

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Maryland Office of People’s Counsel,)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	Docket No. EL26-63-000
)	
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.,)	
Respondent.)	

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME OF PJM INTERCONNECTION, L.L.C.
AND REQUEST FOR ACTION BY MAY 22, 2026**

Pursuant to rule 212 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure,¹ PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (“PJM”) moves for an extension of time to respond to the Complaint filed by Maryland Office of People’s Counsel (“Complainant” or “MD OPC”) in Docket No. EL26-63-000 on May 7, 2026.² Specifically, PJM requests a 60-day extension—until July 27, 2026—to submit its response.³ PJM further requests that the Commission issue an order on this motion no later than **May 22, 2026**. This motion is supported by the PJM Transmission Owners.⁴

¹ 18 C.F.R. § 385.212.

² *Md. Off. of People’s Couns. v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Complaint of Maryland Office of People’s Counsel, Docket No. EL26-63-000 (filed May 7, 2026) (“Complaint”).

³ *See* 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(d)(1)(i) (“If a motion requests an extension of time or a shortened time period for action, then answers to the motion to extend or shorten the time period shall be made within 5 days after the motion is filed, unless otherwise ordered.”).

⁴ For the purposes of this motion, the PJM Transmission Owners include: Public Service Electric and Gas Company; PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. and Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.; Rockland Electric Company; Exelon Corporation, on behalf of its affiliates Atlantic City Electric Company, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Commonwealth Edison Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, PECO Energy Company, and Potomac Edison Power Company; FirstEnergy Service Company, on behalf of its affiliates, American Transmission Systems, Incorporated, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission LLC, The Potomac Edison Company, Monongahela Power Company, Keystone Appalachian Transmission Company, and Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company;

As discussed below, good cause exists to grant this motion, given the breadth, complexity, and region-wide impact of the issues presented. The Complaint broadly challenges the currently effective cost allocation methodology applicable to certain baseline reliability projects, requests various forms of relief related to the integration of large loads into PJM’s system, and further seeks re-study of baseline reliability projects approved in three different Regional Transmission Expansion Plan (“RTEP”) windows from 2022-2025.

These issues concern the entire PJM Region and require significant deliberation among PJM, the PJM Transmission Owners, and potentially other stakeholders. Yet, as the Commission is well aware, PJM is currently focused on implementing Commission priorities on various fronts related to the large load issue. Commission action on the Department of Energy’s Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“ANOPR”) is imminent⁵ and the Complaint itself recognizes that some of the requested relief “[d]epend[s] on the outcome of the Commission’s advanced notice of proposed rulemaking on large load interconnections”⁶ Absent an extension, responding to the Complaint’s

American Electric Power Service Corporation on behalf of its affiliates, Appalachian Power Company, Indiana Michigan Power Company, Kentucky Power Company, Kingsport Power Company, Ohio Power Company, Wheeling Power Company, AEP Appalachian Transmission Company, Inc., AEP Indiana Michigan Transmission Company, Inc., AEP Kentucky Transmission Company, Inc., AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc., and AEP West Virginia Transmission Company, Inc.; Dominion Energy Services, Inc. on behalf of Virginia and Electric Power Company d/b/a Dominion Energy Virginia; East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. Except as otherwise defined, capitalized terms used in this filing shall have the meaning provided under the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (“Tariff”) or the Amended and Restated Operating Agreement of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

⁵ *Interconnection of Large Loads to the Interstate Transmission System*, 195 FERC ¶ 61,045, at PP 1, 4 (2026) (announcing that the Commission intends to act in the docket considering “potential reforms to ensure the timely and orderly interconnection of large loads to the transmission system” by the end of June 2026 (quoting *Interconnection of Large Loads to the Interstate Transmission System*, Secretary of Energy’s Direction that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Initiate Rulemaking Procedures and Proposal Regarding the Interconnection of Large Loads Pursuant to the Secretary’s Authority Under Section 403 of the Department of Energy Organization Act, Docket No. RM26-4-000, ANOPR at 1 (Oct. 23, 2025))).

