Draft 2025 Longer-Term Transmission Planning RFP: Comment Form

NESCOE Comments

Please provide comments on the draft 2025 Longer-Term Transmission Planning RFP in the following table. ISO-NE will publish all responses on the Longer-Term Transmission Studies, Competitive Transmission, and Planning Advisory Committee pages of its website.

Document (Part 1, Part 1 Appendix A, or Part 2)	Page Number	Section/ Question Number	Comment
Part 1	2	1.4	Add key step related to posting high level summary for each proposal referenced in Section 3.7
Part 1	4	1.9	Section 1.9 Information Sharing Revise the language to also allow ISO-NE to share with NESCOE communications between bidders and ISO-NE that are associated with their Longer-Term Proposals. In the event the Supplemental Process is triggered, the states hold decisional authority over project selection. Therefore, the language needs to be revised to allow ISO-NE to share the Longer-Term Proposals and associated communications with designated persons employed or engaged by the States who have signed NDAs such that the States will have sufficient time and information for NESCOE to decide whether to take or not take the actions described in Attachment K § 16.4(j) (supplemental process).
Part 1	5	1.11	Add text to reflect federal permits may be needed in addition to state and municipal permits
Part 1, App. A	1	A Factors	Add text to reflect NESCOE's Dec 13 request: • Any cost cap or cost containment provisions ○ Evaluation may consider a number of different scenarios to understand the exposure to cost increases ○ ***Including considerations to manage consumer bill impacts (e.g., smoothing or other mechanisms to mitigate rate impacts)***
Part 1, App. A	1	A Factors	Add text to reflect NESCOE's Dec 13 request: • Potential siting/permitting issues or delays ○ ***Consideration of whether bidder has demonstrated a clear plan to get support through engagement (assess experience, engagement strategy)***

Document (Part 1, Part 1 Appendix A, or Part 2)	Page Number	Section/ Question Number	Comment
Part 2	1	Para 3	Revise the language to also allow ISO-NE to share with NESCOE communications between bidders and ISO-NE that are associated with their Longer-Term Proposals. In the event the Supplemental Process is triggered, the states hold decisional authority over project selection. Therefore, the language needs to be revised to allow ISO-NE to share the Longer-Term Proposals and associated communications with designated persons employed or engaged by the States who have signed NDAs such that the States will have sufficient time and information for NESCOE to decide whether to take or not take the actions described in Attachment K § 16.4(j) (supplemental process).
Part 2	2	Publicly Shared Information	The Short Summary should include general geographic description (e.g., substation at Pittsfield, ME)
Part 2	2	Publicly Shared Information	The Key Milestone Dates should include the projected in-service date for each requirement (LT-1, LT-2, LT-3)
Part 2	2	Para 1	There is a statement “For reconductoring and rebuilding, a required **maximum rating** may be specified for the interconnecting PTO to achieve.” Should this say “minimum rating”?
Part 2	9	3.2	Key Milestone Date Instructions should include the projected in-service date for each requirement (LT-1, LT-2, LT-3)
Part 2	15	3.13	For new stations, should the design thermal and short circuit characteristics of the new station including bus work, switching, and interrupting devices be included?
Part 2	16	3.14	When describing work in existing stations should the minimum thermal and short circuit characteristics required on the components at the station affected by the LTTU be included?
Part 2	17	3.15	For transformers, should the proposed nameplate characteristics including thermal ratings, impedance, voltage range / step changes be included to coordinate with modeling data provided elsewhere?
Part 2	19	3.19	For PARs, should the proposed nameplate characteristics including thermal ratings, impedance, angular range / step changes be included to coordinate with modeling data provided elsewhere?

Document (Part 1, Part 1 Appendix A, or Part 2)	Page Number	Section/ Question Number	Comment
Part 2	21	3.22	For HVDC systems, should the reactive capability at each terminal (e.g., +/- xx MVars) be included to coordinate with modeling data provided elsewhere?