

Review of 2019 RTEP Assumptions Update

Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee March 7, 2019



- Update of standard RTEP assumptions
- 2019 RTEP
 - TPL-001-4
- Modeling
 - MOD-032 (GOs and TOs)
 - http://pjm.com/planning/rtep-development/powerflow-cases/mod-032.aspx
 - Siemens PSS®MOD Model On Demand (TOs)
 - PJM.com Planning Center Online Tool (Gen Model) GOs
- RTEP Proposal Windows





Load Flow Modeling

- Power flow models for outside world load, capacity, and topology will be based on the following 2018 Series MMWG power flow cases
 - 2018 Series 2023SUM MMWG outside world for
 - 2019 Series 2024SUM RTEP, 2022SUM RTEP
 - 2018 Series 2023SLL MMWG outside world for
 - 2019 Series 2024LL RTEP
 - 2018 Series 2023WIN MMWG outside world for
 - 2019 Series 2024WIN RTEP
- PJM to work with neighbors to identify any updates to topology/corrections
- PJM topology for all cases sourced from Model On Demand
 - Include all PJM Board approved upgrades through the December 2018 PJM Board of Manager approvals as well as all anticipated February 2019 PJM Board approvals
- OVEC will be included as a part of PJM



Locational Deliverability Areas (LDAs)

 Includes the existing 27 LDAs

- Total of 27 LDAs
 - All 27 to be evaluated for the 2022/2023 delivery year RPM base residual auction planning parameters

LDA	Description		
EMAAC	Global area - PJM 500, JCPL, PECO, PSEG, AE, DPL, RECO		
SWMAAC	Global area - BGE and PEPCO		
MAAC	Global area - PJM 500, Penelec, Meted, JCPL, PPL, PECO, PSEG, BGE, Pepco, AE, DPL, UGI, RECO		
PPL	PPL & UGI		
PJM WEST	APS, AEP, Dayton, DUQ, Comed, ATSI, DEO&K, EKPC, Cleveland, OVEC		
WMAAC	PJM 500, Penelec, Meted, PPL, UGI		
PENELEC	Pennsylvania Electric		
METED	Metropolitan Edison		
JCPL	Jersey Central Power and Light		
PECO	PECO		
PSEG	Public Service Electric and Gas		
BGE	Baltimore Gas and Electric		
PEPCO	Potomac Electric Power Company		
AE	Atlantic City Electric		
DPL	Delmarva Power and Light		
DPLSOUTH	Southern Portion of DPL		
PSNORTH	Northern Portion of PSEG		
VAP	Dominion Virginia Power		
APS	Allegheny Power		
AEP	American Electric Power		
DAYTON	Dayton Power and Light		
DLCO	Duquesne Light Company		
Comed	Commonwealth Edison		
ATSI	American Transmission Systems, Incorporated		
DEO&K	Duke Energy Ohio and Kentucky		
EKPC	Eastern Kentucky Power Cooperative		
Cleveland	Cleveland Area		





Firm Commitments

 Long term firm transmission service consistent with those coordinated between PJM and other Planning Coordinators during the 2018 Series MMWG development

Outage Rates

- Generation outage rates will be based on the most recent Reserve Requirement Study (RRS) performed by PJM
- Generation outage rates for future PJM units will be estimated based on class average rates
 (No change from February presentation)



Generator Deliverability: Generic EEFORds

- Generic EEFORd values developed for 2024 RTEP base case
 - To be posted with TEAC materials
- Capacity weighted by fuel type
 - Each unit within a given generator class is assigned the average EEFORd for that class

Gen Class	MW	Avg EEFORD
Fossil Steam	61,723	8.35%
Nuclear	28,830	1.49%
Combustion Turbine	26,915	9.09%
Combined Cycle	62,055	3.35%
Hydro	2,927	7.23%
Pumped Storage	5,609	3.39%
Diesel	999	12.33%
Wind	2,031	0.00%
Solar	1,739	0.00%



