



PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Boulevard
Audubon, PA 19403-2497

Mark J. Stanisz
Senior Counsel
T: (610) 666-4707 | F: (610) 666-8211
mark.stanisz@pjm.com

June 28, 2019

Honorable Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E., Room 1A
Washington, D.C. 20426-0001

Re: PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Docket No. ER19-2301-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Power Act (“FPA”),¹ and part 35 of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission” or “FERC”) regulations,² PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (“PJM”) submits this filing to revise the Amended and Restated Operating Agreement of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (“Operating Agreement”), Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(f). At present, the Operating Agreement is absolute on re-evaluations and provides no mechanism to permit PJM to discontinue, in certain discrete circumstances, its annual re-evaluation of an Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion³ (“market efficiency project”) that has been approved by the PJM Board of Managers (“PJM Board”). The proposed changes here, which received stakeholder support, would add needed clarity to the Operating Agreement by specifying a time after which PJM is no longer required to conduct an annual re-evaluation of such projects. In addition, these proposed changes provide greater clarity for project developers to move forward with the construction of PJM Board-approved market efficiency projects. These proposed

¹ 16 U.S.C. § 824d.

² 18 C.F.R. Part 35.

³ Capitalized terms used and not otherwise defined herein have the Operating Agreement definition of the term. The Operating Agreement defines “Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion” to mean an enhancement or expansion described in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(b) (i) – (iii) that is designed to relieve transmission constraints that have an economic impact.

changes would also permit PJM to re-deploy efforts to other planning initiatives and away from completing annual re-evaluations for certain market efficiency projects that have already benefited from substantial PJM study and developer investment (and, in some cases, state or other relevant regulatory authority approval), and/or that are smaller in scope (*i.e.*, less than \$20 million in capital costs). PJM requests an effective date of August 28, 2019 for the proposed revisions, which is more than 60 days after the date of this filing.

I. WITH THESE PROPOSED CHANGES, THE OPERATING AGREEMENT WOULD SPECIFY A TIME AFTER WHICH PJM IS NO LONGER REQUIRED TO ANNUALLY RE-EVALUATE A PJM BOARD-APPROVED MARKET EFFICIENCY PROJECT.

A. Background

By way of background,⁴ PJM's market efficiency analysis is performed as part of the overall Regional Transmission Expansion Plan ("RTEP") process to accomplish the following two objectives: (1) determine which reliability upgrades, if any, have an economic benefit if accelerated (*i.e.*, placed in service prior to their reliability need date); and (2) identify new transmission upgrades that may result in economic benefits.

PJM performs a market efficiency analysis under a 24-month planning cycle. Following the availability of the appropriate updated RTEP power flow model resulting from the reliability analysis, PJM performs its market efficiency analyses to identify market efficiency needs on the PJM system. At the end of the first year of the 24-month cycle, PJM then solicits proposals during a 120-day window to address market efficiency issues identified five years into the future. During the second year of the 24-month cycle, the market efficiency models are updated with the latest assumptions and the proposals are evaluated using those updated models.

⁴ This high-level discussion of the PJM market efficiency process is set forth in greater detail at Schedule 6, section 1.5.7 of the Operating Agreement. *See also* PJM's Manual 14B entitled the PJM Region Transmission Planning Process.

In the market efficiency analysis, PJM compares the costs and benefits of the economic-based transmission improvement proposals. To calculate the benefits of these potential economic-based enhancements, PJM performs and compares market simulations with and without the newly proposed economic-based enhancements for selected future years within the RTEP's 15-year planning horizon. The relative benefits and costs of the economic-based enhancement or expansion must meet the Benefit/Cost Ratio threshold test to be included in the RTEP recommended to the PJM Board for approval. This means that the relative benefits and costs of the economic-based enhancement or expansion must meet or exceed a Benefit/Cost Ratio threshold of at least 1.25:1. The Benefit/Cost Ratio is calculated by dividing the present value of the total annual benefit for the 15 year period starting with the RTEP Year (defined as current year plus five) minus benefits for years when the project is not yet in-service by the present value of the total annual cost for the same 15 year period.

PJM presents all the RTEP market efficiency projects to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee ("TEAC") for review and comment. Subsequent to TEAC review, PJM considers stakeholder comments and presents the final recommended market efficiency projects to the PJM Board, along with the advice, comments, and recommendations of the TEAC (typically by the end of the 24-month cycle).

Under Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(f), PJM is required to annually review the costs and benefits of constructing market efficiency projects that the PJM Board has already approved. The current Operating Agreement language further provides that:

In the event that there are changes in these costs and benefits, [PJM] shall review the changes in costs and benefits with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and recommend to the PJM Board whether the new [market efficiency projects] continue to provide measurable benefits, as determined in accordance with subsection (d), and should remain in the Regional

Transmission Expansion Plan. The annual review of the costs and benefits of constructing new [market efficiency projects] included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall include review of changes in cost estimates of the [market efficiency project], and changes in system conditions, including but not limited to, changes in load forecasts, and anticipated Merchant Transmission Facilities, generation, and demand response, consistent with the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(i).

At present, the Operating Agreement does not specify when, if at all, PJM is no longer required to conduct a full annual review of an approved market efficiency project.

B. Proposed Operating Agreement Revisions

PJM's proposed revisions to the Operating Agreement call for the addition of the following two sentences to the end of Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(f):

The Office of the Interconnection will not be required to review annually the costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions with capital costs less than \$20 million if, based on updated cost estimates and the original benefits, the Benefit/Cost Ratio remains at or above 1.25.

The Office of the Interconnection shall no longer be required to review costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements and Expansions once: (i) a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is granted by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which such enhancements or expansions will be located; or (ii) if a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is not required by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which an economic-based enhancement or expansion will be located, once construction activities commence at the project site.

At their core, the proposed changes would clarify when annual market efficiency project re-evaluations are no longer required and provide greater clarity for developers of market efficiency projects to move forward with construction.

Turning to the second of these sentences first, if accepted, this addition to the Operating Agreement offers the following specific criteria that, if satisfied, would permit PJM to no longer

conduct an annual review of the costs and benefits of PJM Board-approved market efficiency projects:

- The grant of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (“CPCN”) or its equivalent by a state or relevant regulatory authority where the market efficiency project will be located; or
- If the grant of a CPCN or its equivalent is not required, once construction activities commence at the project site.⁵

To be clear, where a CPCN or its equivalent is required for a project, PJM will continue to fully re-evaluate the benefits and costs of the project until a CPCN or its equivalent is granted. But once a CPCN or its equivalent is granted, it is just and reasonable to use that grant as a trigger to allow PJM to discontinue a market efficiency project’s annual review. Under such circumstances, the project would have already satisfied the PJM Benefit/Cost Ratio requirement and a non-PJM-affiliated siting body (or bodies) would have confirmed and approved the PJM-identified needs and solution (often after discovery and litigation involving various state agencies and other intervenors). Thus, where a CPCN or its equivalent is granted, the developer should be permitted to proceed swiftly with construction so that the market efficiency project’s benefits can be realized as soon as possible in light of the significant time and investment the developer, PJM, and the siting body (or bodies) have given to the development, study, and approval of the project.

Similarly, where no CPCN or its equivalent is required, it is also just and reasonable to allow for the commencement of construction at the project site to be used as the criterion to end an annual market efficiency review requirement. As with market efficiency projects that receive a CPCN or its equivalent, a project not requiring any siting body’s permission to proceed is

⁵ Notably, the proposed language’s reference to “construction activities commence at the project site” was the result of stakeholder consideration of the appropriate triggering criteria. Stakeholders also discussed a percentage of construction criterion as a trigger, but ultimately did not pursue such a criterion because of the recognized impracticalities in measuring and implementing that metric.

nevertheless extensively studied by PJM, vetted with stakeholders, and approved by the PJM Board, after substantial investment by the developer. The developer's investments in the project are only further increased once project construction at the site actually commences. Notwithstanding the possible recovery of abandonment costs in the event a project were to be halted for some reason, projects that have proceeded to this point of development and implementation based upon demonstrable need should be permitted to proceed toward completion. This will ensure that the grid realizes an actual benefit from the well-studied project, as opposed to imposing on load a socialized financial burden.

Turning to the first sentence of PJM's proposed revisions, the proposed language would narrowly apply to market efficiency projects with capital costs under \$20 million. For such projects, the proposed revisions would no longer require PJM to automatically conduct a full annual review of the updated costs and updated benefits (a new PROMOD study) of constructing market efficiency projects if, based on updated cost estimates and the original benefits, the Benefit/Cost Ratio remains at or above the 1.25:1 threshold.

The proposed revision is merely intended to streamline PJM's review of these smaller scale market efficiency projects for at least two reasons. First, since at least the 2014/2015 market efficiency window, no PJM annual re-evaluation of a market efficiency project with capital costs under \$20 million has ever resulted in a Benefit/Cost Ratio below the required 1.25:1 threshold. Thus, foregoing a fulsome annual review of these lower capital cost projects is likely to release PJM resources so that they can be devoted to other planning priorities.

Second, the projects that are \$20 million or less are line and station upgrades that generally come into service faster than five years in the future, as shown in the following chart of energy benefits-targeting market efficiency projects since the August 2015 TEAC costing \$20

million or less.

