

- There is no mention of any loadings or resources coming from HQ or NB into NEISO!
 - These Transfer Limits were set by CRA and not calculated by the PA's.
- Did the PA utilize operating guides, re-dispatch, or other adjustments often used to increase transfer capability in interregional transfer studies in determining the initial values of FCITC?
 - Yes, if the operating guide, re-dispatch or other adjustment was agreed upon by the coordinating PA's.
- Did the PA consider limits due to terminal equipment, CT ratios, or other minor constraints to be local operating constraints which would be upgraded in the course of normal operations and therefore not valid limits in determining long range interregional transfer capability?
 - Yes, if the PA determined that it would be upgraded in the course of normal operations any minor constraint was assumed to be upgraded.
- Were there any subjective assumptions made in the development of the base case(s) which caused values of FCITC to be below those typically determined in interregional transfer studies?
 - No subjective assumptions were made in the base case development that would cause a value of transfer capability to be below those typically determined in interregional transfer studies.
- Are any of the zero values of FCITC actually negative and the result of N-1 overloads with only base case transactions? As such should these be mitigated to remedy TPL compliance issues before establishing base line values of FCITC?
 - No, there are no zero values.
- Since the results of this study are not intended to calculate ATC, is it appropriate to limit interregional FCITC to contract path capacity?
 - FERC tariff regulations limit the transfer capability to the lower of ATC or contract path capacity; such calculations do represent valid limits to interregional transfers that are enforced.
- When adjacent PAs calculate different values of FCITC is averaging the results the best way to resolve the difference? Are the results different because of variations in subsystem definition, facility ratings, contingency definitions, use of operating guides, or some other factors? For the purposes of this study should EIPC arbitrate a single value of FCITC instead of simple averaging?
 - The results were not averaged when there were different values between two PA's. Instead the PA's would investigate what might be contributing to the two different values and then mutually agree upon which value to use as the transfer limit.
- When the PA indicates that OASIS data was reviewed as part of the determination of interregional transfer capability does this imply that FCITC was decremented to account for reservations not included as schedules in the base case?
 - If OASIS data was reviewed in the determination of the transfer capability, it was used as a confirmation that the values that were determined from the linear transfer analysis were accurate.

- Are interregional transfer limits documented in operational guides applicable to model conditions forecast for 10 years in the future?
 - Interregional transfer limits applicable 10 years in the future are addressed according to regional practices. In some cases, operational guides were tested and validated based upon the system conditions seen in the year of the base case.
- The Steady-State Modeling Load-Flow Working Group Procedure Manual (Study Manual) mentions load flow cases of summer Peak, winter Peak, light load, shoulder peak, spring peak and fall peak. However, only a 2020 summer peak case has been provided. Further, the transfer limit analysis states that the limit is based on the most limiting case. Did EIPC use these additional cases in determining the transfer limits and, if so, will they be made available?
 - The Steady-State Modeling Load-Flow Working Group Procedure Manual (Study Manual) is only applicable to the development and analyses associated with the 2020 Roll-Up Case, and were not intended to be applicable to transfer analyses utilized in the determination of the NEEM transfer limits.
- As for the contingency file, the Study Manual says that “The contingency files will represent the contingency outage(s) of all transmission elements 230 kV and above and all transformers with a low-side voltage rating of 110 kV or above.” The limiting facilities and governing contingency for each interface needs to be identified.
 - The Steady-State Modeling Load-Flow Working Group Procedure Manual (Study Manual) is only applicable to the development and analyses associated with the 2020 Roll-Up Case, and were not intended to be applicable to transfer analyses utilized in the determination of the NEEM transfer limits.
- The transfer limit table has two areas, “NE” (ROW 19) and “NEISO” (ROW 20), why is New England defined twice?
 - NE is for Nebraska while NEISO is for New England ISO.
- How were the following sections of the Study Manual applied in EIPC’s transfer limit analysis;
 - Page 8 Section “Perform AC Analysis” should include “voltage limit” concept to be consistent with NERC standard.
 - Page 20 Section “Auxiliary Files Name Convention” should include the description of the “exclude” file and explain why those contingencies are excluded.
 - Page 31 Section “AC analysis” should include “voltage limit” calculation procedure to be consistent with NERC standard.
 - The Steady-State Modeling Load-Flow Working Group Procedure Manual (Study Manual) is only applicable to the development and analyses associated with the 2020 Roll-Up Case, and were not intended to be applicable to transfer analyses utilized in the determination of the NEEM transfer limits.