

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Old Dominion Electric Cooperative v.  
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Docket Nos. EL17-32-000

Advanced Energy Management Alliance v.  
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

EL17-36-000

SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE OF TECHNICAL CONFERENCE

(April 18, 2018)

On February 23, 2018, the Commission issued an order (February Order) directing Commission staff to convene a technical conference in these proceedings.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the February Order, on March 16, 2018, a notice was issued soliciting responses to a list of questions in the above referenced proceedings.<sup>2</sup> The technical conference is scheduled for April 24, 2018, at the Commission's headquarters at 888 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20426 between 9:30 am and 4:15 pm (EDT).

In the February Order, the Commission found that the issues presented in the above captioned proceedings raise a number of issues related to the PJM capacity market that warrant further examination. Accordingly, the Commission established a technical conference to explore these issues. The purpose of the conference is to obtain further information concerning the above referenced proceedings.

A revised agenda with an updated list of selected speakers is attached and will be available on the web calendar on the Commission's website, [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov). A schedule for post-technical conference comments will be established following the technical conference.

The conference will be open for the public to attend. Advanced registration is not required but is highly encouraged. Attendees may register at the following webpage: <http://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/registration/04-24-18-form.asp>. Attendees should allow time to pass through building security procedures before the 9:30 am (EDT)

---

<sup>1</sup> *Old Dominion Elec. Coop.*, 162 FERC ¶ 61,160 (2018).

<sup>2</sup> *Notice of Request for Comments and Technical Conference*, Docket Nos. EL17-32-000 and EL17-36-000 (Mar. 28, 2016).

start time of the technical conference. In addition, information on this event will be posted on the Calendar of Events on the Commission's web site, [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov), prior to the event.

The technical conference will be transcribed and will be part of the record in these proceedings. Transcripts will be available for a fee from Ace-Federal Reports, Inc. (202-347-3700). There will be a free webcast of the conference. The webcast will allow persons to listen to the technical conference, but not participate. Anyone with internet access who wants to listen to the conference can do so by navigating to the Calendar of Events at [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) and locating the technical conference in the Calendar. The technical conference listing on the calendar will contain a link to its webcast.

The Capitol Connection provides technical support for the webcast and offers the option of listening to the meeting via phone-bridge for a fee. The phone bridge must be requested at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting. If you have any questions, visit [www.CapitolConnection.org](http://www.CapitolConnection.org) or call 703-993-3100. The webcast will be available on the Calendar of Events on the Commission's web site [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) for three months after the conference.

Commission conferences are accessible under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. For accessibility accommodations, please send an email to [accessibility@ferc.gov](mailto:accessibility@ferc.gov) or call toll free (866) 208-3372 (voice) or (202) 502-8659 (TTY), or send a FAX to (202) 208-2106 with the required accommodations.

For more information about this technical conference, please contact:

Sarah McKinley (Logistical Issues)  
Office of External Affairs  
202-502-8368  
[sarah.mckinley@ferc.gov](mailto:sarah.mckinley@ferc.gov)

John Riehl (Technical Issues)  
Office of Energy Market Regulation  
202-502-6026  
[john.riehl@ferc.gov](mailto:john.riehl@ferc.gov)

Noah Monick (Legal Issues)  
Office of General Counsel  
202-502-8299  
noah.monick@ferc.gov

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.



## **PJM SEASONAL CAPACITY TECHNICAL CONFERENCE**

**Docket Nos. EL17-32-000 and EL17-36-000  
April 24, 2018**

The purpose of this Commission staff-led technical conference is to examine issues related to the procurement of capacity in PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM), including peak shaving practices within the context of PJM's transition to 100 percent Capacity Performance Resources, the calculation of loss of load expectation (LOLE), the distribution of LOLE over the year in setting capacity procurement requirements, and the possibility of procuring different amounts of capacity in different seasons.

**9:30 AM – 9:40 AM      Welcoming Remarks**

**9:40 AM – 11:00 AM      Peak Shaving Panel**

The objective of the Peak Shaving panel is to review current practices to account for customer peak shaving efforts in the PJM footprint and possible alternatives. Specifically, this panel will review how PJM currently accounts for peak shaving in its load forecasting methodology, with a focus on reducing a specific Locational Deliverability Area's (LDA) capacity obligation to maintain reliability, and advantages and disadvantages of the current practices. Additionally, this panel will examine alternatives to PJM's peak shaving practices, including modifications to PJM's load forecasting methodologies, again focusing on satisfying a specific LDA's capacity obligation to maintain reliability, the advantages and disadvantages of alternative methodologies, and obstacles to implementing those alternative methods. To examine these issues, Commission staff expects to explore the following questions:

1. What is the role of peak shaving where demand can alternatively reflect its peak needs via Demand Response, Energy Efficiency, and Price Responsive Demand? Further, how does PJM account for the effect of these products in its capacity market given their impacts in the energy market?