⁶ Complaint at 5.

lengthy allegations would divert attention away from ongoing efforts to integrate large loads and comply with Commission initiatives, at a time when the White House, the Governors of 13 states comprising the PJM Region, and the Commission are emphasizing “speed.”⁷

I. MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

The Commission may, for good cause shown, extend the time for a party to respond to a complaint.⁸ The Commission has granted motions for extensions of time in similar circumstances,⁹ and should do so here.

The Complaint was filed on May 7, 2026, with a request for fast-track processing, including a request that the Commission direct PJM to answer the complaint within 15 days and consider the Complaint on an expedited basis.¹⁰ The Commission implicitly denied the request for fast track processing when it issued a notice setting a response date of May

⁷ See e.g., *Transcript of the 1135th Commission Meeting held on April 16, 2026*, Accession No. 20260417-4000, at 15:20 (Commissioner Rosner remarks) (Apr. 16, 2026); FERC December 2025 Commission Meeting: *Opening Remarks of Commissioner Lindsay See* (Dec. 18, 2025), <https://www.ferc.gov/news-events/news/december-commission-meeting-opening-remarks-commissioner-lindsay-see>; Office of Science and Technology Policy, *Trump Administration Science & Technology Highlights: Year One*, The White House, 15 (Jan. 2026), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/WHOSTP-2025-Wins.pdf>; United States Department of Energy, *Speed to Power Initiative*, <https://www.energy.gov/speed-to-power> (last visited May 14, 2026); United States Department of Energy Grid Deployment Office, *Accelerating Speed to Power/Winning the Artificial Intelligence Race: Federal Action to Rapidly Expand Grid Capacity and Enable Electricity Demand Growth*, Request for Information, 90 FR 45032 (Sep. 18, 2025), https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-09/55587_Speed_to_Power_FINAL.pdf.

⁸ See 18 C.F.R. § 385.2008(a).

⁹ See e.g., *Spitfire LLC v. Bonneville Power Admin.*, Notice of Extension of Time, Docket Nos. EL26-33-000, et al. (Dec. 18, 2025) (granting extension of time to respond to a complaint that raised “complex factual, legal, and policy issues” to allow respondent “adequate time to fully address the issues raised by the Complaint” and to develop the record sufficiently for an informed Commission decision); *N.D. Pub. Serv. Comm’n v. Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, Notice of Extension of Time, Docket No. EL25-109-000 (Aug. 13, 2025); *Joint Consumer Advoc. v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Notice of Extension of Time, Docket No. EL25-18-000 (Dec. 3, 2024).

¹⁰ Complaint at 6-7.

27, 2026.¹¹ Nonetheless, given the breadth and complexity of the issues raised and their region-wide impact, PJM respectfully requests a 60-day extension of this deadline.

The Complaint broadly challenges the “existing cost allocation rules for baseline transmission projects,”¹² alleging that the “hybrid load-ratio share and solutions-based distribution factor (‘DFAX’) transmission cost allocation methodology for assigning transmission cost responsibility across sub-regions or ‘zones’ of PJM” violates cost causation principles because it “socializes to all customers costs that data centers, not existing customers, are driving.”¹³ The Complaint also seeks the “re-study [of] the baseline reliability projects approved in 2022 RTEP W3, 2024 RTEP W1, and 2025 RTEP W1,” and various other forms of relief to address the integration of large loads, particularly data centers, in PJM.¹⁴ The Complaint itself is 70 pages and is supported by an affidavit that, with its associated exhibits, also spans over 150 pages.

Without an extension, responding to the Complaint would divert PJM’s resources at a time when it is already concentrating its efforts on implementing Commission priorities concerning large loads. PJM is in the process of following the directives of the White House’s National Energy Dominance Council and PJM State Governors¹⁵ in developing a

¹¹ *Md. Off. of People’s Couns. v. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Combined Notice of Filings #1, Docket Nos. EL26-63-000, et al. (May 7, 2026).