Project ID	Project Cost (Millions of Dollars)	TEAC Date	In Service Date
201415_1-2A	1.1	August 2015	2019
201415_1-2B	3.1	August 2015	2018
201415_1-4I	0.75	August 2015	2019
201415_1-4J	0.5	August 2015	2018
201415_1-10B	0.1	August 2015	2018
201415_1-11H	9.7	August 2015	2019
201415_1-12A	11.18	August 2015	2018
201415_1-13E	2.4	August 2015	2016
201415_1-18G	5.2	August 2015	2018
201415_1-18I	0.6	August 2015	2019
201415_Optimal Caps	8.98	February 2016	2019

PJM has confidence that the initial benefits calculation for these smaller scale projects remains sufficiently reliable to use in its annual re-evaluation calculus without fully re-running a PROMOD study for these benefits (since such a re-run consumes significant PJM planning resources). On the other hand, because the cost data is more readily obtainable at substantially less effort, PJM will still update the denominator of the Benefit/Cost Ratio calculus in the streamlined annual review process for smaller scope projects proposed here.

The proposed Operating Agreement language allows PJM to nevertheless re-evaluate any market efficiency project if and when necessary after an annual re-evaluation is no longer required.⁶ PJM's authority in this regard is based upon certain scenarios PJM intends to develop

⁶ Of course, should a CPCN, its equivalent, or other necessary permit be conditioned on additional analysis requested by a state or other regulator, for example, the proposed language would not impede PJM's ability to comply with such a directive.

with stakeholders for inclusion in its manual.

In addition to the substantive additions to the Operating Agreement noted above, PJM also submits minor, non-substantive revisions to address certain formatting issues and modify references located in sections of the Operating Agreement that PJM proposes to revise in this filing. These revisions are part of PJM's ongoing efforts to continually review and make noncontroversial and non-substantive revisions to enhance PJM's governing documents.

II. STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT

The revisions proposed in this filing were overwhelmingly endorsed by PJM stakeholders. On February 28, 2019, a non-binding poll conducted of the PJM Market Efficiency Process Enhancement Task Force revealed that 0% of participants could not support the proposed revision. On April 11, 2019, the Planning Committee endorsed the proposed revisions by acclamation, with no objections and no abstentions. On April 25, 2019, the PJM Markets & Reliability Committee and the PJM Members Committee both endorsed the proposed revisions by acclamation, with only 1 objection and 1 abstention registered in each of these committees. In short order, PJM also intends to present to the Planning Committee the proposed manual revisions outlined above for stakeholder input and endorsement.

III. EFFECTIVE DATE

Consistent with the Commission's prior notice requirements, 18 C.F.R. § 35.3, PJM requests an August 28, 2019 effective date, which is more than 60 days after today's filing date.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF SUBMITTAL

This filing consists of:

1. This Transmittal Letter;
2. Attachment A: Electronic versions of the revisions to the Tariff in redline showing the revisions; and

3. Attachment B: Electronic versions of the revisions to the Tariff in clean form.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence and communications regarding this filing should be sent to:⁷

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

Mark J. Stanisz
Senior Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 666-4707
mark.stanisz@pjm.com

Pauline Foley
Associate General Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, PA 19403
(610) 666-8248
pauline.foley@pjm.com

VI. SERVICE

PJM has served a copy of this filing on all PJM Members and on all state utility regulatory commissions in the PJM Region by posting this filing electronically. In accordance with the Commission's regulations,⁸ PJM will post a copy of this filing to the FERC filings section of its Web site, located at: <http://www.pjm.com/documents/ferc-manuals/ferc-filings.aspx>, with a specific link to the newly-filed document, and will send an email on the same date as this filing to all PJM Members and all state utility regulatory commissions in the PJM Region⁹ alerting them of the filing and its availability on PJM's Web site. PJM also serves

⁷ To the extent necessary, PJM respectfully requests waiver of Rule 203(b)(3) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure to permit all of the following representatives to be included on the official service list compiled by the Secretary for this proceeding.

⁸ See 18 C.F.R. §§ 35.2(e) and 385.2010(f)(3).

⁹ PJM maintains, updates, and regularly uses e-mail lists for all PJM members and affected state commissions.

the parties on the Commission's official service list for this docket. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the document is not immediately available by using the referenced link, the document will be available through the referenced link within 24 hours of the filing. A copy of this filing will also be available on the FERC's eLibrary Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/elibrary.asp> in accordance with the Commission's regulations and Order No. 714.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark J. Stanisz

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

Mark J. Stanisz
Senior Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, Pennsylvania 19403
(610) 666-4707
mark.stanisz@pjm.com

Pauline Foley
Associate General Counsel
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
2750 Monroe Blvd.
Audubon, PA 19403
(610) 666-8248
pauline.foley@pjm.com

DATE: June 28, 2019

On behalf of PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Attachment A

Revisions to the PJM Operating Agreement
(Marked / Redline Format)

1.5 Procedure for Development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

1.5.1 Commencement of the Process.

(a) The Office of the Interconnection shall initiate the enhancement and expansion study process if: (i) required as a result of a need for transfer capability identified by the Office of the Interconnection in its evaluation of requests for interconnection with the Transmission System or for firm transmission service with a term of one year or more; (ii) required to address a need identified by the Office of the Interconnection in its on-going evaluation of the Transmission System's market efficiency and operational performance; (iii) required as a result of the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the Transmission System's compliance with NERC Reliability Standards, more stringent reliability criteria, if any, or PJM planning and operating criteria; (iv) required to address constraints or available transfer capability shortages, including, but not limited to, available transfer capability shortages that prevent the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(b), constraints or shortages as a result of expected generation retirements, constraints or shortages based on an evaluation of load forecasts, or system reliability needs arising from proposals for the addition of Transmission Facilities in the PJM Region; or (v) expansion of the Transmission System is proposed by one or more Transmission Owners, Interconnection Customers, Network Service Users or Transmission Customers, or any party that funds Network Upgrades pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8. The Office of the Interconnection may initiate the enhancement and expansion study process to address or consider, where appropriate, requirements or needs arising from sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, scenario analyses, and Public Policy Objectives.

(b) The Office of the Interconnection shall notify the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants of, as well as publicly notice, the commencement of an enhancement and expansion study. The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants shall notify the Office of the Interconnection in writing of any additional transmission considerations they would like to have included in the Office of the Interconnection's analyses.

1.5.2 Development of Scope, Assumptions and Procedures.

Once the need for an enhancement and expansion study has been established, the Office of the Interconnection shall consult with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees, as appropriate, to prepare the study's scope, assumptions and procedures.

1.5.3 Scope of Studies.

In conducting the enhancement and expansion studies, the Office of the Interconnection shall not limit its analyses to bright line tests to identify and evaluate potential Transmission System limitations, violations of planning criteria, or transmission needs. In addition to the bright line tests, the Office of the Interconnection shall employ sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses, and shall also consider Public Policy Objectives in the studies and analyses, so as to mitigate the possibility that bright line metrics may inappropriately include

or exclude transmission projects from the transmission plan. Sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses shall take account of potential changes in expected future system conditions, including, but not limited to, load levels, transfer levels, fuel costs, the level and type of generation, generation patterns (including, but not limited to, the effects of assumptions regarding generation that is at risk for retirement and new generation to satisfy Public Policy Objectives), demand response, and uncertainties arising from estimated times to construct transmission upgrades. The Office of the Interconnection shall use the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses in evaluating and choosing among alternative solutions to reliability, market efficiency and operational performance needs. The Office of the Interconnection shall provide the results of its studies and analyses to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee to consider the impact that sensitivities, assumptions, and scenarios may have on Transmission System needs and the need for transmission enhancements or expansions. Enhancement and expansion studies shall be completed by the Office of the Interconnection in collaboration with the affected Transmission Owners, as required. In general, enhancement and expansion studies shall include:

- (a) An identification of existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System's physical, economic and/or operational capability or performance, with accompanying simulations to identify the costs of controlling those limitations. Potential enhancements and expansions will be proposed to mitigate limitations controlled by non-economic means.
- (b) Evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions, including alternatives thereto, needed to mitigate such limitations.
- (c) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential transmission expansions and enhancements, demand response programs, and other alternative technologies as appropriate to maintain system reliability.
- (d) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions for the purposes of supporting competition, market efficiency, operational performance, and Public Policy Requirements in the PJM Region.
- (e) Identification, evaluation and analysis of upgrades to support Incremental Auction Revenue Rights requested pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8.
- (f) Identification, evaluation and analysis of upgrades to support all transmission customers, including native load and network service customers.
- (g) Engineering studies needed to determine the effectiveness and compliance of recommended enhancements and expansions, with the following PJM criteria: system reliability, operational performance, and market efficiency.
- (h) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions designed to ensure that the Transmission System's capability can support the simultaneous feasibility of all stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(b). Enhancements and expansions related to stage 1A

Auction Revenue Rights identified pursuant to this Section shall be recommended for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan together with a recommended in-service date based on the results of the ten (10) year stage 1A simultaneous feasibility analysis. Any such recommended enhancement or expansion under this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3(h) shall include, but shall not be limited to, the reason for the upgrade, the cost of the upgrade, the cost allocation identified pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.6(m) and an analysis of the benefits of the enhancement or expansion, provided that any such upgrades will not be subject to a market efficiency cost/benefit analysis.

