

***Generation Interconnection
Feasibility Study Report***

For

***PJM Generation Interconnection Request
Queue Position AD2-201A***

Hickman – Riverbend 69kV

December 2018

Preface

The intent of the feasibility study is to determine a plan, with ballpark cost and construction time estimates, to connect the subject generation to the PJM network at a location specified by the Interconnection Customer. The Interconnection Customer may request the interconnection of generation as a capacity resource or as an energy-only resource. As a requirement for interconnection, the Interconnection Customer may be responsible for the cost of constructing: (1) Direct Connections, which are new facilities and/or facilities upgrades needed to connect the generator to the PJM network, and (2) Network Upgrades, which are facility additions, or upgrades to existing facilities, that are needed to maintain the reliability of the PJM system.

In some instances a generator interconnection may not be responsible for 100% of the identified network upgrade cost because other transmission network uses, e.g. another generation interconnection, may also contribute to the need for the same network reinforcement.

For Local and Network Upgrades which are required due to overloads associated with the System Impact Studies of an individual New Services Queue, and have a cost less than \$5,000,000, the cost of the Local and Network Upgrades will be shared by all proposed projects which have been assigned a Queue Position in the New Services Queue in which the need for the Local and Network Upgrades was identified. The Load Flow Cost Allocation methods discussed in this manual, including cutoffs, still apply to the individual projects.

For Local and Network Upgrades which are required due to the overloads associated with the System Impact Studies of an individual New Services Queue, and have a cost of \$5,000,000 or greater, the cost of the Local and Network Upgrades will be allocated according to the order of the New Service Requests in the New Services Queue and the MW contribution of each individual Interconnection Request for those projects which cause or contribute to the need for the Local or Network Upgrades. The Load Flow Cost Allocation methods discussed in this manual, including cutoffs, still apply to the individual projects.

Cost allocation rules can be found in PJM Manual 14A, Attachment B. The possibility of sharing the reinforcement costs with other projects may be identified in the feasibility study, but the actual allocation will be deferred until the impact study is performed.

PJM utilizes manufacturer models to ensure the performance of turbines is properly captured during the simulations performed for stability verification. Turbine manufacturers provide such models to their customers. The list of manufacturer models PJM has already validated is contained in Attachment G-2 of Manual 14A. Manufacturer models may be updated from time to time, for various reasons such as to reflect changes to the control systems or to more accurately represent the capabilities turbines and controls which are currently available in the field. Additionally, as new turbine models are developed, turbine manufacturers provide such new models which must be used in the conduct of these studies. PJM needs adequate time to evaluate the new models in order to reduce delays to the System Impact Study process timeline for the Interconnection Customer as well as other Interconnection Customers in the study group. Therefore, PJM will require that any Interconnection Customer with a new manufacturer model must supply that model to PJM, along with a \$10,000 fully refundable deposit, no later than three

(3) months prior to the starting date of the System Impact Study (See Section 2.2.2. of Manual 14A for starting dates) for the Interconnection Request which shall specify the use of the new model. The Interconnection Customer will be required to submit a completed dynamic model study request form (Attachment G-1 of Manual 14A) in order to document the request for the study.

The Feasibility Study estimates do not include the feasibility, cost, or time required to obtain property rights and permits for construction of the required facilities. The project developer is responsible for the right of way, real estate, and construction permit issues. For properties currently owned by Transmission Owners, the costs may be included in the study.

General

The interconnection customer (IC) proposes to install PJM Project #AD2-201A, a 50 MW (31 MW Capacity) solar facility in Pulaski County, Virginia (see Figure 2). The primary point of interconnection will be to AEP's Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV section of the Hickman – North Claytor 69 kV circuit (see Figure 1). The Secondary point of interconnection will be a direct connection to AEP's Hickman 69 kV substation (see Figure 3).

The requested in service date is May 3, 2021.

The objective of this Feasibility Study is to determine budgetary cost estimates and approximate construction timelines for identified transmission facilities required to connect the proposed generating facilities to the AEP transmission system. These reinforcements include the Attachment Facilities, Local Upgrades, and Network Upgrades required for maintaining the reliability of the AEP transmission system. Stability analysis is not included as part of this study.

