



Attachment M-3 Update

Aaron Berner
Planning Committee
January 11, 2022



- Review of issues
- Discuss remaining open items
- Stakeholder feedback



- **Issue:** Concerns about Planning Community questions not being addressed appropriately
- **Resolution:** The Transmission Owners have been promptly reviewing and responding to planning questions submitted to the Planning Community. The Transmission Owners have also been properly noting non-planning questions as out of scope or inapplicable.



Issue: Various relating to information presented (item 13 in Appendix)

• Resolution:

- The Transmission Owners strive to provide information on a consistent basis to stakeholders where possible and not unduly burdensome. Consistency in all responses for all Transmission Owners is functionally unrealistic given the different nature of each transmission system and each Transmission Owners' criteria. Where illustrative, TOs have been indicating how many structures have issues or fail inspection out of the total number of structures on a line.
- Regarding consistency for SAIDI, etc., SAIDI, SAIFI, and CAIDI are distribution metrics and not relevant to transmission, particularly the BES which must meet NERC reliability standards.
- Regarding the number of outages as a driver, generally the TOs try to have this information available to discuss verbally. Because of the different systems, it is difficult to provide a greater level of consistency across the TO systems.
- Since generally lines have multiple varying vintages and Solutions typically only address the affected section of the line and not the line in totality, listing individual vintage of assets for an entire line does not address, and often may confuse, the root need for a project. TOs have been providing necessary age information and have been responsive to questions flowing therefrom during planning discussions at SRRTEP and TEAC.
- The TOs are unaware of any timing hurdles resulting from only including the name of each company on the presentment slides. Each SRRTEP has a roster that lists TO and stakeholder contacts. Additionally, in facilitating presentations by each TO, PJM provides or asks for the name of the TO presenter or the individual TO presenter voluntarily announces themselves.
- The TOs are unaware of any conflicting Needs and Drivers. If this was a problem, it appears to have been resolved.
- The TOs are unaware of any Solutions addressing issues or assets not identified in Needs statements. The TOs are also unaware of this issue being raised at TEAC or at an individual SRRTEP. If this was a problem, it appears to have been resolved.



- **Issue:** Are drivers and driver details consistent across a TO's projects? Across TO's? ... (Item 30 in Appendix)
- **Resolution:**
 - The drivers are not consistent across Transmission Owners – The geographical differences in the Transmission Owner footprints would not be conducive to having uniform / consistent drivers.
 - The Transmission Owners believe that adequate information is being provided at the Needs phase.
 - To rank or prioritize Needs does not add useful information to the Needs statement with no benefit to the analysis itself and would be unduly burdensome.



- **Issue:** Request to add information on slides relating to other supplemental projects and baseline upgrades which may be in the electrical vicinity of the M-3 need being discussed
- **Resolution:**
 - PJM is already posting an aggregate map that shows Supplemental Projects
 - PJM to include this as part of the map project which remains open



- Delayed until 2022 due to budget constraints
- M-3 does not include any specified timeline between when a Need is submitted and a Solution is proposed
 - Transmission Owners have reviewed the list of Needs that were presented and are more than 2 years old. The Transmission Owners intend to explore this issue more fully and consider options, including potentially updating the Attachment M-3 Process Guideline document to incorporate further guidance with respect to Needs and Solution presentment timelines.

Open Items – Propose Closing



Items identified in “Review of Issues” this presentation and also indicated in Appendix

Full Action Item list in meeting materials for the January 11, 2022 PC link:

<https://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/committees/pc>



SME/Presenter:

Aaron Berner;
Aaron.Berner@pjm.com

Attachment M-3 Update



Member Hotline

(610) 666 – 8980

(866) 400 – 8980

custsvc@pjm.com

**PROTECT THE
POWER GRID
THINK BEFORE
YOU CLICK!**



Be alert to
malicious
phishing emails.

Report suspicious email activity to PJM.
(610) 666-2244 / it_ops_ctr_shift@pjm.com