2. Are there reasonable modifications to these products that could be alternatives to modifying PJM's load forecasting methodology?
3. Does the seasonal nature of most customer peak shaving efforts negatively impact their ability to provide Demand Response, Energy Efficiency, and Price Responsive Demand in PJM's markets?

- **Majorie Philips, Direct Energy Business Marketing, LLC**
- **Bruce Campbell, CPower**
- **Tom Falin, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.**
- **William Fields, Maryland Office of People's Counsel**
- **Joseph Bowring, Monitoring Analytics**

**11:00 AM – 11:15 AM     Break**

**11:15 AM – 12:30 PM     Loss Of Load Expectation Panel**

The objective of the Loss of Load Expectation (LOLE) panel is to review PJM's current LOLE risk allocation practices. Specifically, this panel will examine whether PJM's existing practice of placing the majority of LOLE risk in the 10 peak-summer weeks while holding a near-zero LOLE risk in the remaining 42 (non-summer) weeks of the year accurately reflects the relative values of reliability in the two seasons. This panel will also review how PJM accounts for outage-related factors in its LOLE calculations. To examine these issues, Commission staff expects to explore the following questions:

1. What are the underlying assumptions and calculations that support PJM's current LOLE risk allocation? What seasonal, economic, or operational characteristics are accounted for in PJM's LOLE risk allocation calculations?
2. Given PJM's procurement of additional reserves above the required reserve margin, how does maintaining the current LOLE risk allocation reflect the value of generation supply in the summer months vs. winter months? How does PJM account for its additional reserves procured above its required reserve margin in its current LOLE assumptions and calculations?
3. Considering that the Polar Vortex of 2014 was a contributing factor in the creation and implementation of Capacity Performance, what is the justification for maintaining a LOLE risk allocation that emphasizes summer-period outages?

4. Based on the evidence PJM provided to its stakeholders showing alternate LOLE allocations, what is the ideal or correct LOLE risk allocation? If PJM were to use an alternate LOLE risk allocation methodology, how would the corresponding differences in summer vs. winter resource procurement affect the Variable Resource Requirement Curve?

- **Michael Cocco, Old Dominion Electric Cooperative**
- **Tom Rutigliano, Advanced Energy Management Alliance**
- **Tom Falin, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.**
- **Michael Jacobs, Union of Concerned Scientists**
- **Joseph Bowring, Monitoring Analytics**
- **Steven Schleimer, Calpine Corporation**

**12:30 PM – 1:30 PM      Lunch Break**

**1:30 PM – 4:15 PM      Seasonality Panel**

The objective of this panel is to discuss the value and feasibility of alternatives to PJM's current LOLE practices that may better account for seasonal patterns in PJM's capacity needs. Specifically, this panel will examine the advantages and disadvantages of procuring capacity under alternate LOLE allocations (e.g., 2-8 allocation, which allocates a two percent risk in the 42 non-summer weeks and an eight percent risk in the 10 peak-summer weeks) while retaining the existing 10 percent annual LOLE. This panel will also discuss possibilities for shifting capacity procurement to a seasonal-based construct. The panel will explore alternative ways of procuring different amounts of capacity in different parts of the year, e.g., PJM's past practice of procuring both annual and seasonal resources in the same auction, versus creating two distinct auctions to separately procure capacity in the summer and capacity in the rest of the year. To further examine this issue, Commission staff expects to explore the following questions:

1. Are there feasible alternatives to PJM's current LOLE practices that may better account for the seasonal needs of PJM's system? If so, what are they and what benefits would each provide? What transition costs would they entail?
2. What are the implementation challenges to adopting a seasonal capacity market construct? Specifically, what assumptions would PJM have to modify to facilitate a seasonal capacity market construct? What new assumptions would PJM have to make for a seasonal capacity market construct?

3. Under a seasonal capacity market construct, what LOLE risk allocation across summer and winter periods would appropriately reflect PJM's summer peaking nature? If PJM explores this possibility, what criteria should be used to determine a reasonable LOLE risk allocation between the seasons?

- **Steven Lieberman, American Municipal Power**
- **Tom Rutigliano, Advanced Energy Management Alliance**
- **Stu Bresler, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.**
- **Sam Newell, The Brattle Group**
- **Andrew Place, Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission**
- **Roy Shanker, Independent Consultant**
- **James Wilson, Wilson Energy Economics**
- **Rob Gramlich, Grid Strategies, LLC**