

additional facilities are also taken out of service in the contingency definition. For example, if a transformer is tapped off a line without a breaker, both the line and transformer are removed from service as a single contingency event.

Contingency definitions for double circuit towerline outages shall include any two adjacent (vertically or horizontally) circuits on a common structure, but shall exclude circuits that share a common structure for one mile or less. The loss of more than two circuits on a common structure constitutes a NERC extreme event.

2.3.6 Baseline Thermal Analysis

Baseline thermal analysis is a thorough analysis of the reference power flow to ensure thermal adequacy based on normal (applicable to system normal conditions prior to contingencies) and emergency (applicable after the occurrence of a contingency) ratings specific to the Transmission Owner facilities being examined. It is based on a 50/50 load forecast from the latest available PJM Load Forecast Report (50% probability that the actual load is higher or lower than the projected load.) It encompasses an exhaustive analysis of all NERC category A, B and C events and the most critical common mode outages. Final results are supported with AC power flow solutions.

For normal conditions, all facilities shall be loaded within their normal ratings. After each single contingency, all control equipment is allowed to adjust. After the first contingency of a multiple-contingency event (NERC category C.3, also referred to as an “N-1-1” event,) all system adjustments are made to achieve a new steady state power flow, including redispatch in preparation for the next contingency. Wind, solar, and other variable resources will be dispatchable up to their Maximum Facility Output if they contribute to simulated facility loadings and will be dispatchable up to their capacity delivery rights if they backoff simulated facility loadings. Subsequent to redispatch all facilities must be within normal ratings. After the second contingency of the pair the technique for single contingencies is followed except that phase shifters are locked and do not adjust to hold flow. All violations of emergency ratings are recorded and reported and tentative solutions will be developed. These study results will be presented to and reviewed with stakeholders.

2.3.7 Baseline Voltage Analysis

Baseline voltage analysis parallels the thermal analysis. It uses the same power flow and examines all the same NERC category A, B, and C events. Also, voltage criteria are examined for compliance. PJM examines system performance for both a voltage drop criteria and an absolute voltage criteria. The voltage drop is calculated as the decrease in bus voltage from the initial steady state power flow to the post-contingency power flow. The post-contingency power flow is solved with generators holding a local generator bus voltage to a pre-contingency level consistent with specific Transmission Owner specifications. In most instances this is the pre-contingency generator bus voltage. Additionally, all phase shifters, transformer taps, switched shunts, and DC lines are locked for the post-contingency solution. SVC's are allowed to regulate.

The absolute voltage criteria is examined for the same contingency set by allowing transformer taps, switched shunts and SVC's to regulate, locking phase shifters and allowing generators to hold steady state voltage criteria (generally an agreed upon voltage on the high voltage bus at the generator location.)

– EEFORd) of the unit with the highest distribution factor is then multiplied by the availability of the unit with the second highest distribution factor and so on until the expected availability of the selected units is as close to but not less than 20%. This resulting “80/20” cumulative ramping impact is then added to the initial DC loading on the flowgate. This resulting loading is the 80/20 DC loading and the generators chosen to contribute to the cumulative ramping impact are the 80/20 generators.

Step 5: Determine Facility Loading Adder

This Step 5 addresses off-line generators which are not included in the 80/20 list. Existing generators that do not have capacity delivery rights and active queued generators that are not yet in commercial operation (or do not yet have a signed ISA) are offline but available to be turned on. The ramping impact of this set of generators determines the Facility Loading Adder. First, for their ramping impact to be considered, off-line generators must pass the impact threshold of at least a 5% DFAX (10% for flowgates with monitored elements having the highest terminal voltage 500 kV and above) on a flowgate or with an impact (DFAX times a generator’s full energy output rating) greater than 5% of the flowgate’s rating.

The ramping impact of offline generators is determined according to their classification as: (1) existing generators that do not have capacity delivery rights and active queued generators with signed ISA’s, or (2) active queued generators without signed ISA’s. Category (1) generators are allowed to aggravate or backoff overloaded flowgates. Category (2) generators are considered only if they aggravate overloaded flowgates (active queued generators without signed ISAs are not allowed to backoff overloads.) Wind, solar, and other variable resources will be dispatchable up to their capacity delivery rights for Category A and B conditions. Wind, solar, and other variable resources will be dispatchable up to their Maximum Facility Output for Category C contingencies if they contribute to simulated facility loadings and will be dispatchable up to their capacity delivery rights if they backoff simulated facility loadings.

