



# ATC Network Customer Meeting Planning Update

*June 26, 2008*

Paul Roehr, Director - Reliability and Interconnections

Dale Burmester, Manager - Economic Planning





# Planning Update

- Major Projects - Roehr
- ATC Energy Collaborative - MI - Roehr
- Wind - Roehr
- Order 890 - Burmester
- Economic Planning - Burmester
- MISO RGOS & NCA Studies - Burmester



# Major Projects Update

- Paddock-Rockdale
  - 35 Mile 345kV line (est. cost of \$133M)
  - PSCW Approval received 6/13/2008
  - First transmission project within MISO footprint approved with economics as the need driver
  - Significant economic savings expected in 6 of 7 futures
    - NPV benefits projected at \$82M - \$1.8B
    - Annual net benefits at \$7M - \$133M



# Major Projects Update

- Rockdale-West Middleton (Cardinal)
  - 345kV line (est. cost of \$214M / \$230M)
  - CPCN Application filed with PSCW 10/15/08
  - Several data requests from PSCW have been answered, to date
  - Currently waiting on completeness review determination
  - Estimated schedule
    - Public Hearings: fall / winter 2008
    - PSCW decision: sometime in 2009
    - In-service date: by end of 2013

The title "ATC Energy Collaborative – MI" is written in a large, bold, yellow font. It is positioned in the upper left quadrant of the slide, partially overlapping a blue curved graphic element that sweeps across the top. In the background, there is a photograph of electrical insulators and power lines against a clear blue sky.

# ATC Energy Collaborative – MI

- Objective is to evaluate needs of the Upper Peninsula using a strategic flexibility approach
- Plan to work closely with stakeholders to:
  - Customize ATC corporate futures for UP
  - Brainstorm wide range of alternatives
  - Perform evaluation with reliability and economic models
  - Make recommendations for overall solutions

The title "ATC Energy Collaborative - MI" is displayed in a large, bold, yellow font. It is positioned over a blue background that features a curved black line and a photograph of electrical insulators in the upper left corner.

# ATC Energy Collaborative - MI

- Timeline
  - May – Jun 2008: Initial stakeholder meetings
  - Jul – Sep 2008: Develop study models and perform analysis
  - Oct – Dec 2008: Review findings with stakeholders and select primary and secondary alternatives for each future
  - Jan 2009: Share results and make final recommendations to ATC Executives
  - Feb – Apr 2009: Develop scope documents needed for projects





# Wind

- Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) Legislation
  - Wisconsin currently at 15% by 2015
  - Gov. Doyle’s Global Warming Task Force looking at recommendations of “25” by “25”
  - PSCW Wind on the Water Task Force
  - National RPS legislation under consideration
    - Obama supports national “25” by “25” standard
    - McCain voted against RPS in 2005 but is leading support for climate change legislation







# Wind – G/T

- Interconnection queue challenges
  - Project suspensions hold up more serious projects
  - First “in” pays all
- Proposed queue improvements
  - Tests for “seriousness” of a project to get into latter stages of process
  - No “free option” for suspension of interconnection agreement
  - Make it more difficult to stall the queue; may allow projects to “park” while others continue





# Order 890 Update

- ATC's Attachment FF/K
  - Filed December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2007
    - ATC filing was coordinated with MISO filing
    - Other Transmission Owners in MISO did not file
  - Tariff effective February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008
- FERC orders – May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2008
  - OA08-42-000 Minor Modifications to ATC filing
    - How will ATC treat generation and demand resources comparably?
    - How will ATC recover planning costs?
  - OA08-53-000 Modifications to MISO filing
    - All Transmission Owner filed projects should be subjected to same level of scrutiny, regardless of their own 890 filing
    - However, MISO must revise to demonstrate how local stakeholder input will be received prior to the Sub-regional Planning Meeting (SPM)



# Economic Planning

- Customer/Stakeholder June 19<sup>th</sup> Meeting
  - Summarized feedback received on key drivers, study assumptions and project recommendations
  - Reviewed “final” drivers and study assumptions: Peak load and energy growth rates, Natural gas costs, CO2 tax, Amount and location of renewables, amount and location of low-cost generation within ATC, and transmission additions (including CapX 2020)
  - Next steps
  - All meeting materials, including summary of feedback received posted at:

<http://www.atc10yearplan.com/A8.shtml>



# Regional Generation Outlet Study (RGOS)

Midwest ISO observing 2 significant drivers for transmission expansion

- Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS)
- generation interconnection queue.
- Focus on **complying** with RPS of 4 states (MN, IA, WI, IL)
- Study timetable: Apr 2008 - Feb 2009 (mimics MTEP09/JCSP)
- Two “futures” taken from MTEP09/JCSP process:
  - Reference
  - Limited Investment (formerly Regulatory)
- Run 2 variants of each Future (as bookends)
  - Locally site RPS within each state or
  - Regionally site RPS (based on best DOE siting in neighboring states)
- 15 year focus (like JCSP)
  - Original focus was 5-10 years out
- ID'd projects will be coordinated with MTEP09/JCSP





# Narrow Constrained Areas (NCAs)

A Narrow Constrained Area:

- IMM identified as binding for at least five hundred (500) hours during a given 12-month period.
- Three NCAs in MISO:
  - Northern WUMS
  - WUMS
  - Minnesota NCA (SE\_MN, N\_IA, SW\_WI )
- Midwest ISO Study:
  - Analyze the NCAs, estimate the cost of the associated congestion, develop and test potential solutions for mitigation, and determine the benefit to cost ratio of mitigation plans for the NCAs on an individual basis.
  - ATC has asked MISO to leverage information from existing studies:
    - PR analysis demonstrates congestion in WUMS << 500 hrs
  - MISO initial 2011 analysis confirms that WUMS & N\_WUMS << 500 hrs
- May 08 - 2008, 2011 and 2016 PROMOD cases used to analyze each NCA
- May 08 - Technical Review Group (TRG) examines initial results and develop mitigation plans, if needed
- June 08 - Determine Benefit/Cost of mitigation & TRG review
- July 08 - Reliability test of effective plans





# Questions?