1.5.4 Supply of Data.

(a) The Transmission Owners shall provide to the Office of the Interconnection on an annual or periodic basis as specified by the Office of the Interconnection, any information and data reasonably required by the Office of the Interconnection to perform the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, including but not limited to the following: (i) a description of the total load to be served from each substation; (ii) the amount of any interruptible loads included in the total load (including conditions under which an interruption can be implemented and any limitations on the duration and frequency of interruptions); (iii) a description of all generation resources to be located in the geographic region encompassed by the Transmission Owner's transmission facilities, including unit sizes, VAR capability, operating restrictions, and any must-run unit designations required for system reliability or contract reasons; the (iv) current local planning information, including all criteria, assumptions and models used by the Transmission Owners, such as those used to develop Supplemental Projects. The data required under this Section shall be provided in the form and manner specified by the Office of the Interconnection.

(b) In addition to the foregoing, the Transmission Owners, those entities requesting transmission service and any other entities proposing to provide Transmission Facilities to be integrated into the PJM Region shall supply any other information and data reasonably required by the Office of the Interconnection to perform the enhancement and expansion study.

(c) The Office of the Interconnection also shall solicit from the Members, Transmission Customers and other interested parties, including but not limited to electric utility regulatory agencies within the States in the PJM Region, Independent State Agencies Committee, and the State Consumer Advocates, information required by, or anticipated to be useful to, the Office of the Interconnection in its preparation of the enhancement and expansion study, including information regarding potential sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, scenario analyses, and Public Policy Objectives that may be considered.

(d) The Office of the Interconnection shall supply to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees reasonably required information and data utilized to develop the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. Such information and data shall be provided pursuant to the appropriate protection of confidentiality provisions and Office of the Interconnection's CEII process.

(e) The Office of the Interconnection shall provide access through the PJM website, to the Transmission Owner's local planning information, including all criteria, assumptions and models

used by the Transmission Owners in their internal planning processes, including the development of Supplemental Projects (“Local Plan Information”). Local Plan Information shall be provided consistent with: (1) any applicable confidentiality provisions set forth in the Operating Agreement, section 18.17; (2) the Office of the Interconnection’s CEII process; and (3) any applicable copyright limitations. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Office of the Interconnection may share with a third party Local Plan Information that has been designated as confidential, pursuant to the provisions for such designation as set forth in the Operating Agreement, section 18.17 and subject to: (i) agreement by the disclosing Transmission Owner consistent with the process set forth in this Operating Agreement; and (ii) an appropriate non-disclosure agreement to be executed by PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., the Transmission Owner and the requesting third party. With the exception of confidential, CEII and copyright protected information, Local Plan Information will be provided for full review by the Planning Committee, the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, and the Subregional RTEP Committees.

1.5.5 Coordination of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(a) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed in accordance with the principles of interregional coordination with the Transmission Systems of the surrounding Regional Entities and with the local transmission providers, through the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committee.

(b) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed taking into account the processes for coordinated regional transmission expansion planning established under the following agreements:

- Joint Operating Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., which is found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/joa-complete.ashx>;
- Northeastern ISO/RTO Planning Coordination Protocol, which is described at Schedule 6-B and found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/northeastern-iso-rto-planning-coordination-protocol.ashx>;
- Joint Operating Agreement Among and Between New York Independent System Operator Inc., which is found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/nyiso-pjm.ashx>;
- Interregional Transmission Coordination Between the SERTP and PJM Regions, which is found at Operating Agreement, Schedule 6-A ;
- Allocation of Costs of Certain Interregional Transmission Projects Located in the PJM and SERTP Regions, which is located at Tariff, Schedule 12-B;
- Joint Reliability Coordination Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc.; PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. and Progress Energy Carolinas.

(i) Coordinated regional transmission expansion planning shall also incorporate input from parties that may be impacted by the coordination efforts, including but not limited to, the Members, Transmission Customers, electric utility regulatory agencies in the PJM Region, and the State Consumer Advocates, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the applicable regional coordination agreements.

(ii) An entity, including existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers, may submit potential Interregional Transmission Projects pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8.

(c) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed by the Office of the Interconnection in consultation with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee during the enhancement and expansion study process.

(d) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed taking into account the processes for coordination of the regional and subregional systems.

1.5.6 Development of the Recommended Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(a) The Office of the Interconnection shall be responsible for the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan and for conducting the studies, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses on which the plan is based. The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, including the Regional RTEP Projects, the Subregional RTEP Projects and the Supplemental Projects shall be developed through an open and collaborative process with opportunity for meaningful participation through the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees.

(b) The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees shall each facilitate a minimum of one initial assumptions meeting to be scheduled at the commencement of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan process. The purpose of the assumptions meeting shall be to provide an open forum to discuss the following: (i) the assumptions to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of the potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission Facilities; (ii) Public Policy Requirements identified by the states for consideration in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iii) Public Policy Objectives identified by stakeholders for consideration in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iv) the impacts of regulatory actions, projected changes in load growth, demand response resources, energy efficiency programs, price responsive demand, generating additions and retirements, market efficiency and other trends in the industry; and (v) alternative sensitivity studies, modeling assumptions and scenario analyses proposed by the Committee participants. Prior to the initial assumptions meeting, the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and Subregional RTEP Committees participants will be afforded the opportunity to provide input and submit suggestions regarding the information identified in items (i) through (v) of this subsection. Following the assumptions meeting and prior to performing the evaluation and analyses of transmission needs, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine the range of assumptions to be used in the studies and scenario analyses, based on the advice and recommendations of the Transmission Expansion

Advisory Committee and Subregional RTEP Committees and, through the Independent State Agencies, the statement of Public Policy Requirements provided individually by the states and any state member's assessment or prioritization of Public Policy Objectives proposed by other stakeholders. The Office of the Interconnection shall document and publicly post its determination for review. Such posting shall include an explanation of those Public Policy Requirements and Public Policy Objectives adopted at the assumptions stage to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of transmission needs. Following identification of transmission needs and prior to evaluating potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission System the Office of the Interconnection shall publicly post all transmission need information identified as described further in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) herein to support the role of the Subregional RTEP Committees in the development of the Local Plan and support the role of Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The Office of the Interconnection shall also post an explanation of why other Public Policy Requirements and Public Policy Objectives introduced by stakeholders at the assumptions stage were not adopted.

(c) The Subregional RTEP Committees shall also schedule and facilitate meetings related to Supplemental Projects, as described in the Tariff, Attachment M-3.

(d) After the assumptions meeting(s), the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees shall facilitate additional meetings and shall post all communications required to provide early opportunity for the committee participants (as defined in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.3(b) and 1.3(c)) to review, evaluate and offer comments and alternatives to the following arising from the studies performed by the Office of the Interconnection, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses: (i) any identified violations of reliability criteria and analyses of the market efficiency and operational performance of the Transmission System; (ii) potential transmission solutions, including any acceleration, deceleration or modifications of a potential expansion or enhancement based on the results of sensitivities studies and scenario analyses; and (iii) the proposed Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. These meetings will be scheduled as deemed necessary by the Office of the Interconnection or upon the request of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee or the Subregional RTEP Committees. The Office of the Interconnection will provide updates on the status of the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan at these meetings or at the regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning Committee.

(e) In addition, the Office of the Interconnection shall facilitate periodic meetings with the Independent State Agencies Committee to discuss: (i) the assumptions to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of the potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission Facilities; (ii) regulatory initiatives, as appropriate, including state regulatory agency initiated programs, and other Public Policy Objectives, to consider including in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iii) the impacts of regulatory actions, projected changes in load growth, demand response resources, energy efficiency programs, generating capacity, market efficiency and other trends in the industry; and (iv) alternative sensitivity studies, modeling assumptions and scenario analyses proposed by Independent State Agencies Committee. At such meetings, the Office of the Interconnection also shall discuss the current status of the enhancement and expansion study process. The Independent State Agencies

Committee may request that the Office of Interconnection schedule additional meetings as necessary. The Office of the Interconnection shall inform the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees, as appropriate, of the input of the Independent State Agencies Committee and shall consider such input in developing the range of assumptions to be used in the studies and scenario analyses described in section (b), above.

(f) Upon completion of its studies and analysis, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the violations, system conditions, economic constraints, and Public Policy Requirements as detailed in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) to afford entities an opportunity to submit proposed enhancements or expansions to address the posted violations, system conditions, economic constraints and Public Policy Requirements as provided for in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). Following the close of a proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection shall: (i) post all proposals submitted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c); (ii) consider proposals submitted during the proposal windows consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(d) and develop a recommended plan. Following review by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee of proposals, the Office of the Interconnection, based on identified needs and the timing of such needs, and taking into account the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses considered pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3, shall determine, which more efficient or cost-effective enhancements and expansions shall be included in the recommended plan, including solutions identified as a result of the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses, that may accelerate, decelerate or modify a potential reliability, market efficiency or operational performance expansion or enhancement identified as a result of the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses, shall be included in the recommended plan. The Office of the Interconnection shall post the proposed recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee. The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee shall facilitate open meetings and communications as necessary to provide opportunity for the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants to collaborate on the preparation of the recommended enhancement and expansion plan. The Office of the Interconnection also shall invite interested parties to submit comments on the plan to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and to the Office of the Interconnection before submitting the recommended plan to the PJM Board for approval.

(g) The recommended plan shall separately identify enhancements and expansions for the three PJM subregions, the PJM Mid-Atlantic Region, the PJM West Region, and the PJM South Region, and shall incorporate recommendations from the Subregional RTEP Committees.

(h) The recommended plan shall separately identify enhancements and expansions that are classified as Supplemental Projects.

(i) The recommended plan shall identify enhancements and expansions that relieve transmission constraints and which, in the judgment of the Office of the Interconnection, are economically justified. Such economic expansions and enhancements shall be developed in

accordance with the procedures, criteria and analyses described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.7 and 1.5.8.

