

## APPENDIX I – Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback











Load:ExtremeRefueling:LimitedDisruption:Looped 2 HighNon-Firm Avail:62.50%Retirement:AnnouncedDispatch:Economic





System	Ove	ervie	w												L	oac			
140,000		• •			•	C	AF	AF	$\sim \lambda$	N	A	A			R	etu	eiin	ig:	
120,000 100,000 9	M	M	M	V	V	$\mathcal{M}$	Λ.A	99	Mr.	0.	<b>8</b> 8	ΨV	M	M	N	on-	Fir	on: n A ent	v.
10,000	A.,			Hours	: 5.0										D	isp	atcl	h:	
5,000	AV	erage		v: 3,3	59.4						1				Но	urh	70	nal	Δ
0																, any	, 20		^
10,000																			
5,000	Av	verag	H ge M	ours: W: 36	5.0 57.8										Z		2	1	1
0											-				-	C			
10,000				Hour	s: 0.0														~~
5,000		Av	erag	e IVIV	V: 0.0														
0																		5	
15,000			Нош	re: 0 (	)														2
10,000	Average MW: 0.0																		
5,000		0													Į.				
\$4,000															\$0	)	\$2	,000	)
\$2,000															Si	tes	Out	of	0
\$0												UV	-		0	0	0	0	(
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	1	2	3	4	Ę
(	Gas F	Pipel	ine [	)isrup	tion		Da	y of	Eve	nt					*14	1 To	otal S	Sites	

Extreme Moderate Looped 2 High /ail: 0% Announced Economic

verage LMP [\$]







10 11 12 13 14





10 11 12 13 14

8 9

Day of Event





10 11 12 13 14

9





Extreme Moderate Looped 2 High **Escalated** 1 Economic











Load:ExtremeRefueling:ModerateDisruption:Looped 2 HighNon-Firm Avail:62.50%Retirement:Escalated 2Dispatch:Economic







Load:ExtremeRefueling:LimitedDisruption:Looped 2 HighNon-Firm Avail:62.50%Retirement:Escalated 2Dispatch:Economic







Moderate Looped 2 High Escalated 2 Economic



PJM©2019





10 11 12 13 14



140,000

120,000

100,000

10,000

5,000 0 10,000

5,000

10,000

5,000 0 15,000 10,000

5,000

\$4,000

\$2,000

\$0

0

**14-day Pipeline Disruption Sensitivity 13** Load: Extreme System Overview Am MMM **Refueling:** Moderate Looped 2 High **Disruption:** Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% **Retirement:** Announced Hours: 1.0 Disnatch: Economic 4.76M

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback:

13 14

Average MW: 42.9	
	Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$]
Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0	
Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0	
Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0	
	\$0 \$2,000
	Sites Out of Oil Oil Barrels Burned:
	0 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4 7 15 19
Gas Pipeline Disruption Day of Event	*141 Total Sites Day of Event



Load: Extreme System Overview manna Refueling: Limited 140,000 Disruption: Looped 2 High 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% 100,000 **Retirement:** Announced Hours: 2.0 Dispatch: Economic 10,000 Average MW: 270.4 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 1.0 5,000 Average MW: 7.7 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil **Oil Barrels Burned: 3.82M** \$2,000 14 34 47 60 68 67 59 \$0 3 10 11 12 13 14 2 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 2 6 8 9 3 5 1 5 6 1 4 \*141 Total Sites Day of Event Gas Pipeline Disruption Day of Event



Load: Extreme System Overview Refueling: Moderate 140,000 Looped 2 High Disruption: 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 0% 100,000 **Retirement:** Announced Hours: 7.0 Dispatch: Economic 10,000 Average MW: 1,427.1 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 5.0 5,000 Average MW: 353.8 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil **Oil Barrels Burned: 5.39M** \$2,000 11 22 22 3 1 \$0 2 3 5 9 10 11 12 13 14 2 3 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 6 8 1 1 4 5 6 \*141 Total Sites Day of Event Day of Event Gas Pipeline Disruption







Load: Extreme System Overview **Refueling:** Moderate 140,000 Disruption: Looped 2 High 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% 100,000 **Retirement: Escalated 1** Hours: 62.0 Economic **Dispatch:** 10,000 Average MW: 1,555.3 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] NAM 0 10,000 Hours: 7.0 5,000 Average MW: 319.9 0 10,000 Hours: 15.0 Average MW: 820.1 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 2.0 10,000 Average MW: 780.9 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil \$2,000 \$0 11 12 13 2 3 5 6 9 10 14 2 3 8 \*141 Total Sites Gas Pipeline Disruption Day of Event

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: **14-day Pipeline Disruption Sensitivity 17** 

Oil Barrels Burned: 6.46M

9

Day of Event

8

10 11 12 13 14



















Load: Extreme System Overview **Refueling:** Limited 140,000 **Disruption:** 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% 100,000 **Retirement:** Hours: 33.0 Dispatch: 10,000 Average MW: 1,512.7 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 20.0 5,000 Average MW: 382.7 0 10,000 Hours: 2.0 Average MW: 38.3 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil \$2,000 \$0 11 12 2 1 2 3 5 6 8 9 10 13 14 1 3 4 5 6 8 \*141 Total Sites Day of Event Gas Pipeline Disruption

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: **14-day Pipeline Disruption Sensitivity 22** 

Looped 2 High Escalated 2 Economic





Load: Extreme System Overview **Refueling:** Moderate 140,000 Disruption: Looped 2 High 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 0% 100,000 **Retirement:** Escalated 2 Hours: 96.0 **Dispatch:** Economic 10,000 Average MW: 3,505.8 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 81.0 5,000 Average MW: 536.2 0 10,000 Hours: 32.0 Average MW: 1,145.8 5,000 0 MANA 15,000 Hours: 18.0 10,000 Average MW: 2,497.0 5,000 \$2,000 \$0 \$4,000 Oil Barrels Burned: 7.27M Sites Out of Oil \$2,000 17 \$0 3 11 12 13 14 2 9 2 5 6 7 9 10 3 8 8 6 1 4 \*141 Total Sites Day of Event Day of Event Gas Pipeline Disruption

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: **14-day Pipeline Disruption Sensitivity 23** 

24 28 32 14 3

10 11 12 13 14







Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: Initial Oil Inventory Level at 50% Sensitivity 25



Load:ExtremeRefueling:ModerateDisruption:NoneNon-Firm Avail:62.50%Retirement:AnnouncedDispatch:Economic