2019 RTEP Load Modeling

- Summer Peak Load
 - Summer Peak Load will be modeled consistent with the 2019 PJM Load Forecast Report
 - The final load forecast released in December 2018
- Winter Peak Load
 - Winter Peak Load will be modeled consistent with the 2019 PJM Load Forecast Report
- Light Load
 - Modeled at 50% of the Peak Load forecast per M14B
 - The Light Load Reliability Criteria case will be modeled consistent with the procedure defined in M14B
- Load Management, where applicable, will be modeled consistent with the 2019 Load Forecast Report
 - Used in LDA under study in load deliverability analysis
 - Include Demand Response (DR) based on what cleared in the 2021/22 BRA



2019 RTEP Generation Assumptions

- All existing generation expected to be in service for the year being studied will be modeled.
- Future generation with a signed Interconnection Service Agreement, or that cleared in the 2021/22 BRA, will be modeled online along with any associated network upgrades.
- Generation with an FSA will be modeled offline but will be allowed to contribute to problems in the generation deliverability sensitivity testing for years 6 through 15
 - Generation with an executed FSA will not be allowed to back-off problems.
- Additional generation information (i.e. machine lists) will be posted to the TEAC page.

(Updated FSA modeling to reflect revised Manual M14B Attachment C language endorsed in February)



2019 RTEP New Load Deliverability Rules

- A few new load deliverability procedures in Manual 14B were endorsed in February
 - Non-radial facilities 345 kV and up will only automatically be considered as CETL limits for an LDA if they have greater than a 2% OTDF
 - PJM may choose to include specific non-PJM transmission facilities in the load deliverability test in order to account for significant loop flows
 - Both thermal and voltage analysis on both Discrete Outage Case and Mean Dispatch Case will be examined
 - Mean thermal loadings will be used instead of median thermal loadings

(New slide to reflect revised Manual M14B Attachment C language endorsed in February)



Queue Project NOT Included in 2019 Series RTEP Cases

- Queue projects with an FSA or ISA but are not included in 2019
 Series RTEP cases
 - X3-028 (MTX)
 - 2000 MW Energy Transmission Injection Rights and 1500 MW Capacity Transmission Injection Rights
 - Y3-092 (MTX)
 - 1000 MW Capacity Transmission Injection Rights
 - 500 MW Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights and 500 MW Non-Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights





- Generation that has officially notified PJM of deactivation will be modeled offline in RTEP base cases for all study years after the intended deactivation date
- RTEP baseline upgrades associated with generation deactivations will be modeled
- Retired units Capacity Interconnection Rights are maintained in RTEP base cases for 1 year after deactivation at which point they will be removed unless claimed by an interconnection queue project





 At a minimum, all PJM bulk electric system facilities, all tie lines to neighboring systems and all lower voltage facilities operated by PJM will be monitored.

- At a minimum, contingency analysis will include all bulk electric system facilities, all tie lines to neighboring systems and all lower voltage facilities operated by PJM.
- Thermal and voltage limits will be consistent with those used in operations.



PJM/NYISO Interface

B & C cables will be modeled out of service consistent with NYISO modeling

Linden VFT

- Withdrawal : Modeled at 330 MW Non-Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights & Modeled 330 MW Long-Term Firm Transmission Service (PJM-NYISO)
- Injection : Modeled at 315 MW Capacity Transmission Injection Rights

HTP

Modeled at 673 MW Non-Firm Transmission Withdrawal Rights



- As part of the 24-month RTEP cycle, a year 7 (2026) base case will be developed and, as necessary, evaluated as part of the 2019 RTEP
- The year 7 case will be based on the 2024 Summer case that will be developed as part of this year's 2019 RTEP
 - The case will be updated to be consistent with the 2019 RTEP assumptions.
- Purpose: To identify and develop longer lead time transmission upgrades

(Updated required evaluation of year 7 case to reflect revised Manual M14B language endorsed in February)



- Similar to the 2018 RTEP and per the PJM Operating Agreement, a proposal window will be conducted for all reliability needs that are not Immediate Need reliability upgrades or are otherwise ineligible to go through the window process.
- FERC 1000 implementation will be similar to the 2018 RTEP.
 - Advance notice and posting of potential violations
 - Advance notice of window openings
 - Window administration





 Request stakeholder suggestions for and input to 2019 alternative sensitivity studies and scenario analysis



V1 – 2/25/2019 – Original Slides Posted