Constellation appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on PJM's co-located load workshops. Constellation's comments reflect its review of relevant materials and are not intended to substitute for formal comments/pleadings filed in any FERC or appellate court proceeding.

Definition of Co-Located Load in 60-Day Compliance Filing

Similar to its the 30-day compliance filing, PJM has proposed in its 60-day compliance filing a definition for "Co-Located Load" that varies from what FERC directed in the December 18, 2025 order in these proceedings (Show Cause Order). FERC adopted the following definition of Co-Located Load (emphasis added) (Show Cause Order at P 164):

> "a configuration that refers to end-use customer load that is physically connected to the facilities of an existing or planned Generating Facility on the Project Developer's side of the **Point of Interconnection** to the [Transmission Provider's] Transmission System."

In response, PJM proposed a definition that changes the term "Point of Interconnection" to instead read "Point of Change in Ownership."

Constellation appreciates PJM's effort in the last co-located load workshop to explain its rationale for this parallel change in the 30-day compliance filing. Without belaboring the point here, however, Constellation's concerns about deviating from the Commission's directive to use Point of Interconnection remain. Specifically, Constellation is concerned that this change in the definition provides less certainty to parties to a co-located configuration because, among other things, PJM's proposed definition ignores the realities of parties determining ownership and electrical connections of new co-located equipment and facilities. Additionally, if PJM's definition were adopted and the interconnection customer and TO fail to agree on the point of change in ownership related to the interconnection of the new facilities, that would only create additional delay while the dispute is resolved. FERC provided needed clarity in the Show Cause Order less than three months ago, and it now appears that PJM's proposal would introduce further complications to FERC's directive.

BTMG

Constellation notes that it raised concerns in the prior workshop (February 20, 2026) related to PJM's proposal on Behind the Meter Generation. Constellation's prior concerns related to BTMG remain. In short:

- PJM's proposal for a 50-MW threshold threatens to create an exemption that swallows the rule. With PJM's proposed treatment for BTMG, it seems likely that all but a limited number of BTMG will be allowed to continue to operate under the existing BTMG rules—rules that FERC found to be unjust and unreasonable. FERC had suggested precedent for what it would consider *de minimis,* in the 10MWs to 20MWs range. 50 MWs is well beyond that range.
- PJM proposes to grandfather Qualifying Facilities under PURPA, but the Show Cause Order does not reference Qualifying Facilities. If PJM is successful in grandfathering all QFs, why does it also think that the 50 MW threshold is reasonable?

PJM Proposal Lacks Detail for Necessary Studies Process

It is not clear that PJM's proposal will accomplish FERC's directive to "provide [the] additional clarity and transparency" to "address some of the transparency concerns … about the use of the necessary study process, including questions about the scope of the analysis" to facilitate co-located configurations. Show Cause Order at P 227.

- The proposed tariff language requires the customer to provide PJM with all information needed to perform the Necessary Studies, but the extent of the interaction with and information required from Transmission Owners is not clearly defined. It should be clear that the TOs must respond in a timely fashion so as to respect the overall timeline for necessary studies.
- PJM's proposed tariff language outlining the procedures for Necessary Studies makes clear that three types of studies will be performed. It should also make clear that when studying the effects of delisting it is through the same transmission study lens.