## Load: Extreme System Overview **Refueling:** Limited 140,000 **Disruption:** None 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% 100,000 **Retirement:** Announced Hours: 1.0 Dispatch: Economic 10,000 Average MW: 34.0 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 5,000 Average MW: 0.0 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil **Oil Barrels Burned: 3.25M** \$2,000 17 47 62 71 75 71 64 \$0 10 11 12 13 14 2 3 9 10 11 12 13 14 1 2 3 6 8 9 5 6 8 5 1 4 4 \*141 Total Sites Day of Event Day of Event



Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: Initial Oil Inventory Level at 50% **Sensitivity 27** 



Extreme Moderate None Non-Firm Avail: 0% Announced Economic





Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: Initial Oil Inventory Level at 50% Sensitivity 28



Load:ExtremeRefueling:LimitedDisruption:NoneNon-Firm Avail:0%Retirement:AnnouncedDispatch:Economic





## Load: System Overview **Refueling:** 140,000 Disruption: 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 100,000 **Retirement:** Hours: 13.0 Dispatch: 10,000 Average MW: 1,288.4 5,000 0 10,000 Hours: 5.0 5,000 Average MW: 425.1 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil \$2,000 \$0 2 3 5 9 10 11 12 13 14 2 3 6 8 1 6 1 4 5 Δ \*141 Total Sites Day of Event

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: Initial Oil Inventory Level at 50% **Sensitivity 29** 

Extreme Moderate None 62.50% **Escalated** 1 Economic





## Load: Extreme System Overview **Refueling:** Limited 140,000 Disruption: None 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% 100,000 **Retirement: Escalated 1** Hours: 28.0 Dispatch: Economic 10,000 Average MW: 1,316.4 5,000 Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$] 0 10,000 Hours: 7.0 5,000 Average MW: 267.7 0 10,000 Hours: 3.0 Average MW: 524.8 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil Oil Barrels Burned: 4.33M \$2,000 3 10 15 28 25 30 53 55 67 76 97 97 94 81 \$0 10 12 13 14 2 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 3 9 11 3 6 2 5 6 8 5 1 4 4 Day of Event \*141 Total Sites Day of Event











Load: System Overview **Refueling:** 140,000 Disruption: 120,000 Non-Firm Avail: 100,000 **Retirement:** Hours: 7.0 Dispatch: 10,000 Average MW: 1,082.6 5,000 0 10,000 Hours: 5.0 5,000 Average MW: 508.4 0 10,000 Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 0 15,000 Hours: 0.0 10,000 Average MW: 0.0 5,000 \$0 \$2,000 \$4,000 Sites Out of Oil \$2,000 \$0 12 1 2 2 3 10 11 13 14 3 5 9 4 1 5 6 8 4 Day of Event

Phase 1 Sensitivities based on Stakeholder Feedback: Initial Oil Inventory Level at 50% **Sensitivity 33** 

Extreme Moderate None 62.50% **Escalated 2** Economic
















9

10 11 12 13 14



PJM©2019

















































Load:ExtremeRefueling:ModerateDisruption:NoneNon-Firm Avail:62.50%Retirement:Escalated 3Dispatch:Economic

Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$]





System	Overview	Load:	Extreme
140,000 120,000 100,000	Hours: 20.0	Refueling: Disruption: Non-Firm Avail: Retirement: Dispatch:	Limited None 62.50% Escalated 3
5,000	Average MW: 886.1	Hourly Zonal Average	e LMP [\$]
0 10,000 5,000 0	Hours: 4.0 Average MW: 277.4		
10,000 5,000 0	Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0		2 mg
15,000 10,000 5,000	Hours: 0.0 Average MW: 0.0		E C
\$4,000	2	\$0	
\$2,000 \$0_		Sites Out of Oil	Oil Barrels Bu 16 22 37 48
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	1 2 3 4 5 6	7 8 9 10
	Day of Event	*141 Total Sites	Day of Eve

Barrels Burned: 4.19M 22 37 48 65 70 70 61 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 Day of Event











None 0% Escalated 3 Economic Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$]

Extreme

Limited











Extreme Limited Looped 2 High Non-Firm Avail: 62.50% **Escalated 3** Economic

Hourly Zonal Average LMP [\$]













### APPENDIX II – Scenarios using Relevant Risk data from Historical Cold Snap Events



#### LOLE vs Disruption for each Cold Snap - Announced Retirements

### Results considering RR-FOR and other random forced outages with no additional disruptions.



# MUDLE vs Disruption for each Cold Snap (CS) - Announced Retirements

Disruption	CS1.1977.17d	CS2.1989.14d	CS3.2017.13d	CS4.1981.11d	CS5.1978.10d	CS6.2013.10d	CS7.2006.9d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## DIMLOLE vs Disruption for each Cold Snap (CS) - Announced Retirements

Disruption	CS8.1976.8d	CS9.1993.8d	CS10.2014.8d	CS11.1976.7d	CS12.1976.7d	CS13.1987.7d	CS14.1995.7d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## DIN LOLE vs Disruption for each Cold Snap (CS) - Announced Retirements

Disruption	CS15.2000.7d	CS16.1972.6d	CS17.1979.6d	CS18.1980.6d	CS19.1986.6d	CS20.1995.6d	CS21.1976.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

MUDLE vs Disruption for each Cold Snap (CS) - Announced Retirements

Disruption	CS22.1983.5d	CS23.1983.5d	CS24.1984.5d	CS25.1993.5d	CS26.1994.5d	CS27.2002.5d	CS28.2003.5d	CS29.2014.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



#### Results considering RR-FOR and other random







Disruption	CS1.1977.17d	CS2.1989.14d	CS3.2017.13d	CS4.1981.11d	CS5.1978.10d	CS6.2013.10d	CS7.2006.9d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0.00025	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0.0015	0	0	0
6000	0	0.00021	0	0.0052	0	0	0
7000	0	0.001	0	0.012	0	0.00036	0
8000	0	0.0032	0	0.028	0	0.00071	0
9000	6e-05	0.007	0	0.051	0	0.0036	0
10000	0.00018	0.016	0	0.085	0	0.0089	0



Disruption	CS8.1976.8d	CS9.1993.8d	CS10.2014.8d	CS11.1976.7d	CS12.1976.7d	CS13.1987.7d	CS14.1995.7d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0.0001	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0.00042	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0.00083	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0.0029	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0.01	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0.025	0	0	0	0	0.00011
8000	0	0.048	0	0	0	0	0.00011
9000	0.0001	0.079	0	0	0	0	0.00045
10000	0.00021	0.12	0	0.00045	0	0	0.002



