

## OMS Resources Work Group

### RASC Feedback on OMS-MISO Survey

Due: February 22, 2017

The OMS Resources Work Group (“OMS RWG” or “work group”) provides feedback on Improving the OMS-MISO Survey from MISO’s proposal at the February 8, 2017 Resource Adequacy Sub Committee (RASC) meeting, ([link](#)). MISO’s proposal is to include 35% of all of the interconnection requests in the Definitive Planning Phase (“DPP”) of their Generation Interconnection Queue (“GIQ”) in the regional and zonal rollups in the survey. This 35% amount will be included with the “low” certainty resources in the regional and zonal rollups. Several stakeholders raised concerns because MISO only addressed these projects in the GIQ as “low” certainty instead of as “high” certainty.

OMS RWG recommends MISO consider the following option:

Based on the data in the presentation of the natural gas projects in the GIQ having a 26% success rate of reaching a final completion date, we recommend that MISO use this 26% amount for all projects in the DPP to be included in the OMS-MISO Survey as “high” certainty. We do support the notion that state commissions or local regulatory bodies in charge of permitting would use this “high” certainty figure as a foundational basis to not support a project to be built in the corresponding state. The use of a “proportionality” success rate of MW is consistent with the geographic uncertainty.

If MISO chooses not to use this recommendation, OMS RWG would support MISO’s proposal to use a 35% value for projects in the GIQ included as “low” certainty in the OMS-MISO survey. However, since MISO is a regional transmission organization and the zones are allowed to rely on the footprint, we would like to have additional data included. We are requesting one or more of the graphs for each zone that highlights how much of the excess capacity in a given zone can be exported to the other zones and how much deficient capacity in a given zone can be imported from other zones. The graphs for each zone would contain different dashed horizontal lines showing (all in installed Capacity (“ICAP”) values): (i) the Capacity Export Limit (“CEL”) (ii) the Capacity Import Limit (“CIL”), and (iii) the Planning Reserve Margin Requirement (“PRMR”)

less the Local Clearing Requirement (“LCR”) (essentially, the portion of the PRMR that can be imported into a zone. ([link](#))

Additionally, OMS RWG would like more information about the generation queue in totality included. For instance, provide the complete queue (all active stages) by fuel type and stage level. One could also add recent “success rate” by fuel type as informative, but not as a firm conclusion. Also, the active queue map would be informative for stakeholders in order to see the footprint diversity.