

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

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

)

Docket No. ER26-1563-002

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO ANSWER AND ANSWER
TO REQUEST FOR REHEARING
OF PJM INTERCONNECTION, L.L.C.**

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (“PJM”), pursuant to Rules 212 and 213 of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure,¹ submits this Motion for Leave to Answer and Answer (“Answer”) to the request for rehearing² of the Commission’s June 9, 2026 order³ accepting PJM’s February 27, 2026 filing⁴ to modify its Open Access Transmission Tariff (“Tariff”)⁵ to establish an Expedited Interconnection Track (“EIT”) process for Generating Facilities.

The EIT Filing proposed a new Expedited Interconnection Track designed to expedite the interconnection of new generation that commits to firm commercial in service dates, has a commitment from the Primary Siting Authority (or a state executive officer in certain circumstances) to expedite consideration of applicable siting, and provides a

¹ 18 C.F.R. §§ 385.212, 385.213.

² *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Request for Rehearing of Public Interest Organizations, Docket No. ER26-1563-002 (July 9, 2026) (“PIOs Rehearing Request”). The Public Interest Organizations (“PIOs”) include Sierra Club, Appalachian Voices, Citizens Action Coalition of Indiana, Citizens for Pennsylvania’s Future, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists. Notably, no other parties requested rehearing of the EIT Order, such as Project Developers active within the PJM Cycle process or state organizations tasked with Primary Siting Authority under the EIT process.

³ *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 195 FERC ¶ 61,197 (2026) (“June 9 Order”).

⁴ *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Proposed Tariff Amendments for Expedited Interconnection Track of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Docket No. ER26-1563-000 (Feb. 27, 2026) (“EIT Filing”).

⁵ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein have the meanings set forth in the Tariff or in the EIT Filing.

pathway for new generation.⁶ PJM in the EIT Filing and in a subsequent answer demonstrated that the proposed Tariff amendments are just, reasonable, not unduly discriminatory or preferential, as well as appropriate and necessary to address near-term resource adequacy concerns in PJM.⁷

The Commission accepted the EIT Filing in a lengthy and well-reasoned order that clearly articulated the objective of the EIT process: to help interconnect large new or uprated Generating Facilities faster at a time when PJM urgently needs additional Capacity Resources to maintain resource adequacy.⁸ Yet the PIOs Rehearing Request argues that the June 9 Order ignored evidence that the EIT process will adversely affect processing of PJM's Cycle study process.⁹ As set forth below, these arguments are unfounded. The PIOs Rehearing Request should therefore be denied, and the Commission should affirm its holdings in the June 9 Order.

I. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO ANSWER

PJM moves for leave to answer certain portions of the PIOs Rehearing Request. While the Commission's regulations generally prohibit answers to requests for rehearing, the Commission will waive this prohibition and accept such an answer when it provides information that assists the Commission in its decision-making process or clarifies the record, including when it addresses issues raised for the first time on rehearing.¹⁰ This

⁶ EIT Filing at 2.

⁷ See *id.* at 23-24; *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, Motion for Leave to Answer, Limited Answer and Amendment of Filing of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Docket No. ER26-1563-001, at 8-9 (Apr. 10, 2026) ("April 10 Answer").

⁸ See June 9 Order at PP 83-85.

⁹ PIOs Rehearing Request at 26-29,

¹⁰ *Nev. Hydro Co.*, 178 FERC ¶ 61,218, at P 12 (2022) (allowing answer to request for rehearing on the basis that it addresses "new information presented on rehearing and provide[s] useful information that has assisted the Commission's consideration" of the issues before it); *Green Island Power Auth.*, 168 FERC ¶ 61,033 at P 37 (2019) (permitting answer that will assist the Commission in its decision-making); *Trans-Pecos*

Answer satisfies these criteria, and PJM therefore requests that the Commission accept this response.

II. ANSWER

The EIT process provides a temporary, expedited interconnection process outside of the Cycle Process to interconnect advanced projects of significant size more quickly.¹¹ As PJM explained in the EIT Filing, the EIT process, which is similar to Commission-approved processes adopted by neighboring transmission providers,¹² will operate in parallel with the Cycle Process and is designed to avoid negative impacts to projects in PJM's Cycle Process.¹³ The Commission agreed, finding that the EIT process "will improve the efficiency of PJM's interconnection process and will help ensure interconnection to the transmission system in a reliable, efficient, transparent, and timely manner."¹⁴ The Commission also considered protestors' claims that use of a serial process will harm PJM's Cycle process and found those claims to be speculative.¹⁵ Specifically, the Commission found that EIT will not harm Project Developers in the Cycle Process and that the guardrails set forth in the EIT Filing (i.e., capping the number of EIT Projects that can be studied per calendar year and sunseting EIT at the end of 2027) ensure that EIT is

Pipeline, LLC, 157 FERC ¶ 61,081, at P 6 (2016) (allowing an answer to a rehearing request because it "provides information that has assisted in our decision-making process"). This Answer also provides information concerning other arguments that will clarify the issues and assist the Commission in its decision-making. In addition, because this Answer is focused and limited to a few issues, the fact that PJM does not respond to a specific argument raised by parties on rehearing is not a concession that such argument is correct.

