Inter-regional Planning Update

Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee

October 6, 2016

Interregional Update - EIPC

- EISPC coordination – EI-wide view WebEx's
  - Regional planning (target October)
  - Interregional planning (date TBD)

- EIPC EC approved 2-year production cost software agreement
  - flow-down of requirements in execution stage among EIPC members
  - Working group in progress

- EIPC response to FERC Order No. 1000 Technical Conference Panel 4

Interregional Update

- All regions data exchanges and issues reviews to be completed
  - With new CEII NDA exchanges with SERTP to be scheduled
- SERTP / NCTPC
  - SERTP regional process: www.southeasternrtp.com
  - SERTP 4th quarter meeting December
- NE Protocol
  - NY-NE IPSAC conducted May 9, 2016 – regional issues/plans/interconnection coordination - http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/stakeholder-meetings/stakeholder-groups/ipsac-ny-ne.aspx
  - End-of-year IPSAC review of regional issues and plans December 9, 2016
- SERC
  - LTSG transfer study, CPP study reliability work
  - NTSG loop flow study complete, planning to carry forward to next year

Interregional Update – MISO – Targeted Studies

- IPSAC dates - September 30, 2016
  - http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/stakeholder-meetings/stakeholder-groups/ipsac-midwest.aspx
  - Final draft JOA TMEP process and criteria language posted
- TMEP 7 potential projects identified
  - Less than $20M total
  - More than $100M four-year benefits total
- Evaluations of project scope, benefits and costs being finalized
- Regional cost allocation decisions are critical path task

2-Year Cycle - PJM Issues Review at IPSAC

- July 29, 2016 – IPSAC was notified of September PJM issues review
- August 26, 2016 – IPSAC stakeholder input to PJM issues review was due
- September 30, 2016 – Reviewed identified PJM regional Issues
  - PJM issues list may be refined over next couple weeks
  - Issues list will be finalized prior to November 1 window opening
- October IPSAC – PJM will share finalized issues list with IPSAC
- Draft regional market efficiency case available
  - http://www.pjm.com/planning/rtep-development/market-efficiency.aspx
- Final market efficiency case will be posted prior to November 1 window opening

EL13-88 Directives & Informational Filings

FERC Directed Stakeholder Involvement

Deliverable		Due Dates (2016)				Stakeholder Forum
		20-Jun	19-Aug	18-Oct	15-Dec	
Directive P186	Include Generator Retirement Coordination Procedures in JOA	X	X	X	X	IPSAC, IPTF
Informational 186	Status Reports on Gen Retirement Coordination Language					
Informational 92	Joint Model in Regional Processes			X		IPSAC, PSC

No FERC Directed Stakeholder Involvement

	Deliverable	Due Dates (2016)		Stakeholder Forum (Informational Updates)
		20-Jun	19-Aug	
Directive P57:	Formalize Steps and Deadlines in CSP Study	X		IPSAC, PAC
Directive P131	Lower Interregional MEP Thresholds	X		RECB
Directive P132	Remove Interregional B/C Ratio	X		RECB
Directive P133	Revise Benefit Calculation of Interregional MEPs	X		RECB
Directive P185	Include BPM GI Coordination Procedures in JOA	X		IPTF
Informational P58	Aligning Interregional, MTEP, and RTEP		X	IPSAC

FERC EL13-88 Informational Filing

- Directs MISO and PJM to submit an informational report describing how MISO and PJM could implement a joint model with the same assumptions and criteria in their regional transmission planning processes
  - Address reliability and economic modeling

- PJM and MISO seek stakeholder input by Friday, October 7, 2016
  - Some PJM and MISO thoughts follow
  - Is the general approach reasonable
  - Explain if you believe common models are feasible or not
  - Additional Issues?

FERC EL13-88 Informational Filing

- Joint models combine regional assumptions
  - Include respective regional assumptions
  - Compromise assumptions when necessary
  - Will always differ from regional models
- Regional models are based on regional planning process tariff requirements
  - Transmission Planning
  - Capacity Markets
- A regional solution on one interface does not address need to coordinate the same assumptions on other interfaces in a consistent fashion
- PJM and MISO drivers for regional transmission planning differ significantly
- Common assumptions are not feasible without significant changes to regional processes
- Even identical models would lead to different results when used in different regional processes

FERC EL13-88 Informational Filing

- Examples of differing regional drivers
  - MISO Reliability – analysis using multiple Transmission Planners' models
    - Years 2, 5, and 10 using both local balancing area (BA) and MISO BA dispatches
    - Can combine with or be deferred by economic upgrades
  - PJM Reliability – analysis using single Transmission Planner models
    - Years 5, 7 and 8 using PJM balancing area dispatch
    - Reliability projects can not be displaced by economic projects
  - MISO production cost models
    - Scope and assumptions varies cycle to cycle
    - Studied in parallel with reliability planning
    - Multiple generation and assumption futures
  - PJM production cost models
    - Market efficiency Scope and assumptions consistent with reliability planning
    - Public Policy Planning driven by scenarios chosen by Independent State Agency Committee