

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

**ISO New England Inc.**  
**Dockets 370A and 370B**

**Witness: Frank Mezzanotte**  
**Page 1 of 3**

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OCC-16**

**OCC-16**     **Reference the CEAB Evaluation Report to CSC, 2/17/09, p. 2, Item 3, stating that ISO-NE plans to revisit its needs assessment for NEEWS and similar projects.**

- (a) When will any revised needs assessment prepared by ISO-NE be available?**
- (b) Is it possible that ISO-NE's revised needs assessment would conclude that GSRP/MMP, and/or NEEWS, is not needed?**

**Supplemental Response:**

- (a) After review of the Needs Assessment, the ISO confirms that the timing of the need for the GSRP has not changed, as detailed herein. The GSRP should not be deferred.

The Needs Assessment was first presented to the Planning Advisory Committee ("PAC") in May 2005, and it described Springfield area criteria violations for 2009. A subsequent analysis presented to the PAC in May 2008 revealed that some of the violations had the possibility of occurring under certain system conditions even at a 50% load level, based on modeling the 2012 system.

The ISO has again reviewed the Needs Assessment and has determined that even with the reduced 2009 CELT load forecast and two successful Forward Capacity Auctions ("FCA"), the timing of the need for the GSRP remains unchanged. The basis for this determination is detailed below:

**Impact of 2009 CELT Load Forecast**

The original NEEWS needs assessment was based on the 2005 CELT load

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

**ISO New England Inc.**  
**Dockets 370A and 370B**

**Witness: Frank Mezzanotte**  
**Page 2 of 3**

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OCC-16 (Cont'd)**

forecast<sup>1</sup>. That forecast for the Western Massachusetts RSP Sub-Area appears in Table 1 below, alongside the 2009 forecast for the Western Massachusetts RSP Sub-Area. The comparison shows that the 2009 forecast for Western Massachusetts is very similar to the 2005 forecast for the years 2009-2011. Starting in 2012, the 2009 forecast overtakes the 2005, reaching a maximum difference of 109 MW in 2018.

The yellow-highlighted boxes in the table show the difference between the forecasted load for the year the projects are expected to be placed in-service (2014 – 2390 MW) as compared to the forecasted load that resulted in the need for all the projects (2009 – 2245 MW). The need was determined at a load level that was 145 MW less than what is now projected for the GSRP in-service date.

	2005	2009	with
	CELT	CELT	DR/Gen
2009	2245	2230	
2010	2265	2255	2157
2011	2290	2290	2192
2012	2310	2330	2232
2013	2320	2360	2262
2014	2335	2390	2292
2015	2350	2425	2327
2016	2365	2450	2352
2017	2381	2480	2382
2018	2396	2505	2407

**Table 1: WMA RSP Sub-area Load Forecast (MW)**

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Southern New England Transmission Reliability, Report 1, Needs Analysis’

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL**

**ISO New England Inc.**  
**Dockets 370A and 370B**

**Witness: Frank Mezzanotte**  
**Page 3 of 3**

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO OCC-16 (Cont'd)**

Impact of New FCA Resources

The Forward Capacity Auctions resulted in 95<sup>2</sup> MW of available New Demand Resources in Western Massachusetts. One New Generating Capacity Resource, with a Capacity Supply Obligation of 2.5 MW for the June 2011 Capacity Commitment Period cleared in FCA 2 in Western Massachusetts.

Factoring in the 97.5 MW of FCA resources to the 2014 forecasted load results in a summer peak of 2292 MW (shown in green in Table 1), which is still 47 MW greater than the load level tested that resulted in the Springfield area violations as described in the NEEWS needs assessment.

The ISO will present these findings at a PAC meeting this summer.

(b) Please see response to (a) above.

---

<sup>2</sup>The availability factors for Demand Resources in the Western Massachusetts are 90% for passive Demand Resources and 69% for active Demand Resources. Actual calculation:  $.60(88*.90 + 114*.69)=95$  MW