

## **ATC Access Study Initiative – July 21, 2005 Customer/Stakeholder Meeting**

On July 21, ATC held the third meeting in its 2005 Access Study Initiative (ASI) series to discuss the topic of transmission access with ATC Customers and interested Stakeholders. The purpose of this meeting series is to present and discuss the status and results of ASI study work done to date, to continue to collaboratively develop and evolve the “access value case”, and to solicit feedback, reaction, and ideas from meeting participants. All initiative materials, including meeting presentations and any follow up materials, are posted on the ATC OASIS page and can be found at <http://www.atcllc.com/IT2c.shtml>.

The following organizations were represented in person or via phone at the July 21 meeting:

- Adams Columbia Electric Cooperative
- Alliant Energy
- Badger Power Marketing Authority
- Citizens Utility Board
- Customers First! Coalition
- Dairyland Power Cooperative
- Exelon
- Madison Gas & Electric
- New Page Corporation
- Peabody Energy
- Public Service Commission of Wisconsin (PSCW)
- We Energies
- Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group
- Wisconsin Paper Council
- Wisconsin Public Power Inc
- Wisconsin Public Service

Following is a summary of Customer/Stakeholder feedback received at this meeting, categorized beneath the relevant meeting agenda item. If an agenda item is not mentioned below, it did not generate significant discussion, resulting in feedback or questions, at the meeting. See meeting materials for full agenda and presentation content.

### **PSCW Docket**

ATC has requested a two-week extension for its filing of updated ASI information with the PSCW. Subsequently, the request was granted. The filing will be made on August 15, 2005 under the Notice of Investigation (NOI) (Docket #137-EI-100). The dates on the schedule presented during the July 21, 2005 meeting will be shifted out by two weeks. ATC noted that the filing will include the various technical analyses and will quantify the “Other Factors” components where possible. In addition, the filing will present various potential cost sharing scenarios based on current Midwest ISO (MISO) Regional Expansion Criteria and Benefits Task Force (RECB) proposals. ATC will also present policy comments in the filing since ATC believes that the state needs more access and, therefore, that the state needs to decide, as a policy, what project, if any, ATC should pursue (i.e. the question for the PSCW is not just technical).

### PROMOD Analysis Update

ATC presented the results identified via PROMOD to-date. Revised baseline results were presented as well as the various sensitivities discussed at the last stakeholder meeting. The results include the impact of the identified major project along with any associated lower voltage facilities shown to produce additional savings. Stakeholders requested that ATC include in its filing the generation modeled in PROMOD, by state, along with relevant information for significant generation assumptions within ATC. ATC noted that the analysis assumed no generation retirements within ATC by 2013 since none have been announced, although one sensitivity did consider the removal from service of all three nuclear plants in ATC.

### Transfer Capability

ATC explained how the various project packages were identified and then presented the First Contingency Total Transfer Capability (FCTTC) results for each package. There was discussion regarding the FCTTC results since the capability identified is lower than the corresponding studies performed in 2004. ATC discussed the various issues that affect FCTTC and emphasized that the project packages in 2005 focused on maximizing production cost savings, not FCTTC. The projects required for maximum FCTTC for one hour at system peak are not necessarily identical to those needed to maximize production cost savings over the 8760 hours PROMOD analyzes.

### Other Factors

Christensen Associates (CA) presented the work they have been performing to either quantify or merit score the various “other factors” ATC has considered in the past. In addition, CA presented information on additional factors that are relevant to the ASI. Stakeholders provided comments to ATC and CA regarding the Expected Unserved Energy (EUE) results and quantification. ATC noted that the 2013 model contained violations of planning criteria and other projects may adequately mitigate the EUE without building one of the major projects in the ASI. During the Question and Answer time, the stakeholders offered comments on a number of issues. ATC noted that its filing will address the comments, where able, but strongly encouraged the stakeholders to provide these and any other comments to the PSCW for their consideration. ATC also noted that it would be following up with the Independent Market Monitor (IMM) on the Narrow Constrained Area (NCA) designation for ATC. The IMM will require a formal request to re-examine ATC but the IMM is primarily focused on this and the next year and not 2013. Additionally, MISO stakeholders have not given much thought to how to un-designate a NCA.