Disruption	CS15.2000.7d	CS16.1972.6d	CS17.1979.6d	CS18.1980.6d	CS19.1986.6d	CS20.1995.6d	CS21.1976.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0.00012	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0.0005	0.00012	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0.0015	0.00075	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0.0036	0.0042	0	0



Disruption	CS22.1983.5d	CS23.1983.5d	CS24.1984.5d	CS25.1993.5d	CS26.1994.5d	CS27.2002.5d	CS28.2003.5d	CS29.2014.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0.00028	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0.00069	0	0.00014	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0.0019	0	0.0018	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0.005	0	0.0062	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0.017	0	0.014	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0.043	0.00042	0.035	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0.09	0.0028	0.072	0	0.00042	0	0	0
10000	0.15	0.0094	0.12	0	0.0011	0	0	0



### Results considering RR-FOR and other random forced outages with no additional disruptions.





Disruption	CS1.1977.17d	CS2.1989.14d	CS3.2017.13d	CS4.1981.11d	CS5.1978.10d	CS6.2013.10d	CS7.2006.9d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	8e-05	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0.00033	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0.0017	0	0	0
8000	0	0.00028	0	0.0053	0	0	0
9000	0	0.00076	0	0.013	0	0.00036	0
10000	0	0.0023	0	0.028	0	0.00036	0



Disruption	CS8.1976.8d	CS9.1993.8d	CS10.2014.8d	CS11.1976.7d	CS12.1976.7d	CS13.1987.7d	CS14.1995.7d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0.00021	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0.00021	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0.00052	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0.0017	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0.004	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0.013	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0.029	0	0	0	0	0



Disruption	CS15.2000.7d	CS16.1972.6d	CS17.1979.6d	CS18.1980.6d	CS19.1986.6d	CS20.1995.6d	CS21.1976.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0	0	0	0	0.00012	0	0


Disruption	CS22.1983.5d	CS23.1983.5d	CS24.1984.5d	CS25.1993.5d	CS26.1994.5d	CS27.2002.5d	CS28.2003.5d	CS29.2014.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0.00042	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0.0012	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0.00042	0	0.0037	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0.0024	0	0.0086	0	0	0	0	0
9000	0.0093	0.00028	0.025	0	0	0	0	0
10000	0.028	0.00069	0.053	0	0	0	0	0



### Results considering RR-FOR and other random forced outages with no additional disruptions.



Note: Only Cold Snaps with LOLE > 0 are labeled in the graph



Disruption	CS1.1977.17d	CS2.1989.14d	CS3.2017.13d	CS4.1981.11d	CS5.1978.10d	CS6.2013.10d	CS7.2006.9d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0.00017	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0.00083	0	0	0
6000	0	7e-05	0	0.0032	0	0.00036	0
7000	0	0.00056	0	0.0093	0	0.00071	0
8000	6e-05	0.0017	0	0.024	0	0.0036	0
9000	0.00024	0.0046	0	0.053	0	0.011	0
10000	0.00077	0.013	0	0.096	0	0.034	0.0001



Disruption	CS8.1976.8d	CS9.1993.8d	CS10.2014.8d	CS11.1976.7d	CS12.1976.7d	CS13.1987.7d	CS14.1995.7d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0.0001	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0.00042	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0.00094	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0.0041	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0.011	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0	0.026	0	0	0	0	0.00011
7000	0	0.049	0	0	0	0	0.00034
8000	0.0001	0.074	0	0	0	0	0.00057
9000	0.00021	0.11	0	0.00045	0	0	0.0018
10000	0.00052	0.13	0	0.00091	0	0	0.0066



Disruption	CS15.2000.7d	CS16.1972.6d	CS17.1979.6d	CS18.1980.6d	CS19.1986.6d	CS20.1995.6d	CS21.1976.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0	0	0	0.00012	0	0	0
6000	0	0	0	0.00012	0	0	0
7000	0	0	0	0.0005	0.00012	0	0
8000	0	0	0	0.0018	0.00075	0	0
9000	0	0	0.00012	0.005	0.0036	0	0
10000	0	0	0.00012	0.014	0.0097	0	0



Disruption	CS22.1983.5d	CS23.1983.5d	CS24.1984.5d	CS25.1993.5d	CS26.1994.5d	CS27.2002.5d	CS28.2003.5d	CS29.2014.5d
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2000	0.00014	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3000	0.00056	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4000	0.0022	0	0.00028	0	0	0	0	0
5000	0.0053	0	0.0017	0	0	0	0	0
6000	0.014	0.00014	0.006	0	0	0	0	0
7000	0.036	0.00042	0.017	0	0	0	0	0
8000	0.071	0.00083	0.039	0	0.00042	0	0	0
9000	0.12	0.0039	0.08	0	0.0012	0	0	0
10000	0.17	0.013	0.14	0	0.0035	0	0	0



# APPENDIX III – Description of Monte Carlo Methodology to model Random Forced Outages



- For each thermal unit (and hydro units), it is assumed that there are two states:
  - On (unit is online producing its maximum output)
  - Off (unit is offline, on a forced outage, producing zero output)
- The time a unit spends in either of the above two states is assumed to be a random variable with an exponential distribution (this is a standard reliability assumption). The cumulative density function (CDF) of the exponential distribution is

$$F(x) = 1 - e^{\frac{-x}{\alpha}}$$

where  $\alpha$  is the mean of the distribution (i.e., the mean time a unit is online or the mean time a unit is offline)



- The mean time a unit is online (or mean time to failure) and the mean time a unit is offline (or mean time to repair) can be estimated from the GADS data.
- If a random number *R* is drawn, then the time-in-state, *T*, can be computed using the CDF of the exponential distribution  $T = -\ln(R) * \alpha$
- For instance, for a given unit the mean time to failure is 1,111 hours while the mean time to repair is 84 hours
- Let's assume that in the first replication of the Monte Carlo, the unit starts online



- To determine for how long the unit is online, we draw a random number R. Let's assume the first random number is 0.59. Therefore,  $T_1 = -\ln(0.59) * 1,111 = 586.2 hrs$
- When the simulation clock hits 586.2 hrs, the unit transitions to the offline state. To determine for how long the unit is offline, we use a second random number, say 0.43. Therefore,

 $T_2 = -\ln(0.43) * 84 = 70.9 hrs$ 

 After the forced outage, the simulation clock hits 586.2 + 70.9 = 657.1 hrs. At this time, the unit transitions to the online state and a new random number is generated. This sequence is repeated until reaching the end of the simulation period.



