Action Items
1) Provide additional clarity as to if NERC TPL-001-4 offers any insight as to when “planned facilities” are placed into the planning model and cases.
2) Assess whether TPL-001-4 applies only to baseline process or baseline and Supplemental Process.
3) Certain stakeholders asserted that FERC may have precedent arising in non-ISO/RTO regions that might allow the regional plan to supersede the local plan and thereby re-shape or perhaps defer/cancel local projects in such jurisdictions. PJM is awaiting receipt of clarification on this item from the stakeholders that raised this issue.
4) Assess where the Office for the Interconnection may order a project to be built and/or stop a project.
5) PJM will assess whether there are additional scenarios/use cases and provide graphics as necessary to consider the stretching or compression of the Need, Solution, and Construction milestones from one process (RTEP or Supplemental) upon the other and whether the related timing would result in differing outcomes or expectations.
6) PJM to clarify where the five categories of Supplemental Projects is documented as well as the source of these categories. PJM will also clarify whether these categories tie in with the NERC Standards. PJM will clarify who has approved these categories.
7) How do you differentiate Operational Performance as a baseline need vs a supplemental need?
8) In relation to slide 10 (Scenario 3), describe communications.

Interests
1) When an “overlap” or an “incompatibility of projects” within the baseline and Supplemental Planning Processes appears, PJM, as the regional planner, should be in a clear, strong, position to manage and control the RTEP processes.
2) Transparency in the RTEP, including both the baseline and Supplemental Planning processes is the key to “do the right thing”.
3) When considering project solutions (whether baseline or Supplemental), that meet the demonstrated needs, consideration should also be given to resultant “headroom” for each project.
4) The baseline and Supplemental Planning Processes should appropriately consider the future of the system and not result in incremental upgrades every 5 years.
5) Ensure communication protocols in the OA are followed and respected as per Schedule 6. Ensure that the expectations of communication protocols within FERC Order #1000 are observed and share when communications are allowed or disallowed when dealing with the intersection of baseline and Supplemental Planning Processes. (Key note - the baseline Planning Process cycles on a regular schedule while the Supplemental Process may have instances in which Supplemental needs may arise in a preceding or succeeding fashion to establishment of the baseline Needs/Solutions/Construction).
6) Utilizing the Hazard-Wooten projects as an example, the Special PC sessions should address and make clear the principles that any mitigation of baseline needs cannot be included in a Supplemental Project.
7) To the extent revisions are made to PJM Manual 14-B, provisions should be made for a quality review to determine if any necessary revisions become required in any of the 14 Series Manuals (specifically 14-C and 14-F) before the Manual(s) are submitted to the PC for endorsement—allowing the PC to consider the totality of the revisions. (Editor’s Note – this interest was identified in the April 24th meeting,
however, subsequent actions at the April 25th MRC meeting suggest an expansion of scope beyond that originally authorized by the MRC and, thus, is beyond the scope of the Special PC.

8) Noting that all FERC Orders, Compliance and Directives need to be met, a specific interest in the requirements and sensitivities of FERC Order No. 1000 was shared.

9) Noting that in the examination of the intersection of the baseline and Supplemental Planning Processes the potential for a competitive window solicitation may arise, an interest was shared to make clear when a “window” may be a possible outcome. Likewise, please share the exemptions and exclusions that may forego formal solicitation of a window (e.g. Substation, Less than 200kV, 715, Immediate Need absent its unique footnotes, etc.)

10) Interest - “who” decides the aggregate best solution? To the extent there is a combination of baseline and Supplemental projects on same facilities, who decides the RTEP baseline “piece”?

11) Interest - might the resultant cost-allocation determination influence the decisional process with or between a baseline and Supplemental Project or some combination of them?

12) Interest- the expectations or rules resulting with the revised Manual 14-B should not invent poor decision-making or result in perverse expenditure

13) Interest in Transparency - Transparency should, at a minimum, address how a decision was reached, was the PJM and or Attachment M-3 process followed, etc.? Will a reason(s) be provided if a baseline or supplemental project need(s) go away?

14) Given the expectation of a 60 day deferral and presumption that we must conclude this effort and produce a revised Manual by the June 27 MRC, an interest was shared to see PJM issue redline/strikeout as soon as possible.

Potential Additional Scenarios:

1. You have a baseline and a supplemental, if TO decides supplemental moves forward even if PJM believes the baseline is better, how would that be handled?

2. A window opens for a baseline to solve 3 violations. After close of the window, a supplemental is proposed that solves 1 of the 3 baseline needs, in addition to its own needs. How would this be handled?