the import limit needs to be increased, ISO provided multiple quotes from the report which stated that the transfers into Boston were above the import limits and that the lines across the import interface were overloading from the north.

There were several additional discussions between the comment submitters and ISO as clarification was given regarding their particular areas of concern within the Draft RSP 12. ISO then provided additional detail to the posted responses provided in the RSP 12 Comments Matrix and when appropriate, noted corrections or additional detail that will be added to the RSP.

Item 3 – Impact of NEEWS Project on Lake Road Location

Mr. Brent Oberlin (ISO) provided an overview regarding the impact of NEEWS on the Lake Road area and its electrical location in the transmission topology. Mr. Oberlin reviewed the history of the resource interconnection and system changes since 2002. The conclusion of the internal review determined that from an electrical perspective, the Lake Road resource will be considered inside the Connecticut import interface.

Some clarification questions were asked and responded to by Mr. Oberlin.

Item 4 – Greater Hartford Central Connecticut (GHCC) Needs Assessment

Mr. Pradip Vijayan (ISO) provided an overview of the Greater Hartford Central Connecticut (GHCC) Needs Assessment and reviewed changes to the scope of work originally present to the PAC on March 16, 2011 in addition to a review of the thermal, voltage, and short circuit needs.

Some clarification questions were asked and responded to by Mr. Vijayan.

Item 5 - Greater Hartford Central Connecticut (CHCC) Market Resource Alternative Update

Mr. Justice Ansah Nyarko (ISO) provided an overview of the Greater Hartford Central Connecticut (CHCC) Market Resource Alternative. Provided project background Assumptions and supply side preliminary results.

Q – Will you consider a hybrid analysis of supply side and demand side?

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

Additional clarification questions regarding the values and assumptions provided in the presentation were asked and responded to by Mr. Nyarko.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:00 PM