

Ken Lotterhos:

Question 1 –

Regarding Section 5.4 Linear Transfer Analysis Results – Tables 1 and 2, is there any correlation between these two tables and the types of transfers listed in the matrix for the MRN-NEEM analysis? They don't seem to match up.

The linear transfers performed on the Roll Up case comprised of different transfers between different defined areas than the NEEM regions; therefore, there is little, if any, correlation between Tables 1 and 2 found in Section 5.4 of the Roll Up report and the transfer limits determined for use in the MRN-NEEM model.

Question 2 –

Regarding Appendix E: Area Interchange Schedules, he didn't see a schedule for the ISO New England to New York Zone JK area transfer on the NNC tie (100 MW?) listed in the interchange schedule.

In Appendix E, ISO-NE and NYISO didn't separate the NNC tie out from the rest of the tie lines between the two areas. The 100 MW transfer is included in the 81 MW total on all AC ties between NYISO and ISO-NE. This is consistent with the way other phase-shifter-regulated ties between New York and New England are treated, such as the phase shifters at Blissville, VT and Sandbar, VT, which are also lumped into the 81 MW total.

Question 3 –

Regarding Flowgates, can we identify which lines/elements make up each of the flowgates?

Appendix D of the Roll Up report provides the limiting facilities, or flowgates, for the linear transfer analyses performed on the Roll Up case.

Wil Burns:

Question 1 –

Regarding Gap Analysis in Section 3, several issues are identified with respect to potential contingencies and then facility issues. It was a little confusing as to how this fit in with the creation of the Roll Up case. The way it was explained was that the Roll Up case was created and solved, and there were no contingencies that

caused any violations. But then there is the Gap Analysis that seems to show some potential facility issues based on certain contingencies. Can you explain how the Gap Analysis may be different from the NERC planning tests that were done?

The objective of this screening analysis was to identify potential power flow interactions from an interconnection wide perspective that may have resulted from the effects of one Planning Authority's plans on another. Potential gaps were identified and reported in Section 3 of the Roll-Up report. The potential gaps are contingent violations in the 2020 Roll-Up model. The understanding that there were no contingent violations in the case is incorrect. Potential solutions (Section 4 of the Roll-Up report) will be referred to the regional planning processes of the Planning Authorities for detailed assessments. As noted in the Roll-Up report, detailed analysis may or may not indicate a need for system upgrades in future planning cycles.

Question 2 –

Regarding the Roll Up case, when the case was initially created there were certain types of NERC testing performed, possibly categories A and B, and that's really the question – was it A, B and C or something else?. Starting with the Roll Up case, what type of NERC contingency testing was performed on the case? How was the system stressed prior to contingency analysis? There is the NERC critical system stress, was anything done for this? How is the Gap Analysis different from what was found in these NERC tests?

Per the SSMLFWG Procedural Manual located on the EIPC website (http://eipconline.com/uploads/SMLFWG_Procedure_Manual_Rev0_Final.pdf), each PA performed reliability analyses applicable to their planning area practices and individual requirements. The summer peak condition is considered a stressed or critical system condition per NERC TPL standards.

The same questions apply for the Baseline Infrastructure case. It is still somewhat confusing as to how the Gap Analysis seems to show potential issues and how it contrasts to what else was done.

The Baseline Infrastructure case was a stakeholder requested case where limited, if any, reliability analysis was performed. The PAs had previously determined that facilities included in the Roll Up case were needed to meet the reliability needs of

their area. The Baseline Infrastructure case was not supported by the PAs as being a reliability based case.

Question 3 –

Regarding transfer limits, he had submitted specific questions, similar to what Ken was talking about, with respect to - how do you go from these linear transfer analyses to (come up with) the specific NEEM limits that were used? There doesn't seem to be any real explanation of that and there's been very little transparency in it. No explanation as of yet as to how the NEEM transfer limits were produced.

The description of how each NEEM transfer limit was determined was provided along with the transfer limits and are located on the EIPC website:

http://eipconline.com/uploads/NEEM_Transfer_Limits_Input_Descriptions_FINAL_2-5-11.xlsx Additionally, there were multiple conference calls to address specific questions regarding the NEEM transfer limits. There were very few questions during those calls.