I. Stakeholder Feedback on MISO/PJM Regional Processes and Metrics

MISO and PJM reviewed their regional planning processes and metrics at the October 2nd IPSAC meeting. To facilitate a productive stakeholder discussion at the October 24th IPSAC meeting, MISO and PJM are soliciting feedback on what issues are priorities and potential steps to further the discussion.

- Please designate the following areas as “important” or “unimportant” to resolve for interregional coordination:
  - Should joint metrics continue to be calculated
  - If joint metrics are needed, how many and what is their use
  - How JOA metrics are calculated
  - Data assumptions issues in coordinated planning
  - Regional planning difference issues
  - Other, please list

- For each “important” item:
  - rank their criticality and priority to coordinated planning
  - briefly describe an approach to advance the discussion

- For reference:
  - Metrics: currently MTEP/RTEP/JOA combinations of Production Cost and Load Cost and Adjustments
  - Process: MTEP/RTEP reliability coordination
  - Process: MTEP/RTEP MEP coordination
  - Process: Interregional JOA coordination

Submit feedback to: Adam Solomon, asolomon@misoenergy.org
Chuck Liebold, chuck.liebold@pjm.com

Submit feedback by: October 16, 2014

Stakeholder feedback:

General Feedback: The Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (IURC) supports a one step process of a joint interregional planning process with its own metrics (project cost in particular) and voltage requirements. This would ensure that appropriately beneficial interregional projects are approved and constructed in a timely manner, rather than having the additional requirements of being studied and approved two more times in each RTO’s regional planning process. The amount and nature of interregional projects should be relatively small compared to each RTO’s regional projects, and yet they are very important to the ability of energy to be exchanged economically (energy markets) as well as during times of emergencies when one RTO may be able to provide energy to the other RTO.

If a new one step interregional transmission planning process cannot be developed (we note that FERC has yet to issue its Interregional Order 1000 orders), the IURC supports the alignment of the two RTOs’ regional planning processes as much as possible in terms of planning models, timing, etc.

Should joint metrics continue to be calculated? —Important—Yes

If joint metrics are needed, how many and what is their use? —Important—Only one joint inter-regional metric for economic projects is necessary. It should measure a uniform set of benefits (short and long term) for projects 100kV and above, capture both short term and long term costs (including congestion relief, inter-RTO payments, and value of firm entitlement hedging against further inter-RTO payments), and be benchmarked against results in real-time operations.

How JOA metrics are calculated? —Important—Reduce/eliminate hedging assumptions to improve seams constraints.

Data assumption issues in coordinated planning? —Important—Siting of new generation that do not have signed
interconnection agreements and the location chosen for these theoretical generating units can have a large impact on benefit analysis which might be out of balance with actual experience.

**Regional planning difference issues?**—Important—RTO planning cycles should incorporate Inter-regional planning and include consistent data coordination, modeling and inputs between MISO and PJM.

---
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