



Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative

SSC Conference Call Summary January 18, 2011

This meeting summary highlights SSC decisions, key discussion items, and next steps from the January 18th conference call/webinar held by the EIPC Stakeholder Steering Committee.

SSC Members in Attendance (by sector)

Canada: Rob Sinclair (alternate)

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, Bob Stein (alternate)

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

States: Lauren Azar, Lib Fleming, Kevin Gunn, Valerie Lemmie, Scott Morris, Doug Nazarian, Bob Pauley (alternate), Paul Suskie, Jim Volz, Marya White (alternate)

Transmission Owners: Will Kaul, Tamara Linde, Stuart Nachmias

Presenters and Speakers

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

1. Baseline Infrastructure challenges

- The SSC accepted all of the SSC challenges introduced to the EISPC Baseline Infrastructure proposal. These included:
 1. Unnamed 272 MW Coal Plant in PA (Excluded)
 2. Unnamed 600 MW Coal Plant in OH (Excluded)
 3. 120 MW Estill Energy Coal Plant (Excluded)
 4. Two 600 MW Longleaf Coal Units (Excluded)
 5. Three Coal Units representing 750 MW Mesaba Plant (Excluded)
 6. 790 MW NextGen Coal Plant (Excluded)
 7. 735 MW Plum Point Coal Plant Unit 2 (Excluded)
 8. Duplicate of 534 MW Wise County Energy Facility in VA (Excluded)
 9. Northeast Energy Link (Included)
- The SSC accepted the recommendations of Rob Sinclair, Ontario Power Authority and SSC member, on the Ontario transmission facilities that should be included in the BI. He made one correction to the list: exclude Nipigon to Crow River.
- A list of Canadian generation facilities to be included in the BI will be sent to SSC members within 24 hours of the conclusion of the call for their review.
- Once approved, the Baseline Infrastructure will be forwarded to David Whiteley so EIPC can model the BI and develop the transfer limits to be used in the MRN-NEEM model.

2. NEEM regions

- David Whiteley presented EIPC's latest proposal for the definition and configuration of the NEEM regions, noting that a pipe between MAPP and RMPA should be shown for accuracy.
- Mary Ellen Paravalos, co-chair of the Modeling WG, stated that the MWG had discussed the proposal and recommends that the SSC adopt the NEEM regions, as proposed.
- Lauren Azar reported that EISPC voted in favor of adopting the NEEM regions, as proposed.
- The SSC accepted the NEEM regions, as proposed by EIPC and recommended by the MWG.
 - SSC members discussed a concern about Nebraska being separated from SPP but there were no objections to the proposed regions and SSC members agreed to focus on the EIPC transfer capabilities between these regions.
 - David Whiteley stated that EIPC will work closely with the MWG to ensure that interchanges with Canada are modeled properly since it is not a NEEM region.

3. BAU sensitivities

- Flora Flygt of the Scenario Planning Working Group (and EIPC) presented the SPWG's recommended nine sensitivities for the BAU Future. The SSC's decisions on each are as follows:
 1. *Revised transfer capability*: The SSC wanted the description of this sensitivity to be amended in the following manner: "~~This sensitivity will allow for the transfer limits to be adjusted increased, per CRA and EIPC's recommendation related to the treatment of transmission in the MRN-NEEM model.~~" The SSC agreed that they need to make a decision on the approach that will be used to determine changes in the MRN-NEEM model (EIPC has proposed two alternatives still under consideration by the MWG), before adopting this sensitivity.
 2. *Interregional fee/dispatch barriers removed*: The SSC would like the SPWG and MWG to consider how removal of hurdle rates, transmission service charges, and other charges might interact with Sensitivity #1 before determining whether it is appropriate for BAU.
 3. *High load growth*: This sensitivity was approved.
 4. *Low load growth*: This sensitivity was approved.
 5. *High gas prices*: This sensitivity was approved.
 6. *Increase state EE/RPS requirements by 5% in absolute terms*: The SSC needs clarification from EISPC about what was intended by the original wording this sensitivity was based on ("Achievable state EE/RPS requirements"). Also, some SSC members would like assurance that DR is included in this sensitivity.
 7. *Higher PHEV levels*: This sensitivity was approved, with the caveat that it may need to be revised later to include DR if that issue isn't properly addressed in sensitivity #6.
 8. *Increased generation costs*: This sensitivity was approved.
 9. *No new non-carbon EPA regulations*: The SSC would prefer to review and approve all "Environmental Moderation" sensitivities as a package, and therefore they did not approve this sensitivity.

- All sensitivities not approved during this call will be up for decision at the February 7-8 SSC meeting.

4. Next steps/other items

- Keystone will circulate an agenda for the February meeting shortly.