### Monte Carlo for Random Forced Outages

### Total MW raphically



0



End of period In this graph, only 3 units are considered (each one represented by a different color)

Each colored block represents the time a unit is online whereas the white spaces in between represent the time a unit is offline (on a forced outage).

More units can be stacked up in the plot.

A plot such as this one is useful to determine the total amount of capacity available at each hour of the period studied.

This plot represents 1 simulation run.

In the analysis, a total of 1,000 simulations are run.

The random numbers generated by the program change between runs. Thus, each simulation is likely to result in a different graph.



## **APPENDIX IV**



### Portfolio Comparison with NERC Retirement Assessment



	PJM Fuel Security Analysis Portfolios (2023)				NERC Generation Retirement Scenario Assessment (2022)		https://www.nerc.com/pa/
	Announced	Escalated 1	Escalated 2	Escalated 3	Reference Case	Generation Retirement Scenario	<u>Ssessments%20DL/NER</u>
Natural Gas	91,896	108,013	91,896	105,826	77,523	91,007	2018 Einal odf
Coal	47,241	28,643	41,051	28,643	54,432	38,103	
Nuclear	28,800	15,233	19,672	15,233	28,620	15,602	
Portfolio IRM	25.80%	15.8%	15.8%	15.8%	27.4%	16.6%	



## Education

#### FSSTF June 26, 2019

Patricio Rocha Garrido, Resource Adequacy Planning Daniel Bennett, Generation Natalie Tacka, Applied Innovation Patrick Bruno, Capacity Market Operations



- At the previous FSSTF, PJM presented the approach to filter the Relevant Risks
  - This entailed determining a Relevant Period

m

2

### Introduction

#### **From Risks to Relevant Risks**



**jm** 

J



- At today's FSSTF, PJM will make presentations
  - Supporting Winter as the Relevant Period
  - Showing a preliminary version of the Relevant Risks filtering process
  - Showing more information about current Products/Mechanisms that address the most typical uncertainties/risks
- At the July FSSTF, as part of the Gap Analysis, PJM will examine if the identified Relevant Risks are addressed by the current Products/Mechanisms



## **Relevant Period Identification and Methodology**



### Theoretical RTO-wide Forced Outage Rate



If individual forced outages are random and independent

Mean: ~7.0% StDev: ~1.4% 90<sup>th</sup> Perc: ~9.2%



- For the last 11 years, the top 3 peak-load weeks of each season are identified
- The RTO-wide Forced Outage Rate at the peak hour of each weekday within each of the above weeks is recorded
- Therefore, for instance, for Winter Week 1
  - There are 11 winter peak weeks (one for each year)
  - There are 5 peak hours within each of the above weeks (one for each weekday)
  - We end up with 55 RTO-wide forced outage observations

### Empirical RTO-wide Forced Outage Rates

		RTO-Wide Forced Outage Rate		
Season	Load-Magnitude Ordered Week	Mean	StDev	90th perc
Summer	1	7.1%	1.8%	9.3%
Summer	2	7.2%	1.3%	8.5%
Summer	3	6.3%	1.3%	7.9%
Winter	1	8.2%	3.8%	11.8%
Winter	2	7.8%	2.3%	10.2%
Winter	3	7.3%	2.4%	11.3%
Spring	1	7.4%	1.6%	9.2%
Spring	2	7.0%	2.3%	10.1%
Spring	3	6.7%	1.7%	8.8%
Fall	1	6.0%	1.2%	8.0%
Fall	2	6.6%	1.7%	9.3%
Fall	3	5.8%	1.6%	7.6%

For comparison, the Theoretical distribution has the following statistics:

> Mean: ~7.0% StDev: ~1.4% 90<sup>th</sup> Perc: ~9.2%

**jm**<sup>•</sup>

1





Height of line represents how often forced outage rates in x-axis have occurred in the last 11 years for each of the season-week combinations.

In the Top 3 winter weeks, the empirical forced outage distribution (blue line) has a longer right-hand side tail than the theoretical forced outage distribution (green line).



- The previous slide shows that historical RTO-wide Forced Outage Rates during the Top 3 Winter weeks do not comport with the independence assumption
  - For the Top 3 weeks of the rest of the seasons the independence assumption seems to hold
- Why have RTO-wide forced outage rates been historically greater during the Top 3 Winter weeks?



Forced Outages due to Lack Of Fuel

 Using the Empirical RTO-wide Forced Outage Rate data, but only considering those forced outages with cause codes related to lack of fuel yields the following table

		RTO-Wide Forced Outage MW due to Lack of Fue					
Season	Load-Magnitude Ordered Week	Mean	StDev	90th perc			
Winter	1	2,310	2,670	6,649			
Winter	3	1,744	2,307	4,572			
Winter	2	1,600	1,640	3,404			
Spring	2	794	1,448	1,648			
Spring	1	570	651	1,284			
Spring	3	563	516	1,351			
Fall	3	476	497	1,219			
Fall	2	307	486	1,170			
Summer	3	194	368	871			
Fall	1	172	307	654			
Summer	1	131	300	339			
Summer	2	113	308	317			

The weeks showing the highest volume of forced outages due to lack of fuel (Winter 1, Winter 3, Winter 2, Spring 2) are the same weeks showing a longer right-hand side tail for the empirical forced outage distribution in Slide 5.

