



# OMS/OPSI Outreach – Update for JCM

Chairman Phil Montgomery
Public Service Commission of
Wisconsin

## Goals of OMS/OPSI Participation

 Develop a clear understanding of what the issues are regarding energy and capacity transfers between MISO and PJM

 Facilitate discussion and work efforts between RTO staffs & among other stakeholders

Identify common language and process

### Since the Last JCM Meeting

- Participants revised definition and characterization of "Gross Energy Transfer Capability" [Oct. 10]
- Modeling inputs revised
- Modeling runs performed and reviewed by RTO staffs
- Modeling outputs discussed and definition/ characterization agreed-upon [Oct. 19]

# Definition Characterization of "Gross Energy Transfer Capability" - Process

- MISO provided an initial definition/discussion point
- PJM provided suggested revisions
- PSCW provided revisions to MISO/PJM suggestions
- PJM provided additional revisions

# Definition Characterization of "Gross Energy Transfer Capability" (Part 1)

**Gross Energy Transfer Capability (GETC)** – Represents the amount of energy that can be reliably transferred between regions under a narrow set of transfer scenarios that represent specific sets of operating conditions. This number does not represent the volume of capacity that could be deemed deliverable to load across the seam. Additional analysis is required to determine if individual units are deliverable across the seam. The stakeholder community should also recognize that this value does not represent and should not be confused with current industry defined terms such as ATC/TTC, Deliverability or Transfer Capability.

# Definition Characterization of "Gross Energy Transfer Capability" (Part 2)

The development and calculation of a GETC has produced a number of benefits. First, the development of the GETC provided an educational opportunity for MISO, PJM and the Commissions from Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin to better understand the modeling process and assumptions used and to communicate that understanding to additional stakeholders. Additionally, the process provided an opportunity for PJM and MISO to share their modeling processes, understand the differences between them and identify potential coordination enhancements. Finally, the calculation of the GETC provided data that stakeholders may consider as issues are prioritized and addressed through the Joint and Common Market Initiative.

## Agreed-Upon Benefits

- Educational
- Collaborative
- Timely
- Framework for moving forward on a variety of issues

### **Modeling Outputs**

- GETC modeling provides a range of results
- Some work still in progress to clarify modeling results (specifically related to the zonal scenarios)

### Modeling Outputs – Example

DF cutoff = 3%						
Voltage Class 100 kV and above						
		ollage class 100 kV and abo				
			_			
Scenario #	Description	Prior_To_Fixes Import Limits		Post_Fixes Cat B Only Import Limit	November 2011 Values	
Scenario 1	PJM Import from All neighbors	1518.3	1518.3	1518.3	3642.5	
Scenario 2	PJM Import from MISO	1217.9	1217.9	2932.4	5754.6	
00011011012	- Com ana post a com ana co	1211.0		2002.	010110	
Scenario 3	PJM West Import from All neighbors	4539.6	4539.6	4539.6	3589.2	
Scenario 4	PJM West Import from MISO	3724.5	3724.5	5558.9	5330.1	
Cochano 1	Tom troot import from impo	0721.0	0.2	0000.0	00011	
Scenario 5-1	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ1	953.5	2047.2	2387.7	3651	
0		0000		0.457.6	540.0	
Scenario 5-2	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ2	2208.3	2208.3	3157.9	-513.3	
Scenario 5-3	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ3	977.5	2163.9	2425.6	2961.2	
Scenario 5-4	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ4	224.4	3781	4197.1	2841.5	
Scenario 5-5	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ5	-1176.6	4899.5	4899.5	2363	
Cooperio E 6	D IM Wood Import from MISO I D76	6149.7	64.49.7	7024 4	2072.0	
Scenario 5-6	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ6	6148.7	6148.7	7934.1	2973.9	
Scenario 5-7	PJM West Import from MISO LRZ7	1676.5	4333.3	6306.1	3072.5	

### Modeling Outputs – Example

Scenario 6-1	PJM Import from MISO LRZ1	-1529.5	-416.8	-75.8	4456
Scenario 6-2	PJM Import from MISO LRZ2	-263.3	-263.3	663	321
Scenario 6-3	PJM Import from MISO LRZ3	-1471.7	-44.2	-44.2	3762.5
Scenario 6-4	PJM Import from MISO LRZ4	-2327.9	1206.6	1671	3163.5
Scenario 6-5	PJM Import from MISO LRZ5	-3765.3	2466.1	2466.1	3082.9
Scenario 0-5	F3W Import Horn WIGO ER25	-5705.5	2400.1	2400.1	3062.9
Scenario 6-6	PJM Import from MISO LRZ6	3680.9	3680.9	5981.3	3697.6
Seeparia 6.7	DIM Import from MISO I D77	750 5	4052.2	2047.6	2620.4
Scenario 6-7	PJM Import from MISO LRZ7	-752.5	1853.2	3847.6	3630.4
Scenario 7	ComEd Import from MISO	547.4	547.4	4860.7	
Scenario 8	MISO Import from PJM	2240.3	2240.3	10602	6122
	MISO Import from PJM West (exclude				
Scenario 9	ComEd)	2248.1	2248.1	10524.5	5043
Scenario 10	MISO IMport from ComEd	1358.2	1358.2	5513.1	2982

### Next Steps

- Requested input from participants about next steps
- Seeking input from JCM stakeholders today
- Review input and map out next steps
- Memorialize our work to date allow for process/benefits to be used in future
- Work to incorporate benefits into the JCM process
- Continue to report to JCM