¹² Complaint at 1.

¹³ *Id.* at 1-2.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 66-67.

¹⁵ National Energy Dominance Council and PJM State Governors, *Statement of Principles Regarding PJM* (Jan. 16, 2026), <https://www.energy.gov/documents/statement-principles-regarding-pjm>.

reliability backstop proposal.¹⁶ Relatedly, PJM is developing a “Connect and Manage” approach through which large loads may quickly interconnect to the PJM system.¹⁷

In addition, as noted, the issues raised in the Complaint overlap with and may be addressed through other ongoing proceedings concerning the same issues. Requiring PJM to respond to those issues simultaneously would be inefficient and risk unnecessary duplication of efforts and potentially inconsistent outcomes. An extension would permit a more orderly and efficient consideration of the overlapping issues, to the extent those issues are appropriately raised in the Complaint.

Moreover, although PJM is named as the respondent to the Complaint, the PJM Transmission Owners are the true parties in interest in the proceeding. The PJM Transmission Owners have the exclusive and unilateral right to make Federal Power Act section 205 filings regarding the establishment and recovery of the PJM Transmission Owners’ transmission revenue requirements and the transmission rate design under the Tariff.¹⁸ Thus, transmission rate design under the Tariff is exclusively within the PJM

¹⁶ PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., *CIFP Reliability Backstop Procurement – PJM Proposal: Critical Issue Fast Path – Reliability Backstop Procurement PJM Proposal* (Apr. 16, 2026), <https://www.pjm.com/-/media/DotCom/committees-groups/cifp-rbp/2026/20260416/20260416-item-05---pjm-reliability-backstop-procurement-proposal---paper.pdf>.

¹⁷ See PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., *Connect and Manage Senior Task Force*, <https://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/task-forces/camstf> (last visited May 14, 2026).

¹⁸ See *Pa.-N.J.-Md. Interconnection*, 105 FERC ¶ 61,294 (2003) (approving settlement agreement). The settlement provisions were memorialized in Tariff, Part I, sections 9.1(a) (“The Transmission Owners shall have the exclusive and unilateral rights to file pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act and the FERC’s rules and regulations thereunder for any changes in or relating to the establishment and recovery of the Transmission Owners’ transmission revenue requirements or the transmission rate design under the PJM Tariff, and such filing rights shall also encompass any provisions of the PJM Tariff governing the recovery of transmission-related costs incurred by the Transmission Owners.”) & 9.1(d) (“Transmission Owners’ exclusive and unilateral rights to make Section 205 filings” includes “Section 34; Schedule 1A; Schedule 7 (except as to transmission congestion charges under Attachment K to the PJM Tariff or any successor thereto); Schedule 8 (except as to transmission congestion charges under Attachment K to the PJM Tariff or any successor thereto); Schedule 11; Schedule 12; Attachment H-A; Attachment J; and Attachment R.”). See also Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement (“CTOA”), Rate Schedule FERC No. 42, sections 7.3.1, 7.3.4 (addressing the same filing rights with almost identical language). These filing rights have also been reiterated by Commission and appellate precedent. See *Atlantic City Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 295 F.3d 1, 6 (D.C. Cir. 2002), *order on remand*, *Pa.-N.J.-Md. Interconnection*, 101 FERC ¶ 61,318 (2002), *order on*

Transmission Owners’ control. Given that the Complaint seeks to modify the PJM Transmission Owners’ established rate design methodology governing the allocation of cost responsibility for reliability projects, PJM will need to coordinate with the PJM Transmission Owners in order to respond effectively to the Complaint.

On the other hand, granting the requested extension will not harm or unduly prejudice any party. The principal impact of the extension will be to allow PJM to thoroughly evaluate the issues raised in the Complaint, especially its challenge to cost allocation throughout PJM. The cost impacts alleged by the Complaint are not imminent.¹⁹ In particular, the Complainant and Maryland ratepayers generally will not be prejudiced by this extension because the projects identified in the Complaint²⁰ are not in service and only a handful are authorized to collect construction work in progress (“CWIP”).²¹ Therefore, the requested extension entails no financial burden on ratepayers.

