



**Generation Interconnection
Feasibility Study Report
for
Queue Project AF1-227
MARYSVILLE-SOUTHWEST LIMA 345 KV
295 MW Capacity / 427 MW Energy**

January, 2020

Table of Contents

1	Preface.....	4
2	General.....	6
2.1	Point of Interconnection	7
2.2	Cost Summary.....	7
3	Transmission Owner Scope of Work.....	8
4	Attachment Facilities	8
5	Direct Connection Cost Estimate.....	8
6	Non-Direct Connection Cost Estimate.....	8
7	Incremental Capacity Transfer Rights (ICTRs)	9
8	Schedule.....	9
9	Interconnection Customer Requirements.....	9
10	Revenue Metering and SCADA Requirements	10
10.1	PJM Requirements	10
10.2	AEP Requirements.....	10
11	Network Impacts.....	11
12	Generation Deliverability	13
13	Multiple Facility Contingency	13
14	Contribution to Previously Identified Overloads	13
15	Potential Congestion due to Local Energy Deliverability.....	13
16	System Reinforcements.....	14
17	Flow Gate Details	15
18	Affected Systems	17
18.1	LG&E.....	17
18.2	MISO	17
18.3	TVA.....	17
18.4	Duke Energy Progress.....	17
18.5	NYISO	17
19	Short Circuit.....	19
20	Network Impacts – secondary POI	21
21	Generation Deliverability	23
22	Multiple Facility Contingency	23

23 Contribution to Previously Identified Overloads23

24 Potential Congestion due to Local Energy Deliverability.....23

25 Flow Gate Details24

26 Affected Systems26

26.1 LG&E.....26

26.2 MISO26

26.3 TVA.....26

26.4 Duke Energy Progress.....26

26.5 NYISO26

27 Contingency Descriptions.....27

28 Short Circuit.....29

29 Single Line Diagram Primary POI..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1 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. Cost allocation rules for network upgrades 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.

The Interconnection Customer seeking to interconnect a wind or solar generation facility shall maintain meteorological data facilities as well as provide that meteorological data which is required per Schedule H to the Interconnection Service Agreement and Section 8 of Manual 14D.

An Interconnection Customer 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.

PJM utilizes manufacturer models to ensure the performance of turbines is properly captured during the simulations performed for stability verification and, where applicable, for compliance with low voltage ride through requirements. Turbine manufacturers provide such models to their customers. The list of manufacturer models PJM has already validated is contained in Attachment B of Manual 14G. 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 4.3 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 B-1 of Manual 14G) 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.

2 General

The Interconnection Customer (IC), has proposed a Solar; Storage generating facility located in Union County, OH. The installed facilities will have a total capability of 427 MW with 295 MW of this output being recognized by PJM as Capacity. The proposed in-service date for this project is 5/31/2022. This study does not imply a TO commitment to this in-service date.

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.

The Feasibility Study includes Short Circuit and Peak Load steady state power flow analyses. The conduct of power flow studies at other load levels, stability analysis, and coordination with non-PJM Transmission Planners, as required under the PJM planning process, is not performed during the Generation Interconnection Feasibility Study phase of the PJM study process. Additional reinforcement requirements for this Interconnection Request may be defined during the conduct of these additional analyses which shall be performed following execution of the System Impact Study agreement

Queue Number	AF1-227
Project Name	MARYSVILLE-SOUTHWEST LIMA 345 KV
State	Ohio
County	Union
Transmission Owner	AEP
MFO	425
MWE	425
MWC	295
Fuel	Solar; Storage
Basecase Study Year	2023

2.1 Point of Interconnection

AF1-227 will interconnect with the AEP transmission system tapping the Marysville to Southwest Lima 345 kV line.

To accommodate the interconnection on the Marysville to Southwest Lima 345 kV circuit, a new three (3) circuit breaker 345 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, 345 kV line risers, SCADA, and 345 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.

2.2 Cost Summary

This project will be responsible for the following costs:

Description	Total Cost
Attachment Facilities	\$350,000
Direct Connection Network Upgrade	\$8,000,000
Non Direct Connection Network Upgrades	\$1,900,000
Total Costs	\$10,250,000

In addition, this project may be responsible for a contribution to the following costs

Description	Total Cost
System Upgrades	\$0

Cost allocations for these upgrades will be provided in the System Impact Study Report.

3 Transmission Owner Scope of Work

4 Attachment Facilities

The total preliminary cost estimate for the Attachment work is given in the table below. These costs do not include CIAC Tax Gross-up.

Description	Total Cost
345 kV Revenue Metering	\$350,000
Total Attachment Facility Costs	\$350,000

5 Direct Connection Cost Estimate

The total preliminary cost estimate for the Direct Connection work is given in the table below. These costs do not include CIAC Tax Gross-up.

Description	Total Cost
Construct a new three (3) circuit breaker 345 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, 345 kV line risers and SCADA will also be required.	\$8,000,000
Total Direct Connection Facility Costs	\$8,000,000

6 Non-Direct Connection Cost Estimate

The total preliminary cost estimate for the Non-Direct Connection work is given in the table below. These costs do not include CIAC Tax Gross-up.

Description	Total Cost
Upgrade line protections & Controls at the 345kV remote end Substation #1	\$350,000
Upgrade line protections & Controls at the 345kV remote end Substation #2	\$350,000
345 kV Transmission Line Cut In	\$1,200,000
Total Non-Direct Connection Facility Costs	\$1,900,000

7 Incremental Capacity Transfer Rights (ICTRs)

Will be determined at a later study phase

8 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 generally be between 24 to 36 months after signing Agreement execution.

