

## **MWG Call – 3/16/11**

### Summary

**Attendees:** MWG – Ryan K., Erin H., Tyler R., Tim C., Hischam C., Jeff K., Paul McC., Mark V., Dennis B., Stan H., Michael G., Bob S., Samir S., Flora F. (EIPC), Catherine M. (Keystone)

#### **1. EISPC Recommendation on Future 7 (Jeff K.)**

EISPC is looking for CRA to explain why they cannot add modular nuclear if the parameters are specified by the SSC. If it is a budget and schedule issue, the SSC will need clarification from EIPC. In the meantime, EISPC proposes the following characterization of modular nuclear (see spreadsheet with assumptions):

- Incremental size for the next build will be smaller at 125 MW (not the smallest-scale)
- Capital costs – no units in operation; DOE nuclear experts suggest that it will be equal to or cheaper than large nuclear on \$/KW
- Availability - 2020 first units added to NEEM
- Licensing & construction time – no approved design; but estimated to be 6-7 years construction time to be a year or 2 less than large
- Learning rate – 15% which is faster than 10% assumed for large nuclear
- All other assumptions would be the same for large nuclear (e.g. lifetime, O&M, decommissioning costs, siting considerations, transmission cost adder, etc.)
- The MWG will forward EISPC's position to the SSC for further discussion without further discussion or a consensus recommendation.

#### **2. Preparation for the meeting - materials for distribution on Mar. 21<sup>st</sup>**

- Reviewed the draft agenda and discussed the best way of presenting the recommendations; suggested that we may want to put the big issues like super regions and carbon prices first and also match Future 2 & 5 (National) and 3&6 (Regional)
- Erin and Catherine will review the time constraints to see if that would work better
- The word document entitled MWG Recommendations on MRN-NEEM Model inputs will be the starting place for summarizing all information for the SSC.
- Erin reminded the sub-team leads responsible for the inputs to include the pros and cons when options are presented.
- Members should provide background documents to support the work of the subteams to Catherine if they would like them distributed along with the recommendations.
- Wil cautioned that we shouldn't rely on the SSC reading the background documents; put enough explanation in the Word doc so it stands on its own.
- An executive summary needed?

#### **3. Stan Hadley overview of Google Docs for model inputs**

- General tab provides assignment information and comments. There is a separate worksheet for each Future with consistent nomenclature. Stan will highlight the inputs that need to be changed from the BAU.
- Can create a new tab for Sensitivities if it will involve significant changes.

#### **4. Sub-Team updates**

- New generation subteam – Intermittency Regions – 3 inter-related issues: a) penetration limits for renewables; b) the geographic scope for applying the limits (Super regions, NEEM regions or Intermittency regions); and c) the contribution to reserve margin
- Also under discussion is whether to distinguish between the penetration limits in the national and regional Futures.
- Have 2 or 3 options for consideration by the SSC.

**NEXT CALL – WED., MAR.23, 3:00 PM**