

D R A F T

**Connecticut Energy Advisory Board**  
**IRP Subcommittee**  
**Teleconference Meeting**  
March 24, 2010 Meeting Minutes

A CEAB conference call meeting of the Connecticut Energy Advisory Board (CEAB) IRP Subcommittee was held at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 24, 2010. CEAB subcommittee members on the call were Michael Cassella (Board Chair); Jeff Gaudiosi (Board Vice Vice Chair); Tim Cole; Paul Nuñez; and Paul Farrell and Rick Rodrigue, designees of the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). Other Board members on the call were Joel Gordes; Melissa Buckley; and Kevin Hennessy. Daniel Peaco, John Athas, Shawn Carraher and Jane Stahl of La Capra Associates were also on the call.

Ms. Carraher summarized the process going forward. La Capra will incorporate comments received from Board members and input from today's session into a revised draft document and circulate it to the Board by close of business Monday, March 29<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Cassella thanked La Capra for all the progress that has been made in getting the document to where it is.

Ms. Carraher summarized the visions section of the draft.

Mr. Gordes suggested adding "secure" to the third bullet in the vision so it reads:

"Transforms the State's generation fleet to be cleaner, more efficient, and more secure and flexible."

In discussing the goals section of the draft, Ms. Carraher noted that Mr. Cassella had some comments related to RPS. Mr. Cassella expressed his opinion that meeting RPS standards not be a goal in CEAB's document but be recognized as a planning constraint.

During the discussion of the draft's findings section, Mr. Cole recommended that CEAB present integrated solutions based on metrics relative to costs. He also cautioned on being to exuberant regarding the potential of shale.

Messrs. Cole and Gordes felt the security findings as presented were not comprehensive enough. Energy security impact statements should be incorporated in the document. The EDC's document this year didn't expand on security anymore than their previous IRPs.

Ms. Carraher next reviewed the three recommendations to present to DPUC contained in the draft.

1. Refocus the C&LM strategy to implement all cost-effective demand side resource potential using a broader mix of funding and financing approaches.

Board members discussed strategies to keep ratepayer contribution levels flat while finding ways to finance pursuing all cost-effective demand side resources. DSM targets in the draft are in line with those of the ECMB.

2. Conduct procurement in 2010 to secure cost-effective renewable resources sized to meet 2015 RPS requirements.

There was extensive discussion of this recommendation. It reflects a moderate position on renewables and factors in instate renewables as well. Members discussed possible impacts of proposed legislation. Mr. Cassella thinks the Board should take bold positions and not worry about what might happen in other arenas but just state what they think should be done.

## D R A F T

It was decided that a subset of the Board will reconvene to address this recommendation further.

3. Conduct a procurement for one or two efficient combined cycle gas units or comparable facilities (i.e., 500 to 1,000 MW) targeted for operation by 2016.

This is a proactive recommendation. Mr. Cole likes it because it incorporated CHP.

The next session of the draft contained general energy planning recommendations for Connecticut.

1. Require Non-Transmission Alternatives Assessments (NTA)

Board members questioned whether EDCs could be relied on to prepare robust NTAs. Some members support an energy department not an energy authority to perform such tasks and to be involved in ISO planning activities so the state is a participant further upstream in the regional planning process.

2. Strengthen connections with ISO-NE, NESCOE and other regional organizations whose decision making directly impacts electric system costs for Connecticut and explore transmission alternatives processes that need to start earlier and be more integrated with NE-ISO in order to be able to consider the potential of the market; eliminate untimely, burdensome RFP process.

This recommendation generated more discussion on a possible energy department for the state. Such a department was seen as an entity which would do policy and planning and not procurement. The organization might look something like NYSERDA or the California Energy Commission. This discussion ties to planning Recommendation 5.

3. Conduct a review of the State Renewables Policy to determine if there are opportunities to lower the cost of achieving the environmental benefits that the RPS was designed to meet.

Overall discussion of Renewables was covered earlier in the call.

4. Identify and remove regulatory barriers to CHP and DE development

Ms. Healey suggested revised wording for this recommendation. Mr. Cole referenced the paper on CHP included in the report.

5. Develop a proposal for the legislature to Restructure Connecticut's Energy Related Entities to Provide a Single Entity for Oversight and Accountability

This recommendation ties in to the discussion of general recommendations 1 and 2 above.

6. Proceed with CASE to study the State capabilities for nuclear energy options.

Due to the sensitivity of many members of the public on this recommendation, the Board cautioned that careful final wording of the recommendation is needed.

Next steps will be to digest input received today and previously and incorporate it into a revised draft to distribute to the full Board by the end of the day Monday, March 29.

An off line discussion is planned with Joel and Tim on security and there will be an opportunity to circle back on renewables.

Tim should receive information on load and demographics by the end of the week.

The call concluded at 2:45 p.m.