(j) The recommended plan shall identify enhancements and expansions proposed by a state or states pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9.

(k) The recommended plan shall include proposed Merchant Transmission Facilities within the PJM Region and any other enhancement or expansion of the Transmission System requested by any participant which the Office of the Interconnection finds to be compatible with the Transmission System, though not required pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.1, provided that (1) the requestor has complied, to the extent applicable, with the procedures and other requirements of the Tariff, Parts IV and VI; (2) the proposed enhancement or expansion is consistent with applicable reliability standards, operating criteria and the purposes and objectives of the regional planning protocol; (3) the requestor shall be responsible for all costs of such enhancement or expansion (including, but not necessarily limited to, costs of siting, designing, financing, constructing, operating and maintaining the pertinent facilities), and (4) except as otherwise provided by the Tariff, Parts IV and VI with respect to Merchant Network Upgrades, the requestor shall accept responsibility for ownership, construction, operation and maintenance of the enhancement or expansion through an undertaking satisfactory to the Office of the Interconnection.

(l) For each enhancement or expansion that is included in the recommended plan, the plan shall consider, based on the planning analysis: other input from participants, including any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion; and, when applicable, relevant projects being undertaken to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of Stage 1A ARRs, to facilitate Incremental ARRs pursuant to the provisions of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8, or to facilitate upgrades pursuant to the Tariff, Parts II, III, or VI, and designate one or more Transmission Owners or other entities to construct, own and, unless otherwise provided, finance the recommended transmission enhancement or expansion. Any designation under this paragraph of one or more entities to construct, own and/or finance a recommended transmission enhancement or expansion shall also include a designation of partial responsibility among them. Nothing herein shall prevent any Transmission Owner or other entity designated to construct, own and/or finance a recommended transmission enhancement or expansion from agreeing to undertake its responsibilities under such designation jointly with other Transmission Owners or other entities.

(m) Based on the planning analysis and other input from participants, including any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for an enhancement or expansion, the recommended plan shall, for any enhancement or expansion that is included in the plan, designate (1) the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones, or any other party that has agreed to fully fund upgrades pursuant to this Agreement or the PJM Tariff, that will bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion, as and to the extent provided by any provision of the PJM Tariff or this Agreement, (2) in the event and to the extent that no provision of the PJM Tariff or this Agreement assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones from which the cost of such enhancement or expansion shall be recovered through charges established pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, and (3) in the event and to the extent that

the Coordinated System Plan developed under the Joint Operating Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones from which the cost of such enhancement or expansion shall be recovered. Any designation under clause (2) of the preceding sentence (A) shall further be based on the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the contributions to the need for, and benefits expected to be derived from, the pertinent enhancement or expansion by affected Market Participants and, (B) subject to FERC review and approval, shall be incorporated in any amendment to the Tariff, Schedule 12 that establishes a Transmission Enhancement Charge Rate in connection with an economic expansion or enhancement developed under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.6(i) and 1.5.7, (C) the costs associated with expansions and enhancements required to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7 shall (1) be allocated across transmission zones based on each zone's stage 1A eligible Auction Revenue Rights flow contribution to the total stage 1A eligible Auction Revenue Rights flow on the facility that limits stage 1A ARR feasibility and (2) within each transmission zone the Network Service Users and Transmission Customers that are eligible to receive stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights shall be the Responsible Customers under the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b) for all expansions and enhancements included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights, and (D) the costs associated with expansions and enhancements required to reduce to zero the Locational Price Adder for LDAs as described in the Tariff, Attachment DD, section 15 shall (1) be allocated across Zones based on each Zone's pro rata share of load in such LDA and (2) within each Zone, to all LSEs serving load in such LDA pro rata based on such load.

Any designation under clause (3), above, (A) shall further be based on the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the contributions to the need for, and benefits expected to be derived from, the pertinent enhancement or expansion by affected Market Participants, and (B), subject to FERC review and approval, shall be incorporated in an amendment to a Schedule of the PJM Tariff which establishes a charge in connection with the pertinent enhancement or expansion. Before designating fewer than all customers using Point-to-Point Transmission Service or Network Integration Transmission Service within a Zone as customers from which the costs of a particular enhancement or expansion may be recovered, Transmission Provider shall consult, in a manner and to the extent that it reasonably determines to be appropriate in each such instance, with affected state utility regulatory authorities and stakeholders. When the plan designates more than one responsible Market Participant, it shall also designate the proportional responsibility among them. Notwithstanding the foregoing, with respect to any facilities that the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan designates to be owned by an entity other than a Transmission Owner, the plan shall designate that entity as responsible for the costs of such facilities.

(n) Certain Regional RTEP Project(s) and Subregional RTEP Project(s) may not be required for compliance with the following PJM criteria: system reliability, market efficiency or operational performance, pursuant to a determination by the Office of the Interconnection. These Supplemental Projects shall be separately identified in the RTEP and are not subject to approval by the PJM Board.

1.5.7 Development of Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions.

(a) Each year the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee shall review and comment on the assumptions to be used in performing the market efficiency analysis to identify enhancements or expansions that could relieve transmission constraints that have an economic impact (“economic constraints”). Such assumptions shall include, but not be limited to, the discount rate used to determine the present value of the Total Annual Enhancement Benefit and Total Enhancement Cost, and the annual revenue requirement, including the recovery period, used to determine the Total Enhancement Cost. The discount rate shall be based on the Transmission Owners’ most recent after-tax embedded cost of capital weighted by each Transmission Owner’s total transmission capitalization. Each year, each Transmission Owner will be requested to provide the Office of the Interconnection with the Transmission Owner’s most recent after-tax embedded cost of capital, total transmission capitalization, and levelized carrying charge rate, including the recovery period. The recovery period shall be consistent with recovery periods allowed by the Commission for comparable facilities. Prior to PJM Board consideration of such assumptions, the assumptions shall be presented to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. Following review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall submit the assumptions to be used in performing the market efficiency analysis described in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7 to the PJM Board for consideration.

(b) Following PJM Board consideration of the assumptions, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform a market efficiency analysis to compare the costs and benefits of: (i) accelerating reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Plan that if accelerated also could relieve one or more economic constraints; (ii) modifying reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Plan that as modified would relieve one or more economic constraints; and (iii) adding new enhancements or expansions that could relieve one or more economic constraints, but for which no reliability-based need has been identified. Economic constraints include, but are not limited to, constraints that cause: (1) significant historical gross congestion; (2) pro-ration of Stage 1B ARR requests as described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(c); or (3) significant simulated congestion as forecasted in the market efficiency analysis. The timeline for the market efficiency analysis and comparison of the costs and benefits for items in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(b)(i-iii) is described in the PJM Manuals.

(c) The process for conducting the market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) above shall include the following:

(i) The Office of the Interconnection shall identify and provide to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee a list of economic constraints to be evaluated in the market efficiency analysis.

(ii) The Office of the Interconnection shall identify any planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, which if accelerated would relieve such constraints, and present any such proposed reliability-based enhancements and expansions to be accelerated to the Transmission Expansion Advisory

Committee for review and comment. The PJM Board, upon consideration of the advice of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, thereafter shall consider and vote to approve any accelerations.

(iii) The Office of the Interconnection shall evaluate whether including any additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan or modifications of existing Regional Transmission Expansion Plan reliability-based enhancements or expansions would relieve an economic constraint. In addition, pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c), any market participant may submit to the Office of the Interconnection a proposal to construct an additional Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion to relieve an economic constraint. Upon completion of its evaluation, including consideration of any eligible market participant proposed Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions, the Office of the Interconnection shall present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee a description of new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions for review and comment. Upon consideration and advice of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the PJM Board shall consider any new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Plan and for those enhancements and expansions it approves, the PJM Board shall designate (a) the entity or entities that will be responsible for constructing and owning or financing the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions, (b) the estimated costs of such enhancements and expansions, and (c) the market participants that will bear responsibility for the costs of the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.6(m). In the event the entity or entities designated as responsible for construction, owning or financing a designated new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion declines to construct, own or finance the new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, the enhancement or expansion will not be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan but will be included in the report filed with the FERC in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.6 and 1.7. This report also shall include information regarding PJM Board approved accelerations of reliability-based enhancements or expansions that an entity declines to accelerate.

(d) To determine the economic benefits of accelerating or modifying planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or of constructing additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions and whether such Economic-based Enhancements or Expansion are eligible for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform and compare market simulations with and without the proposed accelerated or modified planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions as applicable, using the Benefit/Cost Ratio calculation set forth below in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d). An Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion shall be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan recommended to the PJM Board, if the relative benefits and costs of the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion meet a Benefit/Cost Ratio Threshold of at least 1.25:1.