The amount of generation change from the initial load flow due to changes in 80/20 and Facility Loading Adder generation shall not be any more than the online installed capacity exclusive of the 80/20 generators x PJM average EEFORd. Ramping impacts for lower DFAX offline generators that do not influence the 80/20 cumulative ramping impact are not considered when this threshold is exceeded.

The ramping impact of active queued generators without signed ISA’s considers the commercial probability of queued generators at the feasibility and impact study stage of the interconnection process. For generators at the feasibility study stage of the interconnection process, the output of the generator is multiplied by the historic commercial probability of a generator at the feasibility study stage of the interconnection process. For generators at the impact study stage of the interconnection process, the output of the generator is multiplied by the historic commercial probability of a generator at the impact study stage of the interconnection process. To be conservative, these values are then multiplied by 150% to determine the ramping impact of generation at the feasibility study and impact study stage of the interconnection process. The entire requested capacity of queued generation is used to determine the ramping impact of generation that has signed a facility study agreement.

The summation of 85% (100% for a Merchant Transmission project) of the ramping impact on a flowgate of each off-line resource that meets the above conditions is calculated. The resulting impact defines the Facility Loading Adder. The Facility Loading Adder is added to the base loading and the 80/20 DC loading to obtain the final DC loading on the facility.

Step 6: Determine Final Flowgate Loading

If a flowgate has a final DC loading less than 90% of its rating, it is not considered to be overloaded and is not tested further. If a flowgate has a final DC loading greater than or equal to 90% of its rating, the 80/20 generators are ramped up to their installed capacity in the load flow from step 2 and all remaining PJM generators are uniformly ramped down such that the PJM firm interchange is maintained. The resulting flowgate loading is the 80/20 AC loading.

The Facility Loading Adder can sometimes have a significant impact on the results of a deliverability study. However, ramping up the units associated with the adder in the load flow will typically create too much localized generation and a localized capacity emergency condition elsewhere when the rest of PJM is proportionally displaced to maintain the firm interchange. Therefore, to account for the effect of these units on the facility in question, the Facility Loading Adder, as determined in Step 5, is added to the 80/20 AC loading to result in the Final Flowgate Loading. This Facility Loading Adder accounts for the ramping impact of those offline resource requests that are both electrically close to a flowgate and did not participate as an 80/20 generator without actually turning them on. If the cumulative ramping impact of these offline resource requests has a beneficial effect on the flowgate, then the loading of the flowgate will be decreased to account for this beneficial effect. Similarly, the flowgate loading will be increased if these offline resource requests will further add to the overload.

In summary, the 80/20 generators will define the study area *for a particular flowgate* by determining which units to ramp up. All remaining online units are proportionally displaced to some level below their installed capacity $\times (1 - \text{PJM average EEFORd})$ to maintain the firm PJM interchange.

Addendum 1: Modeling Transmission Withdrawal Rights (TWRs) and Transmission Injection Rights (TIRs)

Firm TWRs and TIRs may be associated with a controllable merchant transmission request, i.e. HVDC, which interconnects PJM to another system. If the transmission request has an executed ISA associated with it, the firm rights are modeled at their full amount. When the firm rights are modeled, the initial dispatch in step 2 will need to be modified to support these rights. If the transmission request does not have an executed ISA and is queued ahead of the project under study or is the project under study the following rules apply; for TWRs the sign of the distribution factor is changed for the purpose of deciding whether to model the right. The right is modeled at its full amount if a generator with its distribution factor would be in the 80/20 list. The right is treated as a Facility Loading Adder using the rules of Step 5.

Addendum 2: Common Mode Outage Procedure

In addition to single contingencies, PJM planning criteria requires that the PJM system withstand certain common mode outages. These outages include line faults coupled with a stuck breaker, double circuit towerline outages, faulted circuit breakers and bus faults. PJM uses a procedure very similar to the generator deliverability procedure to study common mode outages. The list below highlights the other details of the common mode outage procedure that differ from the generator deliverability procedure.



In addition to the modeling of capacity resource requests, all existing energy resources and energy resource requests queued ahead of the unit under study are set at 0 MW but available to be turned on. Wind, solar, and other variable resources will be dispatchable up to their Maximum Facility Output if they contribute to simulated facility loadings and will be dispatchable up to their capacity delivery rights if they backoff simulated facility loadings. The energy resource request under study is also set at 0 MW but available to be turned on. Energy resource requests queued after the unit under study are not modeled.

A 50/50 DC loading is used instead of an 80/20 DC loading, i.e., the expected availability of the selected units is close to but not less than 50%.

For all voltage levels, a 10% distribution factor is used instead of a 5% distribution factor to select the 50/50 generators.

