

PAC: Coordinated Planning Process (PAC005) (20200624)
OMS Transmission Planning Work Group (TPWG) Feedback

This feedback does not represent the views of the OMS board of directors.

Feedback Item #1:

The proposed process for economic evaluation of GI Projects.

1. The TPWG is generally supportive of MISO's proposal to economically evaluate GI projects after they have a signed GI Agreement but suggest that MISO complete a "test run" of several projects from previous GIA's that meet the proposed criteria. This "test run" will allow MISO and stakeholders a better understanding of the validity of MISO's proposal.
2. The TPWG recommends MISO provide guidance on anticipated schedule requirements to implement a project that proceeds through MISO's proposed GIP economic evaluation process including schedule requirements for those projects qualifying for MISO's competitive bidding process.
3. The TPWG supports evaluating a possible opt-out provision for Generator Interconnection customers that do not want to participate in the proposed GIP economic evaluation process.

Feedback Item #2:

Should MISO consider changing MTEP model building timeline? If yes, what changes are practically feasible without significant tradeoff on data freshness and review period? Will changes to model building timeline also require changing to project submission deadline (Sep 15)?

1. The TPWG understands this feedback request relates to consolidation of Reliability, Economic, and GI planning and more specifically changing the MTEP model building timeline to accommodate this consolidation of planning processes. The TPWG suggests not changing the MTEP model building timeline unless MISO or other stakeholders can provide a compelling argument to do so. Documented information provided to date does not support a change in the MTEP model building timeline.

One state is not supportive of this statement. In the East region, stakeholders have repeatedly expressed greater need for the reliability models to be completed sooner in the MTEP year to have an opportunity to plan alternatives.

General Comments:

1. The OMS TPWG is generally satisfied with how the Coordinated Planning Process (CPP) discussion has proceeded and looks forward to working through this discussion's next steps.
2. The OMS TPWG suggests more proactive engagement from Generator Interconnection ("GI") Customers in the Technical Study Task Force ("TSTF") and Sub-regional Planning

Meetings (“SPM”) could help address some of the issues that the proponents of the CPP effort seek to resolve.

3. As noted in previous stakeholder feedback GI projects can be submitted by all stakeholders, including GI customers for evaluation in the economic process. MISO has acknowledged that to be true. MISO also acknowledged that the current practice has not resulted in any projects as defined in the Tariff. OMS TPWG would like to point out that a lack of economic projects does not indicate a failure of the process.