The top 3 Winter weeks are by far the weeks with the highest volume of forced outages due to lack of fuel



 In addition, Winter is the season with the second highest peak loads. For instance, according to the 2019 PJM Load Forecast for Delivery Year 2023

Forecasted 50/50 Seasonal Peaks:

- Summer: 152,854 MW
- Winter: 133,882 MW
- Spring: 120,617 MW
- Fall: 130,255 MW



- Putting together the above Forced Outages and Seasonal Peak Load considerations, the Winter Peak Period is the most concerning period from a Fuel/Resource Security perspective given the potential for high forced outage levels and high peak loads that may result in loss-of-load events
  - This supports the approach taken in Phase 1 whose results show loss-of-load events during a Winter cold snap under a high volume of forced outages



## **Risk Filtering Process and Scenario Review**

### Definitions

#### Risk

• Any event that may pose a resource adequacy issue for the PJM system

#### Relevant Period(s)

 Period(s) of the year in which Fuel/Energy/Resource Security issues may result in potential resource adequacy issues

#### **Relevant Risk**

 A subset of the identified Risks relevant to Fuel/Energy/Resource Security scope and that may occur during the determined Relevant Period

#### **Relevant Scenarios**

 Combination of potential realizations of Relevant Risks that create a set of conditions to be evaluated



### **Objectives and Process**

#### **Identify Risks**

 Review historical data and solicit input from stakeholders and area experts to list Risks to the PJM system

#### Narrow to Relevant Risks

• Analyze the Risks identified to develop a list of risks within the Fuel/Energy/Resource Security scope and the identified Relevant Period

#### Collect Data on Study Risks

• Collect data on the frequency of occurrence, generation impact, locational nature, and other factors necessary to model the Study Risks and their affect of Fuel/Energy/Resource Security

#### **Define Relevant Scenarios**

 Combine the Relevant Risks into event scenarios and identify any significant gaps from Phase 1 scenarios

#### **Evaluate Relevant Scenarios**

• Identify Relevant Scenarios with high loss of load impact to the PJM system



### Senior Task Force Charter Terms

### Fuel Security:

This can be categorized as the availability of fuel both on-site and assessed from delivery systems required for a unit to generate consistent with dispatch signals or operating instructions. This includes all resource types



### **Relevant Risk Identification**





### Identified Risks (1 of 3)

INDEX	RISK	DESCRIPTION
1	Long Duration Cold Snap	Consecutive days below a temperature threshold greater than a set duration
2	Short Duration Cold Snap	Consecutive days below a temperature threshold less than a set duration
3	Long Duration Heat Wave	Consecutive days above a temperature threshold greater than a set duration
4	Short Duration Heat Wave	Consecutive days above a temperature threshold less than a set duration
5	Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)	Reduced coal refueling capacity due to a bridge failure
6	Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)	Reduced coal refueling capacity due to a lock and dam failure
7	Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)	Reduced coal refueling capacity due to a failure of the rail infrastructure
8	Coal Refueling (River Freezing)	Reduced coal refueling capacity due to freezing rivers impacting barge traffic
9	Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)	The unavailability of coal fired units due to poor fuel quality (wet coal, low quality coal, etc.)



### Identified Risks (2 of 3)

INDEX	RISK	DESCRIPTION
10	Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions	Any disruption to the natural gas pipeline infrastructure (pipe, gas compressor, etc.) that impacts the ability to transport natural gas, excluding malicious causes (to be included in Phase 3)
11	Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units	The curtailment or unavailability of natural gas delivery to units with interruptible transportation for any reason
12	Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)	Reduced oil refueling capacity due to limitations at oil terminals or other oil supply centers
13	Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)	Reduced oil refueling capacity due to truck transportation limitations
14	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)	A mandated shutdown or power reduction of nuclear units for reasons related to fuel issues
15	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)	A mandated shutdown or power reduction of nuclear units for reasons not related to fuel issues
16	Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)	The preemptive shutdown or power reduction of nuclear units due to high wind speeds



### Identified Risks (3 of 3)

INDEX	RISK	DESCRIPTION
17	Hydro Unavailability (Drought / Low Water Level)	Reduced hydro availability due to low water levels or droughts
18	Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)	Reduced hydro availability due to river freezing
19	Solar Intermittency	The inherent intermittency of solar resources throughout the year
20	Wind Intermittency	The inherent intermittency of wind resources throughout the year; Temperature-triggered shutdown based on turbine settings
21	High River Temperatures / Drought (Cooling Water Impacts)	Plant efficiency impacts caused high river water temperatures reducing cooling capabilities
22	River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)	Plant efficiency impacts caused by river freezing (ice on screens, reduced water intake capabilities, etc.)
23	Earthquake	An earthquake that affects the PJM footprint
24	Hurricane / Tropical Storms	A hurricane or tropical storm that affects the PJM footprint
25	Ice Storm (Transportation Impacts)	An ice storm that affects the PJM footprint and adversely impacts the transportation of fuel or other commodities

INDEX	RISK	SPRING	SUMMER	FALL	WINTER
1	Long Duration Cold Snap				
2	Short Duration Cold Snap				
3	Long Duration Heat Wave				
4	Short Duration Heat Wave				
5	Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)				
6	Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)				
7	Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)				
8	Coal Refueling (River Freezing)				
9	Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)				
10	Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions				
11	Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units				
12	Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)				
13	Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)				
14	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)				
15	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)				
16	Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)				
17	Hydro Unavailability (Drought / Low Water Level)				
18	Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)				
19	Solar Intermittency				
20	Wind Intermittency				
21	High River Temperatures / Drought (Cooling Water Impacts)				
22	River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)				
23	Earthquake				
www.p <mark>24</mark> .com	Hurricane / Tropical Storms				
25	Ice Storm (Transportation Impacts)				

INDEX	RISK	SPRING	SUMMER	FALL	WINTER
1	Long Duration Cold Snap				
2	Short Duration Cold Snap				
5	Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)				
6	Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)				
7	Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)				
8	Coal Refueling (River Freezing)				
9	Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)				
10	Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions				
11	Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units				
12	Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)				
13	Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)				
14	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)				
15	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)				
16	Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)				
18	Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)				
19	Solar Intermittency				
20	Wind Intermittency				
22	River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)				
23	Earthquake				
25	Ice Storm (Transportation Impacts)				
INDEX	RISK	FUEL SECURITY	RESOURCE SECURITY	Explicitly Modeled PHASE 1	
-------------	--	------------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	
1	Long Duration Cold Snap				
2	Short Duration Cold Snap				
5	Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)				
6	Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)				
7	Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)				
8	Coal Refueling (River Freezing)				
9	Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)				
10	Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions				
11	Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units				
12	Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)				
13	Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)				
14	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)				
15	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)				
16	Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)				
18	Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)				
19	Solar Intermittency				
20	Wind Intermittency				
22	River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)				
www.pjg.com	Earthquake				

INDEX	RISK	FUEL SECURITY	RESOURCE SECURITY	Explicitly Modeled PHASE 1
1	Long Duration Cold Snap			
2	Short Duration Cold Snap			
5	Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)			
6	Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)			
7	Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)			
8	Coal Refueling (River Freezing)			
9	Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)			
10	Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions			
11	Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units			
12	Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)			
13	Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)			
14	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)			
15	Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)			
16	Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)			
18	Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)			
19	Solar Intermittency			
20	Wind Intermittency			
www.p <b>22</b> .com	River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)			
25	les Storm (Transportation Imposts)			