Attachment Facilities

Primary Point of Interconnection (Hickman - Riverbend 69 kV)

To accommodate the interconnection on the Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV section of the Hickman – North Claytor 69 kV circuit, a new three (3) circuit breaker 69 kV switching station physically configured in a breaker and half bus arrangement but operated as a ring-bus will be constructed (see Figure 1). Installation of associated protection and control equipment, 69 kV line risers, SCADA, and 69 kV revenue metering will also be required. AEP reserves the right to specify the final acceptable configuration considering design practices, future expansion, and compliance requirements.

New Switching Station Work and Cost:

- Construct a new three (3) circuit breaker 69 kV switching station physically configured in a breaker and half bus arrangement but operated as a ring-bus (See Figure 1). Installation of associated protection and control equipment, 69 kV line risers and SCADA will also be required.
 - **Estimated Station Cost: \$4,350,000**

Direct Connection Cost Estimate

The total preliminary cost estimate for Direct Connection work is given in the following tables below.

For AEP building Direct Connection cost estimates:

Description	Estimated Cost
Hickman - Riverbend 69 kV T-Line Cut In	\$700,000
Total	\$700,000

Table 1

Non-Direct Connection Cost Estimate

The total preliminary cost estimate for Non-Direct Connection work is given in the following table below:

For AEP building Non-Direct Connection cost estimates:

Description	Total Cost
69 kV Revenue Metering	\$250,000
Upgrade line protection and controls at the Hickman 69 kV substation	\$250,000
Upgrade line protection and controls at the North Claytor 69 kV substation	\$250,000
Total	\$750,000

Table 2

Secondary Point of Interconnection (Hickman 69 kV)

To accommodate the interconnection at the Hickman 69 kV substation, the substation will have to be expanded requiring the installation of one (1) 69 kV circuit breaker (see Figure 3). Installation of associated protection and control equipment, 69 kV line risers, SCADA, and 69 kV revenue metering will also be required. AEP reserves the right to specify the final acceptable configuration considering design practices, future expansion, and compliance requirements.

Interconnection Customer Requirements

It is understood that the IC is responsible for all costs associated with this interconnection. The costs above are reimbursable to AEP. The cost of the IC's generating plant and the costs for the line connecting the generating plant to the Hickman – River Bend 69 kV line are not included in this report; these are assumed to be the IC's responsibility.

The Generation Interconnection Agreement does not in or by itself establish a requirement for American Electric Power to provide power for consumption at the developer's facilities. A separate agreement may be reached with the local utility that provides service in the area to ensure that infrastructure is in place to meet this demand and proper metering equipment is installed. It is the responsibility of the developer to contact the local service provider to determine if a local service agreement is required.

Requirement from the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff:

1. An Interconnection Customer entering the New Services Queue on or after October 1, 2012 with a proposed new Customer Facility that has a Maximum Facility Output equal to or greater than 100 MW shall install and maintain, at its expense, phasor measurement units (PMUs). See Section 8.5.3 of Appendix 2 to the Interconnection Service Agreement as well as section 4.3 of PJM Manual 14D for additional information.
2. The Interconnection Customer may be required to install and/or pay for metering as necessary to properly track real time output of the facility as well as installing metering which shall be used for billing purposes. See Section 8 of Appendix 2 to the Interconnection Service Agreement as well as Section 4 of PJM Manual 14D for additional information.

Revenue Metering and SCADA Requirements

PJM Requirements

The Interconnection Customer will be required to install equipment necessary to provide Revenue Metering (KWH, KVARH) and real time data (KW, KVAR) for IC's generating Resource. See PJM Manuals M-01 and M-14D, and PJM Tariff Sections 24.1 and 24.2.