¹¹ EIT Filing at 7-8; April 10 Answer at 2.

¹² EIT Filing at 15-16 (comparing proposed EIT process with expedited processes adopted by Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and Southwest Power Pool, Inc.).

¹³ *Id.* at 11-12.

¹⁴ June 9 Order at P 83.

¹⁵ *Id.* at PP 84-85.

a limited process.¹⁶ The Commission also rejected arguments that EIT Projects will occupy system headroom and subject Cycle projects to more costly Network Upgrades, reiterating its prior finding that interconnection customers have no legal rights to a given system topology and finding that EIT Projects would instead benefit Cycle projects that would otherwise be allocated costs for a particular Network Upgrade.¹⁷

PIOs claim that the June 9 Order is arbitrary and capricious for failing to consider how the EIT process discriminates against resources seeking to interconnect through the Cycle process.¹⁸ The PIOs Rehearing Request argues that the Commission erred in accepting the EIT Filing in part because the EIT process will “divert PJM’s finite study resources from, and allow EIT projects to consume transmission headroom otherwise available to, resources awaiting interconnection through the cluster study process.”¹⁹

The Commission should affirm the June 9 Order in its entirety. PJM clearly demonstrated on the record in this proceeding that the EIT process will not negatively impact the Cycle study process. As explained in the EIT Filing, concerns about withdrawals are mitigated by the fact that a Project Developer’s Readiness Deposit is at-risk once the EIT Request is accepted as valid and complete.²⁰ In addition, PJM will study EIT Projects using the models for the currently active Cycle and require the Project Developer to be financially responsible for 100 percent of the Network Upgrades needed to reliably serve an EIT Project, which will protect active Cycle projects from having to pay for any

¹⁶ *Id.* at P 84.

¹⁷ *Id.* at P 85.

¹⁸ PIOs Rehearing Request at 26-29.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 38.

²⁰ EIT Filing at 9.

Network Upgrades necessitated by an EIT Project.²¹ Further, Interconnection Requests for increases in generating capacity that are in the active Cycle Process and do not have an effective service agreement are not eligible for the EIT process, because it would be difficult to study the EIT Project in a manner that avoids affecting the projects in an active Cycle.²² This exclusion avoids uncertainty that would arise with respect to which model to use for the studies and how to isolate the impact of the EIT Project expansion.²³

The PIOs Rehearing Request ignores these demonstrations, instead claiming that the Commission ignored its “concerns” that the parallel EIT process will lead to withdrawals and delay for projects within the Cycle process.²⁴ As discussed above, the Commission rightly concluded that these concerns lacked merit.²⁵ In fact, given that the Cycle process prohibits intra-Cycle cost allocation, Cycle Projects will likely benefit from the inclusion of EIT Projects by having Network Upgrade costs paid by an EIT Project Developer that would have otherwise been allocated to Cycle Projects.

Moreover, PJM explained and the Commission found that the EIT process is limited in both size and duration to avoid negative effects on PJM’s Cycle process.²⁶ PJM will study only 10 valid and complete projects per calendar year in the EIT process (i.e., 10 projects in the calendar year in the year in which the Commission accepts EIT, and 10 projects in the next calendar year), meaning the EIT process will require fewer resources

²¹ *Id.* at 12.

²² *Id.* at 23-24.

²³ This exclusion does not apply to EIT Projects that are increases in capacity to in-service Generating Facilities.

²⁴ PIOs Rehearing Request at 26-29.

²⁵ June 9 Order at PP 84-85.

²⁶ EIT Filing at 12; June 9 Order at P 84.

to administer and therefore not impinge on the processing of Cycle Process projects.²⁷ EIT is also limited in duration to focus on addressing the urgent need for capacity resources in the near term, and will sunset at the end of the full calendar year following acceptance by the Commission.²⁸

The Commission rightly rejected PIOs' concerns regarding Cycle delays and withdrawals as speculative, noting that the enhanced commercial readiness requirements and time-limited guardrails of the EIT process negate concerns regarding withdrawals and restudies typically associated with serial interconnection queues.²⁹ The Commission should therefore reject the PIOs Rehearing Request and affirm the June 9 Order in its entirety.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, PJM respectfully requests that the Commission accept this Answer, reject the request for rehearing of the June 9 Order, and affirm its findings made in that order.

²⁷ EIT Filing at 12.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ June 9 Order at PP 83, 86.

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

Christopher B. Holt
Managing Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, PA 19403
(610) 666-2368
christopher.holt@pjm.com

Dated: July 24, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elizabeth P. Trinkle
Wendy B. Warren
Elizabeth P. Trinkle
Wright & Talisman, P.C.
1200 G Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-3898
(202) 393-1200
warren@wrightlaw.com
trinkle@wrightlaw.com

Counsel for PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

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 24th day of July 2026.

/s/ Elizabeth P. Trinkle
Elizabeth P. Trinkle
Wright & Talisman, P.C.
1200 G Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-3898
(202) 393-1200
trinkle@wrightlaw.com