Scenario Feedback Mapped to Identified Risks

- A matrix combining feedback on risks/scenarios submitted by stakeholders with a mapping to the identified risks is located on the FSSTF webpage:
  - <u>https://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/task-forces/fsstf.aspx</u>



## Next Steps

#### **Identify Risks**

 Review historical data and solicit input from stakeholders and area experts to list Risks to the PJM system

#### Narrow to Relevant Risks

• Analyze the Risks identified to develop a list of risks within the Fuel/Energy/Resource Security scope and the identified Relevant Period

#### Collect Data on Study Risks

• Collect data on the frequency of occurrence, generation impact, locational nature, and other factors necessary to model the Study Risks and their affect of Fuel/Energy/Resource Security

#### **Define Relevant Scenarios**

 Combine the Relevant Risks into event scenarios and identify any significant gaps from Phase 1 scenarios

#### **Evaluate Relevant Scenarios**

Identify Relevant Scenarios with high loss of load impact to the PJM system



# Cold Snaps and Pipeline Disruptions – Historical Data

Patricio Rocha Garrido FSSTF 07/16/2019

www.pjm.com

PJM©2019



- At the May FSSTF, PJM presented the Risk Assessment Approach which included:
  - Identifying the Relevant Risks (this was covered at the June FSSTF meeting)
  - Identifying the potential realizations of each Relevant Risk.
    - To accomplish this, historical data on each Relevant Risk will be analyzed
- At today's FSSTF, PJM will present historical data on two such Relevant Risks: Cold Snap and Pipeline Disruptions
- At the August FSSTF, PJM will present historical data on the remaining Relevant Risks as well as the impact of the Relevant Risks on PJM generation



## Relevant Risks Identified at June FSSTF Meeting

**Relevant Risks** Long Duration Cold Snap Short Duration Cold Snap Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions Solar Intermittency Wind Intermittency Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure) Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure) Coal Refueling (Rail Failure) Coal Refueling (River Freezing) Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality) Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal) Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions) Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related) Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related) Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds) Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers) **River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)** Ice Storm (Transportation Impacts)



- A series of 5 or more contiguous days where the average RTO wind-adjusted temperature (WWP) in each of such days is less than 21.5°F
  - The RTO WWP for a given day is calculated as a load-weighted average across 30+ weather stations in the current PJM footprint, and across the 24 hour readings of each day
  - The 21.5°F threshold corresponds to an estimate of the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile value of historical daily RTO average WWP values



Cold Snap - Data

- Weather data from period DY1972 DY2018 (47 winter periods)
- Average RTO wind-adjusted temperature (WWP) is calculated for each of the winter days

**办**/pim

## Cold Snaps – Delivery Year vs Number of Cold Snaps



A total of 29 cold snaps in 47 winter periods are identified

# Average: 0.6 Cold Snaps per Delivery Year (Winter)



## Cold Snaps – Number of DYs with X Cold Snaps



A total of 29 cold snaps in 47 winter periods are identified

Average: 0.6 Cold Snaps per Delivery Year (Winter)





## Cold Snaps – Delivery Year vs Length of Cold Snap



# Cold Snaps – Delivery Year vs Length of Cold Snap (and Min T at Peak Hours)





**Pipeline Disruptions – Definition** 

- Pipeline failure event impacting the onshore gas transmission system where the reported failure mode is classified as either a Rupture or a Mechanical Puncture
  - Events where the reported failure mode is classified as a Leak or Other are not included as Pipeline Disruptions because they are deemed to be less impactful



### **Pipeline Disruptions – Data**

- Event data collected by the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA) of the United States Department of Transportation in the period 2010 – 2019 Q2
- Events with a start date in Winter time (Dec Feb) are included
- Events reported by Pipelines or Local Distribution Companies (LDCs) to which PJM generators are connected are included
- Events that have occurred within a PJM State are included



## Delivery Year (Winter) vs Number of Pipeline Disruptions



PJM©2019



## Number of DYs (Winters) with X Pipeline Disruptions





## State vs Number of Pipeline Disruptions



pim

1

www.pjm.com



## **Historical Data on Relevant Risks**

FSSTF 08/12/2019



## **Risk Assessment Review**

#### June

Relevant Risk filtering
 and identification

#### July

- Historical Cold Snap data
- Historical Pipeline Disruption frequency data

### August

- Historical Pipeline
  Disruption impact data
- Historical Wind and Solar Intermittency
- Historical Relevant Risk data



## **Relevant Risks**





# Relevant Risk: Pipeline Disruptions



## **Frequency of Pipeline Disruptions**

# Based on Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration (PHMSA) data:





## **Historical Impact of Pipeline Disruptions**



Only the December 2017 disruption impacted PJM generation (approximately 1,070 MW of forced outages)

The rest of the pipeline disruptions that have occurred during Winter in the PJM footprint since 2010 have not impacted PJM generation

Duration shown for 7 events only. Outliers and events with missing data are not shown



## **Impact of Pipeline Disruptions**

- It is difficult to establish the impact of a pipeline disruption on PJM generation based on GADS data because there are no specific cause codes referencing pipeline disruptions
- The limited impact that PJM generation has experienced due to recent pipeline disruptions is not necessarily an indicator of future impact levels
- Had some of the past disruptions occurred at different geographic locations or other times of the year under more stressful conditions, the impact on PJM generation could have been more significant



# Relevant Risk: Wind and Solar Intermittency



## Wind and Solar Analysis Reference

## **Cold Snaps Analyzed:**

Cold Snap	Start	Stop	Duration
1	Jan. 21, 2014	Jan. 30 2014	10 Days
2	Jan. 6, 2015	Jan. 10, 2015	5 Days
3	Feb. 13, 2015	Feb. 20, 2015	8 Days
4	Dec. 26, 2017	Jan. 7, 2018	13 Days

## **Winter Peak Hours:**

AM Peak	PM Peak
HE08 & HE09	HE19 & HE20

## **Capacity Factor:**

 $CF = \frac{Actual Hourly Output}{Total Installed Nameplate}$ 

For solar and wind resources, capacity factor serves as an indicator of how effectively the resources are performing



#### 0.8 -• Wide CF distribution 0.6 -• All CFs > 0.00 Ъ<sub>0.4</sub>. Many hours are much higher than the anticipated 0.2 -0.13 CF 0 -2014-01-01 2014-07-01 2015-07-01 2016-01-01 2016-07-01 2017-01-01 2015-01-01 2017-07-01 2018-01-01 Date

