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PJM and TOs are improving the consistency in modeling data submittals

- PJM to provide initial case and master list of contingencies
  - SharePoint site being developed
- PJM to model projects in sequence
  - Consider previously provided supplemental projects; PJM to develop listing to alert stakeholders of the projects previously included in do-no-harm evaluations
  - Considering the possibility of modifying supplemental projects listing to include date for inclusion in the analysis – may not be 100 percent effective
- PJM will work with transmission owners to develop common format for submitting modeling files, contingency updates and one-line diagrams
• Seeing improvement in knowledge associated with the M-3 process, but also considering more education about M-3 study/analysis process for stakeholders

• Begin posting maps showing multiple supplemental projects in the same areas that are electrically close
Load Group Perspective Concerns – Closed

• Some projects received regulatory permits prior to the needs presentation
  – Projects were in progress prior to official start of M-3 process
• Requests made to make operationally dispatched cases available
  – PJM cannot release due to market sensitivity
• Additional modeling information requested
  – Power-flow, short-circuit and stability models are available as appropriate
• Volume of work and timing
  – Transmission owners meeting M-3 process timeline
  – 10-day comment periods are not the final point at which comments can be provided
No validation required by PJM to ensure that the solution does not cause harm to facilities not under PJM control

- PJM cannot examine systems not under our planning purview

- PJM does not share the results of PJM’s do-no-harm analysis

- PJM has indicated that the solutions will not be allowed to proceed unless the testing is complete so that PJM can verify that supplemental projects meet the definition of supplemental projects in the OA. This definition requires all reliability issues to be alleviated as a part of the supplemental project.
Load Group Perspective Concerns – Closed

- Stakeholders are not notified about the finalization of solutions and whether the finalized solution is consistent with a previously proposed solution
  - PJM is posting the solutions and sending notifications to the stakeholders
  - Postings of solutions indicate linkage to the need
- Needs statements are being modified after the needs are presented
  - Any changes made will be shown as a new version of the slides
Load Group Perspective Concerns – In Progress

- Transmission owner SMEs not available to respond to questions during meetings
  - Increased TO attendance to address stakeholder questions
- Project status not included for projects when solutions are presented
  - Status will be added if other than conceptual
M-3 Process Concerns for Discussion

• M-3 does not include any specified timeline between when a need is submitted and a solution is proposed
  – Considering tracking system of “needs” that don’t have solutions presented after “X” amount of time

• Some TOs providing conflicting needs and drivers
  – PJM will begin posting maps at October SRRTEP meetings to show where interactions might be occurring

• Most data and information requests are not addressed in timely manner or at all
  – PJM feels that it is appropriate that initial contact to the TOs should be through discussions at the committee meetings or through the Planning Community so that all issues being discussed are identified to all stakeholders, maintaining a transparent process for discussions
Open Discussion