



April 2022 Package Polling Results

May 12, 2022

OC/MIC Special Session

Fuel Requirements for Black Start Resources

Package	Proposer	Status
A	PJM	Original from 2019; Removed in 2022
B*	IMM	Current; Updated in 2022
C	Calpine	Removed in 2019
D	DC OPC / Constellation	Removed in 2022
E	Consumer Advocates	Current; Original from 2019
F	PJM	Current; New in 2022
G**	Brookfield / DC OPC	Current; New in 2022

* Updates made after this round of polling

** Submitted after this round of polling opened

- Intent
 - Compare support for current packages as proposed
 - Identify design components and solution options that require further discussion to refine packages
 - Facilitate stakeholder feedback

- Overall Results
 - Voting Members: 28
 - Affiliate Members: 81
 - Non-Members: 1
 - Total: 110



Questions Targeting Level of Fuel Assurance

Comment Summary

1. Do you believe that fuel assurance requirements for black start resources are necessary for reliability?

	#	%	
Yes	69	63%	→ Important as lack of fuel assurance can materially impact restoration times, and may avoid single points of failure in restoration plans.
No	11	10%	
Maybe	30	27%	→ Depends on what qualifies as fuel-assured

2. Do you think it is important to have a minimum fuel assurance requirement for black start resources?

	#	%	
Yes	69	63%	Similar comments to question 1
No	11	10%	
Maybe	30	27%	

3. Do you think it is appropriate for the minimum fuel assurance requirement to be one black start site per zone?

	#	%	
Yes	49	45%	
No	20	18%	
Maybe	41	37%	→ Depends on alignment with TO restoration plans

4. Beyond a zonal minimum requirement, should additional fuel assurance investments be made based on defined reliability criteria?"

	#	%	
Yes	47	43%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in understanding costs and benefits of this approach • Depends on alignment with TO restoration plans • Criteria should better consider changing resource mix
No	11	10%	
Maybe	52	47%	

5. Can you support Package B?

	#	%
Yes	33	30%
No	77	70%

Comment Summary

- Needs additional details around what criteria and requirements should be
- Changes to the Reliability Backstop Mechanism may be out of scope

6. Can you support Package E?

	#	%
Yes	32	29%
No	78	71%

- Concerns about provision for only one fuel-assured BSR per zone
- Needs additional details around what criteria and requirements should be; accounting for updates since hiatus period
- Issues with minimum fuel requirements

7. Can you support Package F?

	#	%
Yes	59	54%
No	51	46%

- Issues with exceptions to requirements by resource type and minimum fuel requirements
- Concerns about not taking seasonality of renewables into account

- Posting of verbatim comments with attribution (requires stakeholder approval)
- Review and identify updates to solution packages
- Additional polling to reflect updated set of packages

Facilitator / Presenter:
Janell Fabiano,
janell.fabiano@pjm.com

Secretary:
Natalie Tacka,
natalie.tacka@pjm.com

April 2022 Package Polling Results



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