AEP Requirements

The Interconnection Customer will be required to comply with all AEP Revenue Metering Requirements for Generation Interconnection Customers. The Revenue Metering Requirements may be found within the "Requirements for Connection of New Facilities or Changes to Existing Facilities Connected to the AEP Transmission System" document located at the following link:

<http://www.pjm.com/~media/planning/plan-standards/private-aep/aep-interconnection-requirements.ashx>

Network Impacts – Option 1

The Queue Project AD2-201A was evaluated as a 50.0 MW (Capacity 31.0 MW) injection tapping the Hickman to Riverbend 69kV line in the AEP area. Project AD2-201A was evaluated for compliance with applicable reliability planning criteria (PJM, NERC, NERC Regional Reliability Councils, and Transmission Owners). Project AD2-201A was studied with a commercial probability of 53%. Potential network impacts were as follows:

Base Case Used

Summer Peak Analysis – 2021 Case

Contingency Descriptions

The following contingencies resulted in overloads:

Option 1		
Contingency Name	Description	
'AEP_P7-1_#8512'	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1	/ 242608 05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1	/ 242609 05CLYTR2 138 242634 05EDGEMO 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 243874 CKT 1	/ 242791 05SCHRIS 138 243874 05TECHDR 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 244118 CKT 1	/ 242791 05SCHRIS 138 244118 05SCHRISTB 69.0 1
	END	
'AEP_P7-1_#8513'	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1	/ 242608 05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1	/ 242609 05CLYTR2 138 242634 05EDGEMO 138 1
	END	
'242609 05CLYTR2 242610 05CLYTR3 Z1 138/138'	'242609 05CLYTR2 242610 05CLYTR3 Z1 138/138' OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242610 CKT Z1 END	

Table 3

Generator Deliverability

(Single or N-1 contingencies for the Capacity portion only of the interconnection)

None

Multiple Facility Contingency

(Double Circuit Tower Line, Fault with a Stuck Breaker, and Bus Fault contingencies for the full energy output)

AD2-201A Multiple Facility Contingency – Option 1														
#	Type	Contingency Name	Affected Area	Facility Description	Bus				Loading		Rating		MW Con.	FG App.
					From	To	Cir.	PF	Initial	Final	Type	MVA		
1	DCTL	'AEP_P7-1_#8512'	AEP - AEP	AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line	937350	242651	1	DC	97.4	108.16	ER	146	15.72	
2	DCTL	'AEP_P7-1_#8513'	AEP - AEP	AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line	937350	242651	1	DC	97.27	108.03	ER	146	15.72	

Table 4

Note: The correct Summer Emergency rating for AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line is 167 MVA.

Contribution to Previously Identified Overloads

(This project contributes to the following contingency overloads, i.e. "Network Impacts", identified for earlier generation or transmission interconnection projects in the PJM Queue)

None

Steady-State Voltage Requirements

To be determined

Short Circuit

(Summary of impacted circuit breakers)

New circuit breakers found to be over-duty:

None

Affected System Analysis & Mitigation

LGEE Impacts:

LGEE Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

MISO Impacts:

MISO Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

Duke, Progress & TVA Impacts:

Duke Carolina, Progress, & TVA Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

OVEC Impacts:

OVEC Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

Delivery of Energy Portion of Interconnection Request

PJM also studied the delivery of the energy portion of this interconnection request. Any problems identified below are likely to result in operational restrictions to the project under study. The developer can proceed with network upgrades to eliminate the operational restriction at their discretion by submitting a Merchant Transmission Interconnection request.

Only the most severely overloaded conditions are listed. There is no guarantee of full delivery of energy for this project by fixing only the conditions listed in this section. With a Transmission Interconnection Request, a subsequent analysis will be performed, which will study all overload conditions associated with the overloaded element(s) identified.

AD2-201A Delivery of Energy Portion of Interconnection Request – Option 1														
#	Type	Contingency	Affected Area	Facility Description	Bus		Cir.	PF	Loading		Rating		MW Con.	FG App.
		Name			From	To			Initial	Final	Type	MVA		
1	N-1	'242609 05CLYTR2 242610 05CLYTR3 ZI 138/138'	AEP - AEP	AD2-179 TAP- 05GLENL2 138 kV line	937350	242651	1	DC	91.53	103.62	ER	146	17.66	

Table 5

Note: The correct Summer Emergency rating for AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line is 167 MVA.

New System Reinforcements

(Upgrades required to mitigate reliability criteria violations, i.e. Network Impacts, initially caused by the addition of this project generation)

Multiple Facility Contingency

1. (AEP - AEP) The AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line (from bus 937350 to bus 242651 ckt 1) loads from 97.4% to 108.16% (**DC power flow**) of its emergency rating (146 MVA) for the tower line contingency outage of 'AEP_P7-1_#8512'. This project contributes approximately 15.72 MW to the thermal violation.