## Wind Hourly Capacity Factors

Wind Hourly Capacity Factor (01/21/14 – 01/30/14)







**sim** 



## Wind Hourly Capacity Factor (02/13/15 – 02/20/15)





Morning Hours	Evening Hours
Min: 0.07	Min: 0.06
Mean: 0.35	Mean: 0.38
Max: 0.68	Max: 0.71

J

2018-01-05

2018-01-01

2018-01-03

Date

2017-229

2017-12-37 2018-01-01

2017-12-21



0.8 -

0.6 -

Ъ<sub>0.4</sub>

0.2 -

0 -

2014-01-01

2014-07-01

2015-01-01

2015-07-01

## **Solar Hourly Capacity Factors**

• Wide CF

2016-07-01

2016-01-01

Date

- distribution
- Many CFs = 0.00
- Overall average is lower than the anticipated 0.38 CF

2017-01-01 2017-07-01

2018-01-01

## Solar Hourly Capacity (01/21/14 – 01/30/14)



1
#### **Solar Hourly Capacity Factor (01/06/15 – 01/10/15)**



**ojm** 

1



#### **Solar Hourly Capacity Factor (02/13/15 – 02/20/15)**



www.pjm.com

PJM©2019



#### **Solar Hourly Capacity Factor (12/26/17 – 01/07/18)**





#### Wind and Solar Intermittency Summary

## Wind:

- Wide distribution of capacity factors during all four cold snaps
- Capacity factors generally outperform the anticipated capacity factor of 0.13 during both peak and non-peak hours

## <u>Solar:</u>

- Wide distribution of capacity factors during all four cold snaps
- Capacity factors never reach the anticipated capacity factor of 0.38 during peak hours
- Shorter winter days translate to a small number of daily hours at or above the anticipated capacity factor of 0.38



## Relevant Risk: Fuel Specific Risks



#### **Generating Availability Data System (GADS)**

- NERC established data collection system with required data submission for conventional generators 20 MW and greater
- Each event is unique and has an event type that describes the outage/derate and a cause code that describes the mechanism triggering the event

#### NERC GADS Website:

https://www.nerc.com/pa/RAPA/gads/Pages/GeneratingAvailabilityDataSystem-(GADS).aspx

#### 2019 GADS Cause Codes:

https://www.nerc.com/pa/RAPA/gads/DataReportingInstructions/2019\_GADS\_Cause\_Codes.xlsx



#### **Relevant Risks**

Relevant Risks
Long Duration Cold Snap
Short Duration Cold Snap
Natural Gas Pipeline Disruptions
Solar Intermittency
Wind Intermittency
Coal Refueling (Bridge Failure)
Coal Refueling (Lock and Dam Failure)
Coal Refueling (Rail Failure)
Coal Refueling (River Freezing)
Coal Unavailability (Coal Quality)
Natural Gas Unavailability Non-Firm Units
Oil Refueling (Oil Terminal)
Oil Refueling (Truck Restrictions)
Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Fuel Related)
Nuclear Regulatory Shutdown (Non-Fuel Related)
Nuclear Unavailability (High Winds)
Hydro Unavailability (Freezing Rivers)
River Freezing (Cooling Water Impacts)
Ice Storm (Transportation Impacts)







#### **Fuel Specific Risk Analysis Reference**

#### **Cold Snaps Analyzed:**

Cold Snap	Start	Stop	Duration
1	Jan. 21, 2014	Jan. 30 2014	10 Days
2	Jan. 6, 2015	Jan. 10, 2015	5 Days
3	Feb. 13, 2015	Feb. 20, 2015	8 Days
4	Dec. 26, 2017	Jan. 7, 2018	13 Days

### **Winter Peak Hours:**

AM Peak	PM Peak
HE08 & HE09	HE19 & HE20

## Forced Outage Rate:

# $FOR = \frac{MW \text{ Forced Out}}{\text{Total Installed Nameplate}}$

For coal, natural gas, nuclear, hydro, and oil resources, the forced outage rate serves as an indicator of the degree of unavailability for a set of resources



#### **Coal RR-FOR**





#### Coal RR-FOR (01/21/14 - 01/30/14)





#### Coal RR-FOR (01/06/15 - 01/10/15)



#### Coal RR-FOR (02/13/15 - 02/20/15)





#### Coal RR-FOR (12/26/17 - 01/07/18)





#### **Natural Gas RR-FOR**



# **J**pjm

#### Natural Gas RR-FOR (01/21/14 - 01/30/14)





#### Natural Gas RR-FOR (01/06/15 – 01/10/15)



#### Natural Gas RR-FOR (02/13/15 – 02/20/15)



#### Natural Gas RR-FOR (12/26/17 – 01/07/18)





#### **Nuclear RR-FOR**



## Nuclear RR-FOR (01/21/14 – 01/30/14)



#### Nuclear RR-FOR (01/06/15 – 01/10/15)



1

#### Nuclear RR-FOR (02/13/15 – 02/20/15)



J

#### Nuclear RR-FOR (12/26/17 – 01/07/18)





#### Hydro RR-FOR





#### Hydro RR-FOR (01/21/14 – 01/30/14)



## **J**pjm

#### Hydro RR-FOR (01/06/15 – 01/10/15)



#### Hydro RR-FOR (02/13/15 – 02/20/15)



#### Hydro RR-FOR (12/26/17 – 01/07/18)







#### Oil RR-FOR (01/21/14 - 01/30/14)



#### Oil RR-FOR (01/06/15 – 01/10/15)





#### Oil RR-FOR (02/13/15 - 02/20/15)





#### Oil RR-FOR (12/26/17 - 01/07/18)





## **Scenario Development**


#### **Scenario Analysis**

Scenario Analysis	Winter Load	Renewable Profiles	Relevant Risk Forced Outages	Other Forced Outages
Phase 1	Typical • 50/50 peak (134,976 MW) • 2011/12 load profile Extreme Winter • 95/5 peak (147,721 MW) • 2017/18 load profile 14 day study period	2017/18 winter profiles, scaled to nameplate capacity in portfolio	Explicitly modeled sensitivities for fuel delivery risks: oil refueling, non-firm gas availability, pipeline disruptions	Forced outage rates using GADS cause
Phase 2	Load shapes consistent with selected cold snaps	Profile from cold snap,	e from cold snap, d to nameplate ity in portfolio Sensitivities for discrete occurrences of risks outside of historical forced outage dataset	relevant risks or sensitivities
		capacity in portfolio		