The Benefit/Cost Ratio shall be determined as follows:

Benefit/Cost Ratio = [Present value of the Total Annual Enhancement Benefit for the 15 year period starting with the RTEP Year (defined as current year plus five) minus benefits for years when the project is not yet in-service] ÷ [Present value of the Total Enhancement Cost for the same 15 year period]

Where

Total Annual Enhancement Benefit = Energy Market Benefit + Reliability Pricing Model Benefit

and

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(i) the Energy Market Benefit is as follows:

Energy Market Benefit = [.50] * [Change in Total Energy Production Cost] + [.50] * [Change in Load Energy Payment]

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(v) the Energy Market Benefit is as follows:

Energy Market Benefit = [1] * [Change in Load Energy Payment]
and

Change in Total Energy Production Cost = [the estimated total annual fuel costs, variable O&M costs, and emissions costs of the dispatched resources in the PJM Region without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion] – [the estimated total annual fuel costs, variable O&M costs, and emissions costs of the dispatched resources in the PJM Region with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion]. The change in costs for purchases from outside of the PJM Region and sales to outside the PJM Region will be captured, if appropriate. Purchases will be valued at the Load Weighted LMP and sales will be valued at the Generation Weighted LMP.

and

Change in Load Energy Payment = [the annual sum of (the hourly estimated zonal load megawatts for each Zone) * (the hourly estimated zonal Locational Marginal Price for each Zone without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)] – [the annual sum of (the hourly estimated zonal load megawatts for each Zone) * (the hourly estimated zonal Locational Marginal Price for each

Zone with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)] – [the change in value of transmission rights for each Zone with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion (as measured using currently allocated Auction Revenue Rights plus additional Auction Revenue Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)]. The Change in the Load Energy Payment shall be the sum of the Change in the Load Energy Payment only of the Zones that show a decrease in the Load Energy Payment.

And

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(i) the Reliability Pricing Benefit is as follows:

$$\text{Reliability Pricing Benefit} = [.50] * [\text{Change in Total System Capacity Cost}] + [.50] * [\text{Change in Load Capacity Payment}]$$

and

For economic-based enhancements or expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(v) the Reliability Pricing Benefit is as follows:

$$\text{Reliability Pricing Benefit} = [1] * [\text{Change in Load Capacity Payment}]$$

Change in Total System Capacity Cost = [the sum of (the megawatts that are estimated to be cleared in the Base Residual Auction under the Tariff, Attachment DD) * (the prices that are estimated to be contained in the Sell Offers for each such cleared megawatt without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)] – [the sum of (the megawatts that are estimated to be cleared in the Base Residual Auction under the Tariff, Attachment DD) * (the prices that are estimated to be contained in the Sell Offers for each such cleared megawatt with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)]

and

Change in Load Capacity Payment = [the sum of (the estimated zonal load megawatts in each Zone) * (the estimated Final Zonal Capacity Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of

days in the study year)] – [the sum of (the estimated zonal load megawatts in each Zone) * (the estimated Final Zonal Capacity Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)]. The Change in Load Capacity Payment shall take account of the change in value of Capacity Transfer Rights in each Zone, including any additional Capacity Transfer Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion. The Change in the Load Capacity Payment shall be the sum of the change in the Load Capacity Payment only of the Zones that show a decrease in the Load Capacity Payment.

and

Total Enhancement Cost (except for accelerations of planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions) = the estimated annual revenue requirement for the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion.

Total Enhancement Cost (for accelerations of planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions) = the estimated change in annual revenue requirement resulting from the acceleration of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion, taking account of all of the costs incurred that would not have been incurred but for the acceleration of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion.

(e) For informational purposes only, to assist the Office of the Interconnection and the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in evaluating the economic benefits of accelerating planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or of constructing a new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, the Office of the Interconnection shall calculate and post on the PJM website the change in the following metrics on a zonal and system-wide basis: (i) total energy production costs (fuel costs, variable O&M costs and emissions costs);(ii) total load energy payments (zonal load MW times zonal load Locational Marginal Price); (iii) total generator revenue from energy production (generator MW times generator Locational Marginal Price); (iv) Financial Transmission Right credits (as measured using currently allocated Auction Revenue Rights plus additional Auction Revenue Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of a planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion); (v) marginal loss surplus credit; and (vi) total capacity costs and load capacity payments under the Office of the Interconnection’s Commission-approved capacity construct.

(f) To assure that new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan continue to be cost beneficial, the Office of the Interconnection annually shall review the costs and benefits of constructing such enhancements and expansions. In the event that there are changes in these costs and benefits, the Office of the

Interconnection shall review the changes in costs and benefits with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and recommend to the PJM Board whether the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions continue to provide measurable benefits, as determined in accordance with subsection (d), and should remain in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The annual review of the costs and benefits of constructing new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall include review of changes in cost estimates of the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, and changes in system conditions, including but not limited to, changes in load forecasts, and anticipated Merchant Transmission Facilities, generation, and demand response, consistent with the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(i). The Office of the Interconnection will not be required to review annually the costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions with capital costs less than \$20 million if, based on updated cost estimates and the original benefits, the Benefit/Cost Ratio remains at or above 1.25. The Office of the Interconnection shall no longer be required to review costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements and Expansions once: (i) a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is granted by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which such enhancements or expansions will be located; or (ii) if a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is not required by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which an economic-based enhancement or expansion will be located, once construction activities commence at the project site.

(g) For new economic enhancements or expansions with costs in excess of \$50 million, an independent review of such costs shall be performed to assure both consistency of estimating practices and that the scope of the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions is consistent with the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions as recommended in the market efficiency analysis.

(h) At any time, market participants may submit to the Office of the Interconnection requests to interconnect Merchant Transmission Facilities or generation facilities pursuant to the Tariff, Parts IV and VI that could address an economic constraint. In the event the Office of the Interconnection determines that the interconnection of such facilities would relieve an economic constraint, the Office of the Interconnection may designate the project as a “market solution” and, in the event of such designation, the Tariff, Part VI, Subpart B, section 216, as applicable, shall apply to the project.

(i) The assumptions used in the market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) and any review of costs and benefits pursuant to subsection (f) shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (i) Timely installation of Qualifying Transmission Upgrades, that are committed to the PJM Region as a result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.
- (ii) Availability of Generation Capacity Resources, as defined by the RAA, section 1.33, that are committed to the PJM Region as a

result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.

- (iii) Availability of Demand Resources that are committed to the PJM Region as a result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.
- (iv) Addition of Customer Facilities pursuant to an executed Interconnection Service Agreement or executed Interim Interconnection Service Agreement for which Interconnection Service Agreement is expected to be executed. Facilities with an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement may be included by the Office of the Interconnection after review with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.
- (v) Addition of Customer-Funded Upgrades pursuant to an executed Interconnection Construction Service Agreement or an Upgrade Construction Service Agreement.
- (vi) Expected level of demand response over at least the ensuing fifteen years based on analyses that consider historic levels of demand response, expected demand response growth trends, impact of capacity prices, current and emerging technologies.
- (vii) Expected levels of potential new generation and generation retirements over at least the ensuing fifteen years based on analyses that consider generation trends based on existing generation on the system, generation in the PJM interconnection queues and Capacity Resource Clearing Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD. If the Office of the Interconnection finds that the PJM reserve requirement is not met in any of its future year market efficiency analyses then it will model Customer Facilities pursuant to an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement, ranked by their commercial probability. Commercial probability utilizes historical data from the PJM interconnection queues to determine the likelihood of a Customer Facility, pursuant to an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement, reaching commercial operation. If the Office of the Interconnection finds that the PJM reserve requirement is not met in any of its future year market efficiency analyses, following inclusion of the Customer Facilities discussed above in this section 1.5.7(i)(vii), then it will model adequate future generation based on

type and location of generation in existing PJM interconnection queues and, if necessary, add transmission enhancements to address congestion that arises from such modeling.

- (viii) Items (i) through (v) will be included in the market efficiency assumptions if qualified for consideration by the PJM Board. In the event that any of the items listed in (i) through (v) above qualify for inclusion in the market efficiency analysis assumptions, however, because of the timing of the qualification the item was not included in the assumptions used in developing the most recent Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection, to the extent necessary, shall notify any entity constructing an Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion that may be affected by inclusion of such item in the assumptions for the next market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) and any review of costs and benefits pursuant to subsection (f) that the need for the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion may be diminished or obviated as a result of the inclusion of the qualified item in the assumptions for the next annual market efficiency analysis or review of costs and benefits.

(j) For informational purposes only, with regard to Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions that are included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan pursuant to subsection (d) of this ~~s~~Section 1.5.7, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform sensitivity analyses consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3 and shall provide the results of such sensitivity analyses to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.

1.5.8 Development of Long-lead Projects, Short-term Projects, Immediate-need Reliability Projects, and Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions.

(a) Pre-Qualification Process.

(a)(1) On September 1 of each year, the Office of the Interconnection shall open a thirty-day pre-qualification window for entities, including existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers, to submit to the Office of the Interconnection: (i) applications to pre-qualify as eligible to be a Designated Entity; or (ii) updated information as described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a)(3). Pre-qualification applications shall contain the following information: (i) name and address of the entity; (ii) the technical and engineering qualifications of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company; (iii) the demonstrated experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to develop, construct, maintain, and operate transmission facilities, including a list or other evidence of transmission facilities the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company previously developed, constructed, maintained, or operated; (iv) the previous record of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company regarding construction, maintenance, or operation of transmission facilities both inside and outside of the PJM Region; (v) the capability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to adhere to standardized construction, maintenance and operating practices;

(vi) the financial statements of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company for the most recent fiscal quarter, as well as the most recent three fiscal years, or the period of existence of the entity, if shorter, or such other evidence demonstrating an entity's or its affiliate's, partner's, or parent company's current and expected financial capability acceptable to the Office of the Interconnection; (vii) a commitment by the entity to execute the Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement, if the entity becomes a Designated Entity; (viii) evidence demonstrating the ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to address and timely remedy failure of facilities; (ix) a description of the experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company in acquiring rights of way; and (x) such other supporting information that the Office of Interconnection requires to make the pre-qualification determinations consistent with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a).