- 1) A sag study will be required to determine if the whether or not line needs to be rebuilt / reconducted. (Limiting Element: 397.5 ACSR 30/7 LARK - FE Clamps 9 d). A Sag Study will be required on the 21 mile section of line to mitigate the overload. Depending on the sag study results, cost for this upgrade is expected to be between \$138,000 (no remediation's required just the sag study) and \$31.29 million (complete line reconductor/rebuild required).

An approximate construction time would be 24 to 36 months after signing an interconnection agreement

2. (AEP - AEP) The AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line (from bus 937350 to bus 242651 ckt 1) loads from 97.27% to 108.03% (**DC power flow**) of its emergency rating (146 MVA) for the tower line contingency outage of 'AEP_P7-1_#8513'. This project contributes approximately 15.72 MW to the thermal violation.

Same as Multiple Facility Contingency #1

Contribution to Previously Identified System Reinforcements

(Overloads initially caused by prior Queue positions with additional contribution to overloading by this project. This project may have a % allocation cost responsibility which will be calculated and reported for the Impact Study)

(Summary form of Cost allocation for transmission lines and transformers will be inserted here if any)

None

Schedule

It is anticipated that the time between receipt of executed agreements and Commercial Operation may range from 12 to 18 months if no line work is required. If line work is required, construction time would be between 24 to 36 months after signing an interconnection agreement.

Conclusion

Based upon the results of this Feasibility Study, the construction of the 50 MW (31 MW Capacity) solar generating facility of the IC (PJM Project #AD2-201A) will require the following additional interconnection charges. This plan of service will interconnect the proposed solar generating facility in a manner that will provide operational reliability and flexibility to both the AEP system and the IC generating facility.

Cost Breakdown for Primary Point of Interconnection (Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV)		
Attachment Cost	New 69 kV Switching Station and installation of associated protection and controls equipment	\$4,350,000
Direct Connection Cost Estimate	Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV T-Line Cut In	\$700,000
Non-Direct Connection Cost Estimate	69 kV Revenue Metering	\$250,000
	Upgrade line protection and controls at the Hickman 69 kV substation	\$250,000
	Upgrade line protection and controls at the North Claytor 69 kV substation	\$250,000
	Sag Study -Worst Case Scenario. (Cost will be \$5,938,000 if no mitigations are identified by the sag study)	\$31,290,000
Total Estimated Cost for Project AD2-201A		\$37,090,000

Table 6

The estimates are preliminary in nature, as they were determined without the benefit of detailed engineering studies. Final estimates will require an on-site review and coordination to determine final construction requirements. Note: Sag Studies are generally completed in parallel with the Facilities Study.

Network Impacts – Option 2

The Queue Project AD2-201A was evaluated as a 50.0 MW (Capacity 31.0 MW) injection at the Hickman 69kV substation in the AEP area. Project AD2-201A was evaluated for compliance with applicable reliability planning criteria (PJM, NERC, NERC Regional Reliability Councils, and Transmission Owners). Project AD2-201A was studied with a commercial probability of 53%. Potential network impacts were as follows:

Base Case Used

Summer Peak Analysis – 2021 Case

Contingency Descriptions

The following contingencies resulted in overloads:

Option 2		
Contingency Name	Description	
'AEP_P7-1_#8512'	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1	/ 242608 05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1	/ 242609 05CLYTR2 138 242634
	05EDGEMO 138 1	
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 243874 CKT 1	/ 242791 05SCHRIS 138 243874 05TECHDR 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 244118 CKT 1	/ 242791 05SCHRIS 138 244118
'AEP_P7-1_#8513'	05SCHRISTB 69.0 1	
	END	
	CONTINGENCY 'AEP_P7-1_#8513'	
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1	/ 242608 05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1
	OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1	/ 242609 05CLYTR2 138 242634
	05EDGEMO 138 1	
	END	

Table 7

Generator Deliverability

(Single or N-1 contingencies for the Capacity portion only of the interconnection)

None

Multiple Facility Contingency

(Double Circuit Tower Line, Fault with a Stuck Breaker, and Bus Fault contingencies for the full energy output)