Phase 1 portfolios for all scenarios: Announced (25.8% IRM), Escalated 1 (15.8% IRM), Escalated 2 (15.8% IRM)

#### **Approach for Phase 2 Scenarios Using Relevant Risk Data**

- 1. Selected cold snaps from analysis of winter weather:
  - Jan 21, 2014 through Jan 30, 2014 (10 days)
  - Jan 6, 2015 through Jan 10, 2015 (5 days)
  - Feb 13, 2015 through Feb 20, 2015 (8 days)
  - Dec 26, 2017 though Jan 7, 2018 (13 days)
- 2. For each cold snap, will use associated:
  - a) Resource-Type Specific Forced Outage profiles to address the relevant risks
  - b) Renewable output profiles
  - c) Forced outage rates using GADS cause codes not used in relevant risks or sensitivities
- 3. Sensitivities to model discrete occurrences of risks outside of historical forced outage dataset (pipeline disruptions, rail disruption, nuclear regulatory shutdown, etc.)



# **Technical Appendix: Fuel Specific Cause Code Combinations**



#### **Coal Specific Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
9200 & 9201	High Ash Content (OMC & non-OMC)
9210 & 9211	Low Grindability (OMC & non-OMC)
9220 & 9221	High Sulfur Content (OMC & non-OMC)
9230 & 9231	High Vanadium Content (OMC & non-OMC)
9240 & 9241	High Sodium Content (OMC & non-OMC)
9250 & 9251	Low BTU Coal (OMC & non-OMC)
9270 & 9271	Wet Coal (OMC & non-OMC)
9280 & 9281	Frozen Coal (OMC & non-OMC)



#### **Coal Applicable Common Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
9130	Lack of fuel where operators is not in control of contracts, supply lines, or delivery of fuels
9131	Lack of fuel (interruptible supple of fuel part of fuel contract)
9290 & 9291	Other Fuel Quality Problems (OMC & non-OMC)
7112 & 3274	Ice blockages at intake structures
7199	Other water supply/discharge problems
9135	Lack of Water
3273	Debris in circulating water from outside sources
3280	High Circulating Water Temperature
9000, 9001, 9020, 9025, 9030, 9031, 9035, 9040	Natural Disasters (Flood, Drought, Lightning, Geomagnetic Disturbance, Earthquake, Tornado, Hurricane, Other Catastrophe)
9134	Fuel Conservation



#### **Natural Gas Specific Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description	
9205	Poor quality natural gas fuel, low heat content	



#### Natural Gas Applicable Common Cause Codes

Cause Code	Description
9130	Lack of fuel where operators is not in control of contracts, supply lines, or delivery of fuels
9131	Lack of fuel (interruptible supple of fuel part of fuel contract)
9290 & 9291	Other Fuel Quality Problems (OMC & non-OMC)
7112 & 3274	Ice blockages at intake structures
7199	Other water supply/discharge problems
9135	Lack of Water
3273	Debris in circulating water from outside sources
3280	High Circulating Water Temperature
9000, 9001, 9020, 9025, 9030, 9031, 9035, 9040	Natural Disasters (Flood, Drought, Lightning, Geomagnetic Disturbance, Earthquake, Tornado, Hurricane, Other Catastrophe)
9134	Fuel Conservation



#### **Nuclear Specific Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
9500	Regulatory (nuclear) proceedings and hearings – regulatory agency initiated
9502	Regulatory (nuclear) proceedings and hearings – intervenor initiated
9710	Investigation of possible nuclear safety problems
2010	Fuel failure, including high activity in Reactor Coolant System or off-gas system
2030	Fuel limits – peaking factors
2032	Fuel limits – minimum critical power ratio (BWR units only)
2033	Fuel limits – maximum average planar linear heat generation rate (BWR units only)
2037	Other fuel limits (excluding core coast down, conservation, or stretch)



### **Nuclear Applicable Common Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
9130	Lack of fuel where operators is not in control of contracts, supply lines, or delivery of fuels
9131	Lack of fuel (interruptible supple of fuel part of fuel contract)
9290 & 9291	Other Fuel Quality Problems (OMC & non-OMC)
7112 & 3274	Ice blockages at intake structures
7199	Other water supply/discharge problems
9135	Lack of Water
3273	Debris in circulating water from outside sources
3280	High Circulating Water Temperature
9000, 9001, 9020, 9025, 9030, 9031, 9035, 9040	Natural Disasters (Flood, Drought, Lightning, Geomagnetic Disturbance, Earthquake, Tornado, Hurricane, Other Catastrophe)
9134	Fuel Conservation



## **Hydro Specific Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
7100	Upper reservoir dams and dikes
7101	Lower reservoir dams and dikes
7102	Auxiliary reservoir dams and dikes
7110	Intake channel or flume (excluding trash racks)
7111	Intake tunnel



#### Hydro Applicable Common Cause Codes

Cause Code	Description
9130	Lack of fuel where operators is not in control of contracts, supply lines, or delivery of fuels
9131	Lack of fuel (interruptible supple of fuel part of fuel contract)
9290 & 9291	Other Fuel Quality Problems (OMC & non-OMC)
7112 & 3274	Ice blockages at intake structures
7199	Other water supply/discharge problems
9135	Lack of Water
3273	Debris in circulating water from outside sources
3280	High Circulating Water Temperature
9000, 9001, 9020, 9025, 9030, 9031, 9035, 9040	Natural Disasters (Flood, Drought, Lightning, Geomagnetic Disturbance, Earthquake, Tornado, Hurricane, Other Catastrophe)
9134	Fuel Conservation



#### **Oil Specific Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description	
9260 & 9261	Low BTU oil (OMC & non-OMC)	



#### **Oil Applicable Common Cause Codes**

Cause Code	Description
9130	Lack of fuel where operators is not in control of contracts, supply lines, or delivery of fuels
9131	Lack of fuel (interruptible supple of fuel part of fuel contract)
9290 & 9291	Other Fuel Quality Problems (OMC & non-OMC)
7112 & 3274	Ice blockages at intake structures
7199	Other water supply/discharge problems
9135	Lack of Water
3273	Debris in circulating water from outside sources
3280	High Circulating Water Temperature
9000, 9001, 9020, 9025, 9030, 9031, 9035, 9040	Natural Disasters (Flood, Drought, Lightning, Geomagnetic Disturbance, Earthquake, Tornado, Hurricane, Other Catastrophe)
9134	Fuel Conservation