Appendix

Action Item List

Item Number	Action Item	Status	Action to take
13	<p><u>TOs are presenting Needs but most are providing insufficient information to stakeholders to validate that the identified Needs are justified</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Most of the TOs are not providing enough information or timely information for Stakeholders to replicate their results per FERC Show cause Orders</u> • For condition drivers, TO's present the number of structures and the number of open conditions, but only some provide the number of structures with open conditions • Most TOs cite the number of outages as a driver for condition/performance need, but do not provide cause of outages, and ordinarily do not have information on hand • [10/11/2019] Request that cause of outages be provided in addition to the number of outages • Some consistency needed with factors used to determine need based on performance, such as SAIDI, SAIFI and CAIDI, particularly as to # of years used to calculate and what data set is used (service to other utilities vs. vertically integrated distribution affiliate) • TOs cite age of initial line as vintage of entire line, without providing percentage of total line that is original vintage • There is no contact information on slides this creates more timing hurdles • <u>10-day input deadline is a deadline to fail when:</u> <p><u>1. The proposal does not include an adequate level of information</u></p>	<p>The Transmission Owners strive to provide information on a consistent basis to stakeholders where possible and not unduly burdensome. Consistency in all responses for all Transmission Owners is functionally unrealistic given the different nature of each transmission system and each Transmission Owners' criteria. Where illustrative, TOs have been indicating how many structures have issues or fail inspection out of the total number of structures on a line.</p> <p>Regarding consistency for SAIDI, etc., SAIDI, SAIFI, and CAIDI are distribution metrics and not relevant to transmission, particularly the BES which must meet NERC reliability standards.</p> <p>Regarding the number of outages as a driver, generally the TOs try to have this information available to discuss verbally. Because of the different systems, it is difficult to provide a greater level of consistency across the TO systems.</p> <p>Since generally lines have multiple varying vintages and Solutions typically only address the affected section of the line and not the line in totality, listing individual vintage of assets for an entire line does not address, and often may confuse, the root need for a project. TOs have been providing necessary age information and have been responsive to questions flowing therefrom during planning discussions at SRRTPEP and TEAC.</p>	Close

Action Item List

Item Number	Action Item	Status	Date Entered
<p>13 (continued)</p>	<p><u>2. Requests for information are left unanswered</u></p> <p><u>3. There is no process to get answers or follow-up</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Certain TOs are not providing information or appropriate granularity</u> • <u>Many of the criteria that are provided include poorly-defined or nonexistent criteria and no criteria thresholds</u> • <u>Additional transparency regarding criteria definitions requested</u> • <u>Many of the assumptions that are provided are overly broad or conservative, ill-defined, and/or include “catch all” statements</u> • <u>[10/11/2019] CAPS requests more details at the Needs meeting to add necessary value for CAPS participation in the Alternatives and Solutions phase</u> • <u>[10/11/2019] Some TOs providing conflicting Needs and Drivers</u> • <u>[10/11/2019] Needs not detailed enough in some cases for stakeholders to participate meaningfully in the process</u> • <u>Many Solutions address issues or assets not identified in the Needs statements</u> • <u>When an assumption is tied to an M3 need, please provide the quantitative value associated this assumption (ie: elevated gas levels yield x% increase in gas levels) (5/22/2020)</u> • <u>Where are actionable levels identified, can TO point to a criteria when they make statements along the lines of “elevated gas levels” (5/22/2020)</u> 	<p>The TOs are unaware of any timing hurdles resulting from only including the name of each company on the presentment slides. Each SRRTEP has a roster that lists TO and stakeholder contacts. Additionally, in facilitating presentations by each TO, PJM provides or asks for the name of the TO presenter or the individual TO presenter voluntarily announces themselves.</p> <p>The TOs are unaware of any conflicting Needs and Drivers. If this was a problem, it appears to have been resolved.</p> <p>The TOs are unaware of any Solutions addressing issues or assets not identified in Needs statements. The TOs are also unaware of this issue being raised at TEAC or at an individual SRRTEP. If this was a problem, it appears to have been resolved.</p>	<p>Close</p>

Action Item List

Item Number	Action Item	Status	Date Entered
25	<p>M-3 does not include any specified timeline between when a Need is submitted and a Solution is proposed</p> <p>When a credible, identified Need is identified – how long should it take to see a proposed Solution? Might Need criteria help?</p>	<p>PJM will look to explore when a need might be withdrawn when there is no activity to pursue solution - 18 months?</p> <p>Transmission Owners have reviewed the list of Needs that were presented and are more than 2 years old. The Transmission Owners intend to explore this issue more fully and consider options, including potentially updating the Attachment M-3 Process Guideline document to incorporate further guidance with respect to Needs and Solution presentment timelines.</p>	Keep Open
30	<p>Are drivers and driver details consistent across a TO's projects? Across TO's?</p> <p>Looking for more information at the needs phase</p> <p>Desire to have a ranking of Needs – more information at the Needs phase is desired. Desire for “ranking/prioritizing” Needs</p>	<p>The drivers are not consistent across Transmission Owners – The geographical differences in the Transmission Owner footprints would not be conducive to having uniform / consistent drivers.</p> <p>The Transmission Owners believe that adequate information is being provided at the Needs phase.</p> <p>To rank or prioritize Needs does not add useful information to the Needs statement with no benefit to the analysis itself and would be unduly burdensome.</p>	Close
40	<p>Request to add information on slides relating to other supplemental projects and baseline upgrades which may be in the electrical vicinity of the M-3 need being discussed</p>	<p>PJM is already posting an aggregate map that shows Supplemental Projects.</p> <p>PJM to include this as part of the map project which remains open</p>	Close and add to map project