

Summary of Modeling WG Call #7
Wednesday, Oct. 27, 3:30 PM ET

Official/designated WG members in attendance: Mary Ellen Paravalos, Erin Hogan, Doug Hurley, Ryan Kind, Alice Jackson, Paul McCurley, Dennis Sobieski, Doug Kallesen, Doug Gotham, Valerie Lemmie, Hisham Choueiki, Matt Schuerger, Will Burns, Samir Succar, Steve Chui, Mike Li (DOE), John Buechler (EIPC). Facilitator: Catherine Morris (Keystone).

1. Co-chairs for MWG: Erin Hogan & Mary Ellen Paravalos were confirmed.
2. Report from SPWG on development of “indicative” BAU case
 - Alice Jackson, member of SPWG and MWG, review the EISPC BAU case forwarded to CRA, Fri., Oct. 22 as the indicative case for the Joint MWG/SPWG Workshop on Nov. 8-9.
 - BAU has no new transmission beyond Baseline. Discussion on how will it accommodate the existing State RPS and other policies? John B. responded that in some cases the PAs have included the necessary transmission for existing state policies and this will be provided in the revised Roll-up Case.
 - Discussion of whether Baseline Infrastructure will be the starting place and the same for all the Futures. Alice suggested that this was the direction from the SSC at the Oct. meeting.
 - John B. provided a high-level description of the EIPC/CRA process for addressing transmission in the MRN-NEEM model. If a future includes forced resources, an estimate of the transmission needed to bring the power the bulk level will be added; otherwise the model with build out generation resources and identify congestion points. Planning authorities will look at a high level of facilities needed to resolve congestion.
 - Other attributes of BAU - Fuel Prices remain stable, which the SPWG interpreted as a continuation of historic price trends; Shale gas is viable; nuclear licenses are extended; State Energy Efficiency plans continue; any regulations currently in place are met EPA carbon regulations are excluded – b/c they are too uncertain.
 - Discussion of whether transmission can be treated as a sensitivity? For instance, could we do a blanket 10% increase in transmission capacity to see if it changes the outcome?

NEXT STEPS:

- SPWG is continuing to work to bring the 2 (EISPC and SPWG) BAUs together, with a more detail and more user friendly format. Cleaner version will be provided next Tues.
- John B. agreed to take request from MWG to CRA for information at the Joint WG Workshop, e.g.
 - Map the BAU Future to the CRA inputs
 - Critical Drivers/Inputs of model
 - Internal workings of the model
 - Whether stakeholder experts could “get under the hood” of the model
 - Advice on adjusting the NEEM regions or “bubbles” and the impact on model outcomes

3. Review of CRA forecast data sources provided Oct. 26th
 - WG members agreed that this is helpful information and further review and questions will be taken up at the Nov. 8-9 Workshop
 - Data provided could serve as the default data unless directed by the SSC to change for specific Futures;

NEXT STEPS:

- John B. – just received updates to tables 2 & 3; will be sent out after the call
 - WG members should send questions in advance to John B. by THIS FRI.
 - Steve Chui would like to recommend corrected values for Canada; will present at Nov. 8-9 or later
 - WG members interested in looking at EPRI PRISM data as an alternative could access it for a fee, according to Sarah Inwood, EPRI staff. As part of the access, TAG WAG can be used to get state-specific capital costs of generation. Sarah mentioned that Integrated Generation Technology Options is non-proprietary and comes out annually. SEE - Report 1019539 for 2009. Cost estimates based on recommendations of project engineers.
 - Samir recommended taking a look at Midwest Governor's Futures project data, particularly on nuclear and geothermal capital costs. EIA AEO is low on these capital costs, in his opinion.
 - Erin will find out when EIA AEO 2011 be released for more current data.
4. Outcomes / objectives for Joint MWG/SPWG Meeting
 - Understanding the Inputs to CRA model; link to outputs
 - Understanding the level of detail required and the effort required to complete the task.
 - Prioritizing the most important inputs because of impact on outputs
 - How transmission constraints impact the outputs of the model
 - Understand how inconsistencies in the Roll-up Case assumptions might impact the outputs of CRA model
 5. Input on agenda:
 - Several people endorsed breakout groups;
 - Erin suggested a breakout group on MRN and another on NEEM with CRA expert in each.
 - One member was less enthusiastic about breakouts
 - Not planning on exploring MAPS at this meeting.

NEXT STEPS:

- **NEXT WG CALL** – Nov. 3 to review the agenda; 30 minute check in;
- **WORKSHOP** - Nov.8- 9 Model WG will meet at the end of the Workshop if they complete their other work
- **Nov. 10 MWG CALL** If in-person meeting doesn't work.
- **DRAFT AGENDA** for Joint WG Workshop will be provided after review by EIPC and CRA