



Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative

**SSC Conference Call Summary
November 22, 2010**

This meeting summary highlights SSC decisions, key discussion items, and next steps from the November conference call/ webinar of the EIPC Stakeholder Steering Committee. **Please note that the next SSC meeting will be in Charlotte, NC, on December 13-14.**

The meeting agenda and presentations are available in their entirety at www.eipconline.com.

SSC Members in Attendance (by sector)

End Users: Alice Jackson, Ryan Kind, Sonny Popowsky

Generation Owners: Steve Gaw, Michael Goggin, Volpe

NGOs: Mark Brownstein, Andy Oliver, Beth Sohlt

Other Suppliers: Herb Healy, Dennis Sobieski

Public Power/TDUs: Paul Malone, Tim Noeldner, Maryam Sharif

States: Lauren Azar, Lib Fleming, Kevin Gunn, Valerie Lemmie, Scott Morris, Doug Nazarian, Paul Suskie, Jim Volz

Transmission Owners: Will Kaul, Tamara Linde, Stuart Nachmias

Ex-officio: Joe Bryson (EPA), David Meyer (DOE)

Presenters and Speakers

Roy Thilly, SSC Chair; Kevin Gunn, SSC Vice Chair; Catherine Morris, The Keystone Center; Dave Whiteley, EIPC; John Lucas, EIPC RUWG Liaison; Wil Burns, RUWG Co-Chair; Flora Flygt, EIPC SPWG Liaison and SPWG Chair; Erin Hogan, Co-Chair of MWG; Mary Ellen Paravalos, Co-Chair of MWG

1. Report from EIPC Roll-Up Team on revised Roll-Up
(John Lucas, Southern Company, EIPC RUWG liaison)

- John Lucas gave an overview of the contents of the revised Roll-Up report
- A webinar will be held to review the revised Roll-Up Report on Nov. 30 at 10:30 a.m. ET
- A report containing 3 additional sections will be completed in late Dec/ early Jan.

2. Roll-Up WG (RUWG) report on development of baseline infrastructure criteria progress
(Wil Burns, RUWG co-chair)

- Wil Burns described the status of RUWG discussion of potential criteria for baseline infrastructure, given that the RUWG has not yet decided on a recommendation to the SSC.
- Lauren Azar clarified the EISPC's position: at last week's EISPC meeting, they voted that the Baseline Infrastructure should include only transmission projects that are:
 - In service by 2015,
 - Categorized as "planned" and

- Required for reliability purposes

with the added possibility of facilities excluded being added back in through a petition process, in which exceptions would be considered on the basis of “reasonable certainty,” with a general “when in doubt, leave it out” approach. These criteria refer to transmission projects only, not generation.

- David Whiteley mentioned his concern about removing some reliability projects and therefore creating an “unreliable” starting point -- it should be emphasized that the Baseline Infrastructure is for informational purposes only, and is not the actual result of regional planning processes
- The RUWG’s next steps for the development of the Baseline Infrastructure criteria are to review the Revised Roll-Up Report, work on developing RUWG recommendations, try to reach consensus with SPWG, and put recommended criteria forward for decision at the December 13 & 14 SSC meeting.

3. EIPC Proposal for Transmission approach in NEEM analysis

(David Whiteley, EIPC project manager)

- David Whiteley gave a brief overview of the slides that had been previously presented at EISPC and the CRA/EIPC workshop in early November which propose a 5-step process for dealing with transmission topography changes and transmission costs in the MRN-NEEM model ([see slides online here](#)).

4. Criteria for Futures selection

(Flora Flygt, SPWG chair)

- Flora Flygt gave an overview of the SPWG’s proposed criteria for selecting Futures, which include:
 - Diversity of forecast assumptions
 - Diversity of key drivers
 - Diversity of perceived transmission outcomes
 - Plausibility
- These criteria will act more like objectives / aims than as a basis for eliminating Futures.
- Some were concerned about the plausibility criterion. It was agreed that this would be modified, thus: “...each future must be generally plausible – **that is, not impossible** –...”
- **The SSC accepted the Futures Selection criteria, including the aforementioned modification, with no objections.**

5. High-level BAU Futures description

(Flora Flygt)

- Flora gave an overview of the SPWG’s proposed high-level BAU description.
- Lauren Azar pointed out that EISPC’s proposed BAU has current policies with built-in expiration dates continue, rather than “sunset,” as they would in the SPWG’s proposal.
- Joe Bryson will work with the SPWG to create an accurate list of currently proposed EPA regulations to be included in the BAU description.
- **The SSC did not make a decision on the BAU description, and deferred the approval of this Future to the December SSC meeting, where it will be examining all 8 of the SPWG’s proposed Futures.**

6. MWG/SPWG update on proposed approach for defining inputs
(Flora Flygt & Erin Hogan)

- Most parties (SPWG, MWG, SSC, EISPC) seem to be in agreement about the need for developing inputs for one future first, and sending that through the modeling process, so learning can be incorporated into developing the inputs for the remaining Futures.
- Though many have operated on the assumption that the BAU will be the first case, this has not been formally agreed upon. The SSC should decide on the first Future at the December SSC meeting, so the SPWG and MWG can initiate the process of developing inputs during the joint WG meeting following the SSC meeting.
 - Lauren Azar will talk with EISPC executive committee about having EISPC vote on this issue prior to the December SSC meeting.
- After the first Future has been run through the model, the SSC will agree upon the inputs for the remaining 7 Futures and submit them to CRA either in groupings of 3 or 4, or as a package of 7, by the end of March.
 - Some expressed concern over submitting the sensitivities at the same time as the Futures.

7. Chairs' Update on upcoming events and schedule
(Roy Thilly, SSC Chair & Kevin Gunn, SSC Vice-Chair)

- Selection of the first case to be specified and sent to CRA will be added to the December SSC Agenda.
- The EIPC/DOE agreement related to open meetings will be discussed at the December SSC meeting.
- The results of the January SSC conference call scheduling poll will be made available soon.
- The survey results from the October SSC meeting indicated a strong preference for consistency in meeting locations, with Chicago and Washington/Baltimore as the preferred locations.
 - If stakeholders have additional feedback about locations, particularly whether they are amenable to selecting hotels farther away from airports, they should convey this as soon as possible to Keystone or the SSC Chair or Vice Chair.
- The Chair and Vice Chair requested that the SSC be open to requests for waivers on the 2-week deadline for materials related to meeting materials.

8. Next Steps

- Keystone will circulate a draft agenda for the December 13th -14th SSC meeting.