(a)(2) No later than October 31, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entities that submitted pre-qualification applications or updated information during the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window, whether they are, or will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity. In the event the Office of the Interconnection determines that an entity (i) is not, or no longer will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity, or (ii) provided insufficient information to determine pre-qualification, the Office of the Interconnection shall inform that the entity it is not pre-qualified and include in the notification the basis for its determination. The entity then may submit additional information, which the Office of the Interconnection shall consider in re-evaluating whether the entity is, or will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity. If the entity submits additional information by November 30, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entity of the results of its re-evaluation no later than December 15. If the entity submits additional information after November 30, the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to re-evaluate the application, with the additional information, and notify the entity of its determination as soon as practicable. No later than December 31, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the list of entities that are pre-qualified as eligible to be Designated Entities. If an entity is notified by the Office of the Interconnection that it does not pre-qualify or will not continue to be pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity, such entity may request dispute resolution pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 5.

(a)(3) In order to continue to pre-qualify as eligible to be a Designated Entity, such entity must confirm its information with the Office of the Interconnection no later than three years following its last submission or sooner if necessary as required below. In the event the information on which the entity's pre-qualification is based changes with respect to the upcoming year, such entity must submit to the Office of the Interconnection all updated information during the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window and the timeframes for notification in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a)(2) shall apply. In the event the information on which the entity's pre-qualification is based changes with respect to the current year, such entity must submit to the Office of the Interconnection all updated information at the time the information changes and the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to evaluate the updated information and notify the entity of its determination as soon as practicable.

(a)(4) As determined by the Office of the Interconnection, an entity may submit a pre-qualification application outside the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window for good cause shown. For a pre-qualification application received outside of the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window, the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to process the application and notify the entity as to whether it pre-qualifies as eligible to be a Designated Entity as soon as practicable.

(a)(5) To be designated as a Designated Entity for any project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers must be pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity pursuant to this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a). This Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) shall not apply to entities that desire to propose projects for inclusion in the recommended plan but do not intend to be a Designated Entity.

(b) **Posting of Transmission System Needs.** Following identification of existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System's physical, economic and/or operational capability or performance in the enhancement and expansion analysis process described in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6 and the PJM Manuals, and after consideration of non-transmission solutions, and prior to evaluating potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission System, the Office of the Interconnection shall publicly post on the PJM website all transmission need information, including violations, system conditions, and economic constraints, and Public Policy Requirements, including (i) federal Public Policy Requirements; (ii) state Public Policy Requirements identified or agreed-to by the states in the PJM Region, which could be addressed by potential Short-term Projects, Long-lead Projects or projects determined pursuant to the State Agreement Approach in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9, as applicable. Such posting shall support the role of the Subregional RTEP Committees in the development of the Local Plans and support the role of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The Office of the Interconnection also shall post an explanation regarding why transmission needs associated with federal or state Public Policy Requirements were identified but were not selected for further evaluation.

(c) **Project Proposal Windows.** The Office of the Interconnection shall provide notice to stakeholders of a 60-day proposal window for Short-term Projects and a 120-day proposal window for Long-lead Projects and Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions. The specifics regarding whether or not the following types of violations or projects are subject to a proposal window are detailed in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m) for Immediate-need Reliability Projects; Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(n) for reliability violations on transmission facilities below 200 kV; Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(o) for violations resulting from individual transmission owner Form 715 Planning Criteria; and Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(p) for violations on transmission substation equipment. The Office of Interconnection may shorten a proposal window should an identified need require a shorter proposal window to meet the needed in-service date of the proposed enhancements or expansions, or extend a proposal window as needed to accommodate updated information regarding system conditions. The Office of the Interconnection may shorten or lengthen a proposal window that is not yet opened based on one or more of the

following criteria: (1) complexity of the violation or system condition; and (2) whether there is sufficient time remaining in the relevant planning cycle to accommodate a standard proposal window and timely address the violation or system condition. The Office of the Interconnection may lengthen a proposal window that already is opened based on or more of the following criteria: (i) changes in assumptions or conditions relating to the underlying need for the project, such as load growth or Reliability Pricing Model auction results; (ii) availability of new or changed information regarding the nature of the violations and the facilities involved; and (iii) time remaining in the relevant proposal window. In the event that the Office of the Interconnection determines to lengthen or shorten a proposal window, it will post on the PJM website the new proposal window period and an explanation as to the reasons for the change in the proposal window period. During these windows, the Office of the Interconnection will accept proposals from existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers for potential enhancements or expansions to address the posted violations, system conditions, economic constraints, as well as Public Policy Requirements.

(c)(1) All proposals submitted in the proposal windows must contain: (i) the name and address of the proposing entity; (ii) a statement whether the entity intends to be the Designated Entity for the proposed project; (iii) the location of proposed project, including source and sink, if applicable; (iv) relevant engineering studies, and other relevant information as described in the PJM Manuals pertaining to the proposed project; (v) a proposed initial construction schedule including projected dates on which needed permits are required to be obtained in order to meet the required in-service date; (vi) cost estimates and analyses that provide sufficient detail for the Office of Interconnection to review and analyze the proposed cost of the project; and (vii) with the exception of project proposals with cost estimates submitted with the proposals that are under \$20 million, a non-refundable fee must be submitted with each proposal, by each proposing entity who indicates an intention to be the Designated Entity, as follows: a non-refundable fee in the amount of \$5,000 for each project with a cost estimate submitted with the proposal that is equal to or greater than \$20 million and less than \$100 million and a non-refundable fee in the amount of \$30,000 for each project with a cost estimate submitted with the proposal that is equal to \$100 million or greater.

(c)(2) Proposals from all entities (both existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers) that indicate the entity intends to be a Designated Entity, also must contain information to the extent not previously provided pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) demonstrating: (i) technical and engineering qualifications of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company relevant to construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (ii) experience of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company in developing, constructing, maintaining, and operating the type of transmission facilities contained in the project proposal; (iii) the emergency response capability of the entity that will be operating and maintaining the proposed project; (iv) evidence of transmission facilities the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company previously constructed, maintained, or operated; (v) the ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to obtain adequate financing relative to the proposed project, which may include a letter of intent from a financial institution approved by the Office of the Interconnection or such other evidence of the financial resources available to finance the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (vi) the managerial ability of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent

company to contain costs and adhere to construction schedules for the proposed project, including a description of verifiable past achievement of these goals; (vii) a demonstration of other advantages the entity may have to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed project, including any cost commitment the entity may wish to submit; and (viii) any other information that may assist the Office of the Interconnection in evaluating the proposed project.

(c)(3) The Office of the Interconnection may request additional reports or information from an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developers that it determines are reasonably necessary to evaluate its specific project proposal pursuant to the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.8(e) and 1.5.8(f). If the Office of the Interconnection determines any of the information provided in a proposal is deficient or it requires additional reports or information to analyze the submitted proposal, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the proposing entity of such deficiency or request. Within 10 Business Days of receipt of the notification of deficiency and/or request for additional reports or information, or other reasonable time period as determined by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity shall provide the necessary information.

(c)(4) The request for additional reports or information by the Office of the Interconnection pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c)(3) may be used only to clarify a proposed project as submitted. In response to the Office of the Information's request for additional reports or information, the proposing entity (whether an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer) may not submit a new project proposal or modifications to a proposed project once the proposal window is closed. In the event that the proposing entity fails to timely cure the deficiency or provide the requested reports or information regarding a proposed project, the proposed project will not be considered for inclusion in the recommended plan.

(c)(5) Within 30 days of the closing of the proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection may notify the proposing entity that additional per project fees are required if the Office of the Interconnection determines the proposing entity's submittal includes multiple project proposals. Within 10 Business Days of receipt of the notification of insufficient funds by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity shall submit such funds or notify the Office of the Interconnection which of the project proposals the Office of the Interconnection should evaluate based on the fee(s) submitted.

(d) **Posting and Review of Projects.** Following the close of a proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website all proposals submitted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). All proposals addressing state Public Policy Requirements shall be provided to the applicable states in the PJM Region for review and consideration as a Supplemental Project or a state public policy project consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9. The Office of the Interconnection shall review all proposals submitted during a proposal window and determine and present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee the proposals that merit further consideration for inclusion in the recommended plan. In making this determination, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.8(e) and 1.5.8(f). The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and present to the

Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment descriptions of the proposed enhancements and expansions, including any proposed Supplemental Projects or state public policy projects identified by a state(s). Based on review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection may, if necessary conduct further study and evaluation. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee the revised enhancements and expansions for review and comment. After consultation with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine the more efficient or cost-effective transmission enhancements and expansions for inclusion in the recommended plan consistent with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6.

(e) **Criteria for Considering Inclusion of a Project in the Recommended Plan.** In determining whether a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c), individually or in combination with other Short-term Projects or Long-lead Projects, is the more efficient or cost-effective solution and therefore should be included in the recommended plan, the Office of the Interconnection, taking into account sensitivity studies and scenario analyses considered pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3, shall consider the following criteria, to the extent applicable: (i) the extent to which a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would address and solve the posted violation, system condition, or economic constraint; (ii) the extent to which the relative benefits of the project meets a Benefit/Cost Ratio Threshold of at least 1.25:1 as calculated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d); (iii) the extent to which the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would have secondary benefits, such as addressing additional or other system reliability, operational performance, economic efficiency issues or federal Public Policy Requirements or state Public Policy Requirements identified by the states in the PJM Region; and (iv) other factors such as cost-effectiveness, the ability to timely complete the project, and project development feasibility.

