



JCM update on Queue Coordination

January 29, 2013



- Customers information remains confidential to the greatest extent possible
- PJM queue rights “first come, first served”
 - Queue studied on approved baseline
 - Previous Queue Positions rights must be preserved if project is active
- Requests for service are only allowed to aggravate constraints and not back-off until ISA is signed (suspension also precludes ability to back-off)
- Generation Deliverability Study conducted IAW procedures in PJM Manual 14B

PJM Requirements for Load Flow Mitigation

When mitigation is necessary - by the type of resource.

Criteria Test / Resource Type	Non-firm: Energy Resource / Non-Firm merchant transmission	Typical Firm: Capacity Resource / Firm merchant transmission / Long Term Firm Transmission Service	Wind Resource
Category B, Peak NERC Category B (loss of 1 element): Summer Peak	N/A	Required	Based on Capacity Resource and Energy Resource designation
Category C NERC category C1, 2, 4, 5: (loss of 2+ elements)	Required	Required	Required
TO Criteria Transmission Owner Criteria (FERC 715)	As Required	As Required	As Required
Category B & C, Light Load NERC Category B & C: Light Load	N/A	As Required	Ramp from 40 to 80% of Energy Resource designation

MISO Requirements for Load Flow Mitigation On MISO Transmission

Criteria Test	Resource Type	Energy Resource	Network Resource
Category B, Peak NERC Category B (loss of 1 element): Summer Peak		Required	Required
Category B, Off-Peak NERC Category B (loss of 1 element): Summer Peak		Required	Not Required (Must mitigate for ERIS)
Category C Peak & Off Peak NERC category C1, 2, 4, 5: (loss of 2+ elements)		Based on TO Criteria	Based on TO Criteria
TO Criteria Transmission Owner Criteria (FERC 715)		Required (As applicable)	Required (As applicable)

- Multiple proposals provided for consideration
 - Proposal 1: Apply to MISO after PJM completes a portion of the PJM studies
 - Proposal 2: Apply to PJM and MISO at same time with PJM commencing Impact Study ASAP following queue close
 - Proposal 3: Apply to PJM and MISO at same time with PJM commencing Impact Study immediately after Initial Study completed (Requires PJM Tariff change affecting customer cost allocation)
- Responses from stakeholders
 - One indicated no position on proposals
 - 4 indicated preference for proposal 2 with continued discussions surrounding potential for additional change
 - One indicated preference for proposal #1
- MISO & PJM propose to move forward with proposal #2 with potential for discussions of additional future proposals following 12 months of implementation of these new rules

- Multiple proposals discussed for consideration
 - Proposal 1: Defined exchange of information points and coordination
 - For impacts to MISO facilities: PJM provides modeling updates to include completed Impact Studies following the execution of the Facilities Study Agreements for a queue. MISO and PJM would then coordinate completion of analysis with next DPP cycle. (PJM would monitor MISO and provide information to customers about potential impacts in the PJM Impact Study Report)
 - For impacts to PJM facilities: MISO provides modeling updates to include projects which have entered into the DPP cycle. MISO and PJM would then coordinate completion of analysis with the next System Impact Study cycle.
 - Proposal 2: Establish new process at the seams to provide a new “seams queue”
- Responses from stakeholders
 - Responses from multiple stakeholders during meetings indicated preference for proposal #1
 - Response from one stakeholder indicated reservations regarding benefits of proposal #1
- MISO & PJM propose to move forward with proposal #1 with potential for discussions of additional future proposals following 12 months of implementation of these new rules