



Request To Amend Large Load Adjustment Issue Charge

MRC Meeting --- March 20, 2024

Large Load Adjustments Issue Charge

- Seeking to amend/clarify the Capacity Obligations for Forecasted Large Load Adjustments (“LLA”) Issue Charge
- Proposed amendment/clarification identifies a new In-Scope item.
- Proposed modification is as follows:

Areas not in scope:

Changes to existing PJM load forecasting methodology

Areas in scope:

Changes to Manual 19 Attachment B (Load Forecast Adjustment Guidelines) related to an LSE’s right if they choose, to control the forecast of their large load adjustments that are submitted to the LAS (Table B9 of the LAS Report) that are expected to be reported in more granular form as a result of this issue charge.

Manual 19 (Table B9) -- Scale of the Issue

Table B-9
ADJUSTMENTS ABOVE EMBEDDED TO SUMMER PEAK LOAD (MW) FOR
EACH PJM ZONE AND RTO
2024 - 2039

| | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| AE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BGE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DPL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| JCPL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| METED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PECO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PENLC | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PEPCO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| PL | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| PS | 16 | 49 | 83 | 142 | 197 | 252 | 295 | 298 | 312 | 329 | 347 | 364 | 383 | 401 | 420 | 439 |
| RECO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| UGI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AEP | 767 | 1,738 | 2,419 | 2,871 | 3,218 | 3,432 | 3,544 | 3,638 | 3,626 | 3,627 | 3,634 | 3,621 | 3,641 | 3,647 | 3,638 | 3,624 |
| APS | 73 | 213 | 566 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 | 803 |
| ATSI | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| COMED | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DAYTON | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| DEOK | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| DLCO | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EKPC | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 | -5 |
| OVEC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DOM | 1,801 | 2,666 | 4,482 | 6,241 | 8,417 | 10,263 | 11,831 | 13,118 | 14,319 | 15,491 | 16,605 | 17,610 | 18,521 | 19,514 | 20,533 | 21,563 |
| PJM RTO | 2,664 | 4,673 | 7,557 | 10,064 | 12,643 | 14,757 | 16,480 | 17,864 | 19,067 | 20,258 | 21,397 | 22,406 | 23,355 | 24,372 | 25,403 | 26,436 |

Source is PJM's January 2024 Load Forecast Report

Why The Need For The Amendment?

- The proposal in the MIC is seeking to allocate the Large Load Adjustment by entity based on Table B9 of the LAS Load Forecast Report (Large Load Adjustments)
- The language in PJM's Manual 19 lacks needed specificity on the ability of the LSE to forecast its LLA.
 - "The EDC shall identify to PJM the Load Serving Entity (LSE) where the addition will occur".
 - "Each requesting EDC and/or LSE will be expected to present on their adjustment request including backup documentation at a September/October LAS meeting."
- One possible interpretation of the above language for Co-ops & Munis, is the allocation process is within the control of large transmission providers (generally the EDCs).
- Implication is that one market participant would be required to have its large load forecast adjustment determined by another market participant.
- Without changes to this Issue Charge, ODEC was advised by the MIC Chair that it can't address this issue in the solution phase of the MIC CIBR process

Other Details of the Request

- Why are we making this request at the “Parent” Committee?
- Asking for a vote at the first read.