9 Interconnection Customer Requirements

It is understood that the Interconnection Customer is responsible for all costs associated with this interconnection. The costs above are reimbursable to AEP. The cost of the Interconnection Customer's generating plant and the costs for the line connecting the generating plant to AEP's 345kV Facilities are not included in this report; these are assumed to be the Interconnection Customer'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.

10 Revenue Metering and SCADA Requirements

10.1 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 Section 8 of Attachment O.

10.2 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>

11 Network Impacts

The Queue Project AF1-227 was evaluated as a 425 MW (Capacity 295.0 MW) injection tapping the Marysville to Southwest Lima 345 kV line in the AEP area. Project AF1-227 was evaluated for compliance with applicable reliability planning criteria (PJM, NERC, NERC Regional Reliability Councils, and Transmission Owners). Project AF1-227 was studied with a commercial probability of 1.00. Potential network impacts were as follows:

Summer Peak Load Flow

12 Generation Deliverability

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

None

13 Multiple Facility Contingency

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

None

14 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

15 Potential Congestion due to Local Energy Deliverability

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.

Note: Only the most severely overloaded conditions are listed below. 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 shall study all overload conditions associated with the overloaded element(s) identified.

None

16 System Reinforcements

ID	Index	Facility	Upgrade Description	Cost
			TOTAL COST	\$0

17 Flow Gate Details

The following indices contain additional information about each flowgate presented in the body of the report. For each index, 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. Although this information is not used "as is" for cost allocation purposes, it can be used to gage other generators impact. It should be noted the generator contributions presented in the appendices sections are full contributions, whereas in the body of the report, those contributions take into consideration the commercial probability of each project.

Affected Systems

18 Affected Systems

18.1 LG&E

LG&E Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

18.2 MISO

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

18.3 TVA

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

18.4 Duke Energy Progress

Duke Energy Progress Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

18.5 NYISO

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

Short Circuit

19 Short Circuit

The following Breakers are overduty

Bus Number	Bus Name	BREAKER	Type	Capacity (Amps)	Duty Percentage Post Queue	Duty Percentage Pre Queue

Secondary Point of Interconnection

20 Network Impacts – secondary POI

The Queue Project AF1-227 was evaluated as a 425 MW (Capacity 295.0 MW) injection tapping the Marysville to East lime 345 kV line in the AEP area. Project AF1-227 was evaluated for compliance with applicable reliability planning criteria (PJM, NERC, NERC Regional Reliability Councils, and Transmission Owners). Project AF1-227 was studied with a commercial probability of 1.00. Potential network impacts were as follows:

Summer Peak Load Flow

21 Generation Deliverability

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

None

22 Multiple Facility Contingency

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

None

23 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

24 Potential Congestion due to Local Energy Deliverability

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.

Note: Only the most severely overloaded conditions are listed below. 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 shall study all overload conditions associated with the overloaded element(s) identified.

ID	FROM BUS#	FROM BUS	kV	FROM BUS AREA	TO BUS#	TO BUS	kV	TO BUS AREA	CK T ID	CONT NAME	Type	Rating MVA	PRE PROJECT LOADIN G %	POST PROJECT LOADIN G %	AC/D C	MW IMPACT
51947942	242935	05E LIMA	345.0	AEP	242945	05SW LIM	345.0	AEP	1	AEP_P1-2_#11144-B	operation	971.0	94.65	107.4	DC	123.71
43546248	243902	05HARDIN SS	345.0	AEP	242935	05E LIMA	345.0	AEP	1	Base Case	operation	897.0	110.2	121.97	DC	105.6
51947722	243902	05HARDIN SS	345.0	AEP	242935	05E LIMA	345.0	AEP	1	AEP_P1-2_#11144-B	operation	1151.0	115.89	152.81	DC	425.0
51947717	945620	AF1-227 TAP	345.0	AEP	242939	05MARYSV	345.0	AEP	1	AEP_P1-2_#6496	operation	1151.0	115.89	152.81	DC	425.0
51947718	945620	AF1-227 TAP	345.0	AEP	242939	05MARYSV	345.0	AEP	1	Base Case	operation	897.0	81.6	117.21	DC	319.4

25 Flow Gate Details

The following indices contain additional information about each flowgate presented in the body of the report. For each index, 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. Although this information is not used "as is" for cost allocation purposes, it can be used to gage other generators impact. It should be noted the generator contributions presented in the appendices sections are full contributions, whereas in the body of the report, those contributions take into consideration the commercial probability of each project.

Affected Systems

26 Affected Systems

26.1 LG&E

LG&E Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

26.2 MISO

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

26.3 TVA

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

26.4 Duke Energy Progress

Duke Energy Progress Impacts to be determined during later study phases (as applicable).

26.5 NYISO

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

27 Contingency Descriptions

Contingency Name	Contingency Definition
Base Case	
AEP_P1-2_#11144-B	CONTINGENCY 'AEP_P1-2_#11144-B' OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 945620 TO BUS 242939 CKT 1 / 945620 AF1-227 TAP 345 242939 05MARYSV 345 1 END
AEP_P1-2_#6496	CONTINGENCY 'AEP_P1-2_#6496' OPEN BRANCH FROM BUS 242935 TO BUS 243902 CKT 1 / 242935 05E LIMA 345 243902 05HARDIN SS 345 1 END

Short Circuit

28 Short Circuit

The following Breakers are overduty

Bus Number	Bus Name	BREAKER	Type	Capacity (Amps)	Duty Percentage Post Queue	Duty Percentage Pre Queue