AD2-201A Multiple Facility Contingency – Option 2														
#	Type	Contingency Name	Affected Area	Facility Description	Bus		Cir.	PF	Loading		Rating		MW Con.	FG App.
					From	To			Initial	Final	Type	MVA		
1	DCTL	'AEP_P7-1_#8512'	AEP - AEP	AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL1 138 kV	937350	242650	1	DC	98.93	105.73	ER	146	9.93	

AD2-201A Multiple Facility Contingency – Option 2													
#	Type	Contingency Name	Affected Area	Facility Description	Bus		Cir.	PF	Loading		Rating	MW Con.	FG App.
				line	From	To			Initial	Final	Type	MVA	
2	DCTL	'AEP_P7-1_#8513'	AEP - AEP	AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL1 138 kV line	937350	242650	1	DC	98.79	105.6	ER	146	9.93

Table 8

Note: The correct Summer Emergency rating for AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL1 138 kV line is 151 MVA.

Contribution to Previously Identified Overloads

(This project contributes to the following contingency overloads, i.e. "Network Impacts", identified for earlier generation or transmission interconnection projects in the PJM Queue

None

Steady-State Voltage Requirements

To be determined

Short Circuit

(Summary of impacted circuit breakers)

New circuit breakers found to be over-duty:

None

Affected System Analysis & Mitigation

LGEE Impacts:

LGEE Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

MISO Impacts:

MISO Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

Duke, Progress & TVA Impacts:

Duke Carolina, Progress, & TVA Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

OVEC Impacts:

OVEC Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

Delivery of Energy Portion of Interconnection Request

PJM also studied the delivery of the energy portion of this interconnection request. Any problems identified below are likely to result in operational restrictions to the project under study. The developer can proceed with network upgrades to eliminate the operational restriction at their discretion by submitting a Merchant Transmission Interconnection request.

Only the most severely overloaded conditions are listed. There is no guarantee of full delivery of energy for this project by fixing only the conditions listed in this section. With a Transmission Interconnection Request, a subsequent analysis will be performed, which will study all overload conditions associated with the overloaded element(s) identified.

None

Figure 1: Primary Point of Interconnection (Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV)
Single-Line Diagram

Figure 2: Primary Point of Interconnection (Hickman – Riverbend 69 kV)

Figure 3: Secondary Point of Interconnection (Hickman 69 kV)

Figure 4: Secondary Point of Interconnection (Hickman 69 kV)

Figure 5: Proposed Customer Site Location for Primary Point of Interconnection

Appendices – Primary POI

The following appendices contain additional information about each flowgate presented in the body of the report. For each appendix, a description of the flowgate and its contingency was included for convenience. However, the intent of the appendix section is to provide more information on which projects/generators have contributions to the flowgate in question. All New Service Queue Requests, through the end of the Queue under study, that are contributors to a flowgate will be listed in the Appendices. Please note that there may be contributors that are subsequently queued after the queue under study that are not listed in the Appendices. Although this information is not used "as is" for cost allocation purposes, it can be used to gage the impact of other projects/generators.

It should be noted the project/generator MW contributions presented in the body of the report and appendices sections are full contributions, whereas the loading percentages reported in the body of the report, take into consideration the commercial probability of each project as well as the ramping impact of "Adder" contributions.

Appendix 1

(AEP - AEP) The AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL2 138 kV line (from bus 937350 to bus 242651 ckt 1) loads from 97.4% to 108.16% (**DC power flow**) of its emergency rating (146 MVA) for the tower line contingency outage of 'AEP_P7-1_#8512'. This project contributes approximately 15.72 MW to the thermal violation.

CONTINGENCY 'AEP_P7-1_#8512'

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1 / 242608
05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1 / 242609
05CLYTR2 138 242634 05EDGEMO 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 243874 CKT 1 / 242791 05SCHRIS
138 243874 05TECHDR 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 244118 CKT 1 / 242791 05SCHRIS
138 244118 05SCHRISTB 69.0 1

