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About the Study

- The ISO is conducting a scenario analysis for NEPOOL to inform regional stakeholder discussions about the effects of public policies on the future electric power system.
- What’s *not* included in the study: recommendations, a transmission plan, resolution of technical or market issues.
The ISO Has Organized the Study into Two Phases

- **Phase I** – A traditional economic study analysis that utilizes assumptions provided by stakeholders and shows their effect on factors like the future resource mix and energy market prices (completed in 2016)

- **Phase II** – The ISO will supplement Phase I in 2017 by discussing additional market and operational issues, such as projected Forward Capacity Market prices, regulation, ramping and reserve requirements, and natural gas deliverability issues

- Study materials are available on the Planning Advisory Committee webpage: [https://www.iso-ne.com/committees/planning/planning-advisory](https://www.iso-ne.com/committees/planning/planning-advisory)
NEPOOL Identified Resource Scenarios

The scenarios include a range of potential futures to address system needs as generators retire or demand grows, and fall into two general categories:

1. Closer to current system and planned development of resources (Scenarios 1, 4, 5)

2. Effects of large amounts of renewable/clean energy resources (Scenarios 2, 3, 6)
NEPOOL’s Six Base Scenarios

1. **RPS + Gas:** Physically meet Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) and replace generator retirements with natural gas (combined cycle units)

2. **ISO Queue:** Physically meet RPS and replace generator retirements with new renewable/clean energy

3. **Renewables Plus:** Physically meet RPS, add renewable/clean energy, EE, PV, PEV, storage, retire old generating units

4. **No Retirements (beyond FCA #10):** Meet RPS with resources under development and use RPS Alternative Compliance Payments (ACP) for shortfalls, add natural gas units

5. **Gas + ACPs:** Meet RPS with resources under development and use ACP, replace retirements with natural gas

6. **RPS + Geodiverse Renewables:** Scenario 2 with a more geographically balanced mix of on/offshore wind and solar PV
Highlights of Study Metrics

• Total energy production for each resource type (terawatt-hours)

• Relative Annual Resource Cost (RARC) encompassing all components (billions of dollars and cents per kWh)
  – Systemwide production costs ($M/year)
  – Capital costs of resource additions
  – Preliminary high-level, order-of-magnitude transmission-development costs ($ billion)

• Energy market contributions to fixed costs ($/kW-year)

• Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) emissions (Million tons)

• Full study contains additional metrics:
  – Load-serving entity (LSE) energy expense ($ million)
  – Average locational marginal prices (LMPs) ($/MWh)
  – Transmission interface flows (% of interface ratings)
RESULTS SUMMARY
Key Findings

• Some scenarios yielded lower production costs and emissions, but higher relative annual resource costs
  – Would require significant transmission expansion and investment in new resources, particularly for wind power development in northern New England

• Across all scenarios, revenues from the energy market are insufficient to cover a new resource’s fixed costs
  – Would require other revenue sources to be economically viable
Energy by Source Varies Across Scenarios in 2030

*Natural gas is on the margin most of the time across all scenarios*

---

**Notes:** TWh: Terawatt-hours; Unconstrained transmission shown in left column; constrained transmission shown in right column.
Transmission Constraints Have a Noticeable Impact in Scenarios with Heavy Onshore Wind

Wind Energy Output in 2030

*Wind-power output increases when transmission is unconstrained*
Comparing Total Costs of All Scenarios

• The Relative Annual Resource Cost (RARC) metric is a means of comparing the total costs of all six scenarios

• RARC compares the annualized carrying costs assumed for new resource additions, order-of-magnitude transmission costs for integrating resources, and production-cost savings for each scenario

• Scenarios with more onshore wind see higher increases in transmission costs

• Scenarios with more PV and offshore wind see higher increases in new resource development costs
Renewable Resources Have *Lower* Production Costs, but *Higher* Relative Annual Resource Costs

Capital Cost of Developing Resources, Annualized

2030 Case with Transmission System Constrained
Greater Transmission Investment Is Required to Unlock Onshore Wind in Maine
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Energy Market Revenues Are Insufficient to Cover a Resource’s Fixed Costs; Other Revenues Are Needed for Economic Viability

- Energy market revenues are depressed by:
  - Zero-cost resources
  - Competition of natural gas units
  - Low capacity factors of fossil units

**Key:**
- Light blue: Revenue needed from other sources
- Dark blue: Contribution to fixed costs

---

**Offshore wind resources see the largest revenue gap**

- **RPS+Gas**
- **ISO Queue**
- **Renewables Plus**
- **No Retirements**
- **Gas+ACP**
- **RPS+GeoDiv. Renewables**

- Annual PV
- Annual NGCC
- Annual GT
- Annual Off-Shore
- Offshore Wind #1
- Offshore Wind #2
- Massachusetts PV
- Massachusetts Wind
- Maine Wind
- Simple Cycle GT
**CO₂ Emissions Vary with Amount of Zero-Emitting Resources**

Renewable-heavy scenarios would fall below or within the range of RGGI goals, but transmission constraints could pose a challenge.

Note: “Non RGGI” includes smaller resources not subject to the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative.
Challenges and Solutions for Large-Scale Renewable Integration

- Lack of traditional spinning resources (and addition of asynchronous resources including EE, PV, wind, and HVDC imports) may pose physical challenges
  - Issues include need to address system protection, power quality, voltage regulation, regulation, ramping, and reserves
- Special control systems may be required, especially to stabilize the system and provide frequency control
- Efficient storage technologies would help facilitate the integration of variable resources
Questions