(f) **Entity-Specific Criteria Considered in Determining the Designated Entity for a Project.** In determining whether the entity proposing a Short-term Project, Long-lead Project or Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion recommended for inclusion in the plan shall be the Designated Entity, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider: (i) whether in its proposal, the entity indicated its intent to be the Designated Entity; (ii) whether the entity is pre-qualified to be a Designated Entity pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a); (iii) information provided either in the proposing entity's submission pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) or 1.5.8(c)(2) relative to the specific proposed project that demonstrates: (1) the technical and engineering experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company, including its previous record regarding construction, maintenance, and operation of transmission facilities relative to the project proposed; (2) ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to construct, maintain, and operate transmission facilities, as proposed, (3) capability of the entity to adhere to standardized construction, maintenance, and operating practices, including the capability for emergency response and restoration of damaged equipment; (4) experience of the entity in acquiring rights of way; (5) evidence of the ability of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company to secure a financial commitment from an approved financial institution(s) agreeing to finance the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, if it is accepted into the recommended plan; and (iv) any other factors that may be

relevant to the proposed project, including but not limited to whether the proposal includes the entity's previously designated project(s) included in the plan.

(g) Procedures if No Long-lead Project or Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion Proposal is Determined to be the More Efficient or Cost-Effective Solution. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that none of the proposed Long-lead Projects received during the Long-lead Project proposal window would be the more efficient or cost-effective solution to resolve a posted violation, or system condition, the Office of the Interconnection may re-evaluate and re-post on the PJM website the unresolved violations, or system conditions pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b), provided such re-evaluation and re-posting would not affect the ability of the Office of the Interconnection to timely address the identified reliability need. In the event that re-posting and conducting such re-evaluation would prevent the Office of the Interconnection from timely addressing the existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System that give rise to the need for an enhancement or expansion, the Office of the Interconnection shall propose a project to solve the posted violation, or system condition for inclusion in the recommended plan and shall present such project to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. The Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is to be located shall be the Designated Entity(ies) for such project. In determining whether there is insufficient time for re-posting and re-evaluation, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop and post on the PJM website a transmission solution construction timeline for input and review by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee that will include factors such as, but not limited to: (i) deadlines for obtaining regulatory approvals, (ii) dates by which long lead equipment should be acquired, (iii) the time necessary to complete a proposed solution to meet the required in-service date, and (iv) other time-based factors impacting the feasibility of achieving the required in-service date. Based on input from the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the time frames set forth in the construction timeline, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine whether there is sufficient time to conduct a re-evaluation and re-post and timely address the existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System that give rise to the need for an enhancement or expansion. To the extent that an economic constraint remains unaddressed, the economic constraint will be re-evaluated and re-posted.

(h) Procedures if No Short-term Project Proposal is Determined to be the More Efficient or Cost-Effective Solution. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that none of the proposed Short-term Projects received during a Short-term Project proposal window would be the more efficient or cost-effective solution to resolve a posted violation or system condition, the Office of the Interconnection shall propose a Short-term Project to solve the posted violation, or system condition for inclusion in the recommended plan and will present such Short-term Project to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. The Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the Short-term Project is to be located shall be the Designated Entity(ies) for the Project.

(i) Notification of Designated Entity. Within 15 Business Days of PJM Board approval of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entities that have been designated as the Designated Entities for projects included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of such designations. In such notices, the Office of the

Interconnection shall provide: (i) the needed in-service date of the project; and (ii) a date by which all necessary state approvals should be obtained to timely meet the needed in-service date of the project. The Office of the Interconnection shall use these dates as part of its on-going monitoring of the progress of the project to ensure that the project is completed by its needed in-service date.

(j) **Acceptance of Designation.** Within 30 days of receiving notification of its designation as a Designated Entity, the existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer shall notify the Office of the Interconnection of its acceptance of such designation and submit to the Office of the Interconnection a development schedule, which shall include, but not be limited to, milestones necessary to develop and construct the project to achieve the required in-service date, including milestone dates for obtaining all necessary authorizations and approvals, including but not limited to, state approvals. For good cause shown, the Office of the Interconnection may extend the deadline for submitting the development schedule. The Office of the Interconnection then shall review the development schedule and within 15 days or other reasonable time as required by the Office of the Interconnection: (i) notify the Designated Entity of any issues regarding the development schedule identified by the Office of the Interconnection that may need to be addressed to ensure that the project meets its needed in-service date; and (ii) tender to the Designated Entity an executable Designated Entity Agreement setting forth the rights and obligations of the parties. To retain its status as a Designated Entity, within 60 days of receiving an executable Designated Entity Agreement (or other such period as mutually agreed upon by the Office of the Interconnection and the Designated Entity), the Designated Entity (both existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers) shall submit to the Office of the Interconnection a letter of credit as determined by the Office of Interconnection to cover the incremental costs of construction resulting from reassignment of the project, and return to the Office of the Interconnection an executed Designated Entity Agreement containing a mutually agreed upon development schedule. In the alternative, the Designated Entity may request dispute resolution pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 5, or request that the Designated Entity Agreement be filed unexecuted with the Commission.

(k) **Failure of Designated Entity to Meet Milestones.** In the event the Designated Entity fails to comply with one or more of the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(j); or fails to meet a milestone in the development schedule set forth in the Designated Entity Agreement that causes a delay of the project's in-service date, the Office of the Interconnection shall re-evaluate the need for the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project, and based on that re-evaluation may: (i) retain the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; (ii) remove the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project from the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; or (iii) include an alternative solution in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. If the Office of the Interconnection retains the Short-term or Long-term Project in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, it shall determine whether the delay is beyond the Designated Entity's control and whether to retain the Designated Entity or to designate the Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is located as Designated Entity(ies) for the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project. If the Designated Entity is the Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is located, the Office of the Interconnection shall seek recourse through the Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement or FERC, as appropriate. Any modifications to the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan

pursuant to this section shall be presented to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment and approved by the PJM Board.

(l) **Transmission Owners Required to be the Designated Entity.** Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, in all events, the Transmission Owner(s) in whose Zone(s) a project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) is to be located will be the Designated Entity for the project, when the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project is: (i) a Transmission Owner Upgrade; (ii) located solely within a Transmission Owner's Zone and the costs of the project are allocated solely to the Transmission Owner's Zone; (iii) located solely within a Transmission Owner's Zone and is not selected in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for purposes of cost allocation; or (iv) proposed to be located on a Transmission Owner's existing right of way and the project would alter the Transmission Owner's use and control of its existing right of way under state law. Transmission Owner shall be the Designated Entity when required by state law, regulation or administrative agency order with regard to enhancements or expansions or portions of such enhancements or expansions located within that state.

(m) **Immediate-need Reliability Projects:**

(m)(1) Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify immediate reliability needs that must be addressed within three years or less. For those immediate reliability needs for which PJM determines a proposal window may not be feasible, PJM shall identify and post such immediate need reliability criteria violations and system conditions for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders. Following review and comment, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2) is infeasible. The Office of the Interconnection shall consider the following factors in determining the infeasibility of such a proposal window: (i) nature of the reliability criteria violation; (ii) nature and type of potential solution required; and (iii) projected construction time for a potential solution to the type of reliability criteria violation to be addressed. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2) is infeasible. The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to designate the Transmission Owner as the Designated Entity for the Immediate-need Reliability Project rather than conducting a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2), including an explanation of the time-sensitive need for the Immediate-need Reliability Project, other transmission and non-transmission options that were considered but concluded would not sufficiently address the immediate reliability need, the circumstances that generated the immediate reliability need, and why the immediate reliability need was not identified earlier. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments to the Office of the Interconnection. All comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website. Based on the comments received from stakeholders and the review by Transmission Expansion Advisory

Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall, if necessary, conduct further study and evaluation and post a revised recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee. The PJM Board shall approve the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for inclusion in the recommended plan. In January of each year, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and file with the Commission for informational purposes a list of the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which an existing Transmission Owner was designated in the prior year as the Designated Entity in accordance with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(1). The list shall include the need-by date of Immediate-need Reliability Project and the date the Transmission Owner actually energized the Immediate-need Reliability Project.

(m)(2) If, in the judgment of the Office of the Interconnection, there is sufficient time for the Office of the Interconnection to accept proposals in a shortened proposal window for Immediate-need Reliability Projects, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the violations and system conditions that could be addressed by Immediate-need Reliability Project proposals, including an explanation of the time-sensitive need for an Immediate-need Reliability Project and provide notice to stakeholders of a shortened proposal window. Proposals must contain the information required in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) and, if the entity is seeking to be the Designated Entity, such entity must have pre-qualified to be a Designated Entity pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a). In determining the more efficient or cost-effective proposed Immediate-need Reliability Project for inclusion in the recommended plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider the extent to which the proposed Immediate-need Reliability Project, individually or in combination with other Immediate-need Reliability Projects, would address and solve the posted violations or system conditions and other factors such as cost-effectiveness, the ability of the entity to timely complete the project, and project development feasibility in light of the required need. After PJM Board approval, the Office of the Interconnection, in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(i), shall notify the entities that have been designated as Designated Entities for Immediate-need Projects included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of such designations. Designated Entities shall accept such designations in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(j). In the event that (i) the Office of the Interconnection determines that no proposal resolves a posted violation or system condition; (ii) the proposing entity is not selected to be the Designated Entity; (iii) an entity does not accept the designation as a Designated Entity; or (iv) the Designated Entity fails to meet milestones that would delay the in-service date of the Immediate-need Reliability Project, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop and recommend an Immediate-need Reliability Project to solve the violation or system needs in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(1).