END

<i>Bus Number</i>	<i>Bus Name</i>	<i>Full Contribution</i>
242906	05CLAY-1	1.68
242907	05CLAY-2	1.69
934751	AD1-102 C	4.65
934752	AD1-102 E	31.12
937341	AD2-178 C O1	11.17
937342	AD2-178 E O1	7.45
937351	AD2-179 C O1	38.17
937352	AD2-179 E O1	25.45
937471	AD2-201AC O1	9.74
937472	AD2-201AE O1	5.97
LTF	AMIL	< 0.01
LTF	BLUEG	0.13
LTF	CANNELTON	0.02
LTF	CARR	0.01
LTF	CBM-S1	0.12
LTF	CBM-S2	0.99
LTF	CBM-W2	0.3
LTF	CLIFTY	0.83
LTF	CPL	0.3
LTF	DEARBORN	0.07
LTF	EDWARDS	0.03
LTF	ELMERSMITH	0.04
LTF	FARMERCITY	< 0.01
LTF	G-007A	0.02

<i>LTF</i>	<i>GIBSON</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>NEWTON</i>	<i>0.06</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>PRAIRIE</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>RENSSELAER</i>	<i>< 0.01</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>ROSETON</i>	<i>0.06</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TATANKA</i>	<i>0.02</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TILTON</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TRIMBLE</i>	<i>0.03</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>VFT</i>	<i>0.05</i>
<i>247619</i>	<i>Y1-049</i>	<i>0.16</i>

Appendices – Alternate POI

The following appendices contain additional information about each flowgate presented in the body of the report. For each appendix, a description of the flowgate and its contingency was included for convenience. However, the intent of the appendix section is to provide more information on which projects/generators have contributions to the flowgate in question. All New Service Queue Requests, through the end of the Queue under study, that are contributors to a flowgate will be listed in the Appendices. Please note that there may be contributors that are subsequently queued after the queue under study that are not listed in the Appendices. Although this information is not used "as is" for cost allocation purposes, it can be used to gage the impact of other projects/generators.

It should be noted the project/generator MW contributions presented in the body of the report and appendices sections are full contributions, whereas the loading percentages reported in the body of the report, take into consideration the commercial probability of each project as well as the ramping impact of "Adder" contributions.

Appendix 1

(AEP - AEP) The AD2-179 TAP-05GLENL1 138 kV line (from bus 937350 to bus 242650 ckt 1) loads from 98.93% to 105.73% (**DC power flow**) of its emergency rating (146 MVA) for the tower line contingency outage of 'AEP_P7-1_#8512'. This project contributes approximately 9.93 MW to the thermal violation.

CONTINGENCY 'AEP_P7-1_#8512'

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242608 TO BUS 242791 CKT 1 / 242608
05CLYTR1 138 242791 05SCHRIS 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242609 TO BUS 242634 CKT 1 / 242609
05CLYTR2 138 242634 05EDGEMO 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 243874 CKT 1 / 242791 05SCHRIS
138 243874 05TECHDR 138 1

OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242791 TO BUS 244118 CKT 1 / 242791 05SCHRIS
138 244118 05SCHRISTB 69.0 1

END

<i>Bus Number</i>	<i>Bus Name</i>	<i>Full Contribution</i>
242906	05CLAY-1	1.67
242907	05CLAY-2	1.66
934751	AD1-102 C	4.57
934752	AD1-102 E	30.59
937341	AD2-178 C O2	10.67
937342	AD2-178 E O2	7.12
937351	AD2-179 C O2	37.37
937352	AD2-179 E O2	24.91
937471	AD2-201AC O2	6.16
937472	AD2-201AE O2	3.77
LTF	AMIL	< 0.01
LTF	BLUEG	0.13
LTF	CANNELTON	0.02
LTF	CARR	0.01
LTF	CBM-S1	0.12
LTF	CBM-S2	0.98
LTF	CBM-W2	0.3
LTF	CLIFTY	0.81
LTF	CPLE	0.29
LTF	DEARBORN	0.07
LTF	EDWARDS	0.03
LTF	ELMERSMITH	0.04
LTF	FARMERCITY	< 0.01
LTF	G-007A	0.02
LTF	GIBSON	0.04
LTF	NEWTON	0.06

<i>LTF</i>	<i>PRAIRIE</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>RENSSELAER</i>	<i>< 0.01</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>ROSETON</i>	<i>0.06</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TATANKA</i>	<i>0.02</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TILTON</i>	<i>0.04</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>TRIMBLE</i>	<i>0.03</i>
<i>LTF</i>	<i>VFT</i>	<i>0.05</i>
<i>247619</i>	<i>Y1-049</i>	<i>0.16</i>