Further, given that the Complaint invokes the Commission’s upcoming action on the Department of Energy’s ANOPR,²² PJM’s and other interested parties’ responses

reh’g, 103 FERC ¶ 61,170 (2003), *remand aff’d*, *Atlantic City Elec. Co. v. FERC*, 329 F.3d 856 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (affirming the provisions of the CTOA that allow PJM Transmission Owners to “file changes in transmission service rate design and non-rate terms and conditions to the tariff under section 205”).

¹⁹ Complaint at 2 (“PJM’s cost allocation rules have assigned Maryland ratepayers \$2.0 billion in capital costs—costs that will drive up Maryland customer bills through \$1.6 billion in additional revenue requirements over the next ten years . . .”).

²⁰ The Complaint cites to the CWIP Incentive granted to the Valley Link 2024 RTEP Window 1 projects, in *Valley Link Transmission Md., LLC*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,113 (2025). Complaint at 5, n.10.

²¹ FERC granted CWIP Incentive for two of the 2022 RTEP Window 3 projects—NextEra’s MidAtlantic Resiliency Link and FirstEnergy’s Doubs-Goose Creek projects—and the 2024 RTEP Window 1 Valley Link projects. See *NextEra Energy Transmission MidAtlantic Ind., Inc.*, 186 FERC ¶ 61,052 (2024); *FirstEnergy Serv. Co.*, 193 FERC ¶ 61,005 (2025); *Valley Link*, 191 FERC ¶ 61,113, at P 134.

²² Complaint at 5 (Relief requested “[d]epend[s] on the outcome of the Commission’s advanced notice of proposed rulemaking on large load interconnections . . .”), 52 (stating that relief proposed by Complainant “is necessary to implement the Department of Energy’s recommendations pursuant to its ANOPR”), 54 (Proposed relief “may be more responsive to the directives and policies embodied in the ANOPR and the Ratepayer Protection Pledge”), 66-67 (“Regarding PJM’s broader planning, interconnection, and cost-allocation processes related to large loads and conditioned on or in parallel with the Commission’s advancing

should be informed by the Commission's actions there. In so doing, the Commission would ensure that the record is adequately and thoroughly developed to allow for reasoned decision-making on the weighty issues presented by the Complaint.

Accordingly, PJM requests a 60-day extension of time to submit its response to this Complaint to allow PJM to address the issues raised in this Complaint.

II. REQUEST FOR ACTION BY MAY 22, 2026

PJM respectfully requests that the Commission act on this request for extension of time by May 22, 2026. Action by that date is important so that PJM and other interested parties may best allocate their resources to simultaneously respond to the Complaint while attending to the other important obligations discussed above.

its review of large load arrangements in the ANOPR proceeding, the Commission should adopt" remedies specified by Complainant.).

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, PJM requests the Commission issue an order no later than May 22, 2026, granting the requested 60-day extension of time for PJM to submit its response to the Complaint.

Craig Glazer
Vice President – Federal Government Policy
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
1200 G Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 423-4743
craig.glazer@pjm.com

Jessica M. Lynch
Associate General Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, PA 19403
(267) 563-3688
jessica.lynch@pjm.com

Aspassia V. Staevska
Senior Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, PA 19403
(484) 401-4931
aspassia.staevska@pjm.com

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew T. Swers
Ryan P. Collins
Andrew T. Swers
Alyssa Umberger
WRIGHT & TALISMAN, P.C.
1200 G Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 393-1200
collins@wrightlaw.com
swers@wrightlaw.com
umberger@wrightlaw.com

***Counsel for
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.***

May 15, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Dated at Washington, DC, this 15th day of May 2026.

/s/ Andrew T. Swers
Andrew T. Swers
WRIGHT & TALISMAN, P.C.
1200 G Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-3898
(202) 393-1200
swers@wrightlaw.com

Attorney for PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.