Responses to comments from Julian Silk provided by email on February 18, 2022:

1. *In following the NREL Advanced Technology Baseline (ATB), presumably for 2021, they are making 2 assumptions that I would at least like them to question, or put caveats on. The first is that batteries will be lithium-ion, which is what the ATB detailed. I would like them to at least consider the iron-air batteries from Form Energy, discussed in https://formenergy.com/technology/battery-technology/, which is being put to a test by Georgia Power, as in https://www.utilitydive.com/news/form-energy-announces-partnership-with-georgia-power-to-test-100-hour-iron-/618626/.*

VCE's model includes not only battery storage but pumped hydro storage and redox flow batteries. While we will be watching Form Energy and other companies pursuing iron-air batteries with interest, iron-air batteries are not in the model at this time. The important factors to keep in mind with this study are the capacity and duration (1 hr, 2 hr, 4 hr, etc.) of storage selected by the model, not so much which type of battery technology is being installed.

2. *The second thing is the notion of nuclear ramping. My point of view is that Exeter should specify what they think will happen to Calvert Cliffs under the various scenarios. If you don't have the 100% renewable energy, there may be some residual nuclear, in that some fraction of Calvert Cliffs will be replaced, either in-state or through imports, with an SMR such as is being developed by NuScale, which can potentially ramp in a meaningful time, as in https://www.nuscalepower.com/newsletter/nucleus-summer-2020/featured-topic-cleaner-energy.*

We do plan to discuss Calvert Cliffs in all three scenarios that will initially be modeled. SMR is one of the technologies included in VCE's model, and the model also incorporates the higher ramp rate of SMRs.