(n) **Reliability Violations on Transmission Facilities Below 200 kV.** Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify reliability violations on facilities below 200 kV. The Office of the Interconnection shall not post such a violation pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) unless the identified violation(s) satisfies one of the following exceptions: (i) the reliability violations are thermal overload

violations identified on multiple transmission lines and/or transformers rated below 200 kV that are impacted by a common contingent element, such that multiple reliability violations could be addressed by one or more solutions, including but not limited to a higher voltage solution; or (ii) the reliability violations are thermal overload violations identified on multiple transmission lines and/or transformers rated below 200 kV and the Office of the Interconnection determines that given the location and electrical features of the violations one or more solutions could potentially address or reduce the flow on multiple lower voltage facilities, thereby eliminating the multiple reliability violations. If the reliability violation is identified on multiple facilities rated below 200 kV that are determined by the Office of the Interconnection to meet one of the two exceptions stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the reliability violations to be included in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the identified reliability violations do not satisfy either of the two exceptions stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop a solution to address the reliability violation on below 200 kV Transmission Facilities that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The Office of Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the below 200 kV reliability violations that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to not include the below 200 kV reliability violation(s) in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) proposal window, a description of the facility on which the violation(s) is found, the Zone in which the facility is located, and notice that such construction responsibility for and ownership of the project that resolves such below 200 kV reliability violation will be designated to the incumbent Transmission Owner. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. With the exception of Immediate-need Reliability Projects under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m), PJM will not select an above 200 kV solution for inclusion in the recommended plan that would address a reliability violation on a below 200 kV transmission facility without posting the violation for inclusion in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website.

(o) **Transmission Owner Form 715 Planning Criteria.** Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify transmission needs driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders the identified transmission needs driven by individual transmission owner Form 715 Planning Criteria. Such transmission needs shall not be posted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window and such postings will not be subject to the proposal window process pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). Any project proposal submitted in a proposal window pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) addressing both a posted violation or system condition other than a Form 715 Planning Criteria violation and a transmission need driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria that complies with the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6,

section 1.5.8(c) shall be accepted for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection and, if selected in the proposal window process for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the project proposer may be designated as the Designated Entity for such project. Project proposals submitted in a proposal window that address only a transmission need solely driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria may be considered by the Office of the Interconnection as a potential alternative to a Form 715 Planning Criteria violation but shall not be accepted for consideration under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) and, if selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity may not be designated as the Designated Entity. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders a description of the Form No. 715 projects. The descriptions shall identify the applicable Form 715 Planning Criteria, the Zone in which the facility is located, an explanation of the decision to designate the Transmission Owner as the Designated Entity, and any alternatives considered by the Office of the Interconnection but were not found to be the more efficient or cost effective solution. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website. Based on the comments received from stakeholders and the review by Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection may, if necessary, conduct further study and evaluation and post a revised recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.

(p) **Thermal Reliability Violations on Transmission Substation Equipment.** Pursuant to the regional transmission expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify thermal reliability violations on existing transmission substation equipment. The Office of the Interconnection shall not post such thermal reliability violations pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) if the Office of the Interconnection determines that the reliability violations would be more efficiently addressed by an upgrade to replace in kind transmission substation equipment with higher rated equipment, excluding power transmission transformers, but including station service transformers and instrument transformers. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the reliability violation does not meet the exemption stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the reliability violations to be included in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the identified thermal reliability violations satisfy the above exemption to the proposal window process, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the transmission substation equipment thermal reliability violations that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to not include the transmission substation equipment thermal reliability violation(s) in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) proposal window, a description of the facility on which the thermal violation(s) is found, the Zone in which the facility is located, and notice that such construction

responsibility for and ownership of the project that resolves such transmission substation equipment thermal violations will be designated to the incumbent Transmission Owner. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website.

1.5.9 State Agreement Approach.

(a) State governmental entities authorized by their respective states, individually or jointly, may agree voluntarily to be responsible for the allocation of all costs of a proposed transmission expansion or enhancement that addresses state Public Policy Requirements identified or accepted by the state(s) in the PJM Region. As determined by the authorized state governmental entities, such transmission enhancements or expansions may be included in the recommended plan, either as a (i) Supplemental Project or (ii) state public policy project, which is a transmission enhancement or expansion, the costs of which will be recovered pursuant to a FERC-accepted cost allocation proposed by agreement of one or more states and voluntarily agreed to by those state(s). All costs related to a state public policy project or Supplemental Project included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan to address state Public Policy Requirements pursuant to this Section shall be recovered from customers in a state(s) in the PJM Region that agrees to be responsible for the projects. No such costs shall be recovered from customers in a state that did not agree to be responsible for such cost allocation. A state public policy project will be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for cost allocation purposes only if there is an associated FERC-accepted allocation permitting recovery of the costs of the state public policy project consistent with this Section.

(b) Subject to any designation reserved for Transmission Owners in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(l), the state(s) responsible for cost allocation for a Supplemental Project or a state public policy project in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9(a) may submit to the Office of the Interconnection the entity(ies) to construct, own, operate and maintain the state public policy project from a list of entities supplied by the Office of the Interconnection that pre-qualified to be Designated Entities pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a).

1.5.10 Multi-Driver Project.

(a) When a proposal submitted by an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) meets the definition of a Multi-Driver Project and is designated to be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for purposes of cost allocation, the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity for the project as follows: (i) if the Multi-Driver Project does not contain a state Public Policy Requirement component, the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity pursuant to the criteria in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8; or (ii) if the Multi-Driver Project contains a state Public Policy Requirement component, the Office of the Interconnection shall evaluate potential Designated Entity candidates based on the criteria in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, and provide its evaluation to and elicit feedback from the sponsoring state governmental entities responsible for allocation of all

costs of the proposed state Public Policy Requirement component (“state governmental entity(ies)”) regarding its evaluation. Based on its evaluation of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8 criteria and consideration of the feedback from the sponsoring state governmental entity(ies), the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity for the Multi-Driver Project and notify such entity consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(i). A Multi-Driver Project may be based on proposals that consist of (1) newly proposed transmission enhancements or expansions; (2) additions to, or modifications of, transmission enhancements or expansions already selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; and/or (3) one or more transmission enhancements or expansions already selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(b) A Multi-Driver Project may contain an enhancement or expansion that addresses a state Public Policy Requirement component only if it meets the requirements set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9(a) and its cost allocations are established consistent with the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(c) If a state governmental entity(ies) desires to include a Public Policy Requirement component after an enhancement or expansion has been included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection may re-evaluate the relevant reliability-based enhancement or expansion, Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, or Multi-Driver Project to determine whether adding the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component would create a more cost effective or efficient solution to system conditions. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that adding the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component to an enhancement or expansion already included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan would result in a more cost effective or efficient solution, the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component may be included in the relevant enhancement or expansion, provided all of the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.10(b) are met, and cost allocations are established consistent with the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(d) If, subsequent to the inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of a Multi-Driver Project that contains a state Public Policy Requirement component, a state governmental entity(ies) withdraws its support of the Public Policy Requirement component of a Multi-Driver Project, then: (i) the Office of the Interconnection shall re-evaluate the need for the remaining components of the Multi-Driver Project without the state Public Policy Requirement component, remove the Multi-Driver Project from the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, or replace the Multi-Driver Project with an enhancement or expansion that addresses remaining reliability or economic system needs; (ii) if the Multi-Driver Project is retained in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan without the state Public Policy Requirement component, the costs of the remaining components will be allocated in accordance with the Tariff, Schedule 12; (iii) if more than one state is responsible for the costs apportioned to the state Public Policy Requirement component of the Multi-Driver Project, the remaining state governmental entity(ies) shall have the option to continue supporting the state Public Policy component of the Multi-Driver Project and if the remaining state governmental entity(ies) choose this option, the apportionment of the state Public Policy Requirement component will remain in place and the remaining state governmental entity(ies) shall agree upon their respective apportionments; (iv) if

a Multi-Driver Project must be retained in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan and completed with the State Public Policy component, the state Public Policy Requirement apportionment will remain in place and the withdrawing state governmental entity(ies) shall continue to be responsible for its/their share of the FERC-accepted cost allocations as filed pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(e) The actual costs of a Multi-Driver Project shall be apportioned to the different components (reliability-based enhancement or expansion, Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion and/or Public Policy Requirement) based on the initial estimated costs of the Multi-Driver Project in accordance with the methodology set forth in the Tariff, Schedule 12.

(f) The benefit metric calculation used for evaluating the market efficiency component of a Multi-Driver Project will be based on the final voltage of the Multi-Driver Project using the Benefit/Cost Ratio calculation set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d) where the Cost component of the calculation is the present value of the estimated cost of the enhancement apportioned to the market efficiency component of the Multi-Driver Project for each of the first 15 years of the life of the enhancement or expansion.

(g) Except as provided to the contrary in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.10 and Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8 applies to Multi-Driver Projects.

(h) The Office of the Interconnection shall determine whether a proposal(s) meets the definition of a Multi-Driver Project by identifying a more efficient or cost effective solution that uses one of the following methods: (i) combining separate solutions that address reliability, economics and/or public policy into a single transmission enhancement or expansion that incorporates separate drivers into one Multi-Driver Project (“Proportional Multi-Driver Method”); or (ii) expanding or enhancing a proposed single driver solution to include one or more additional component(s) to address a combination of reliability, economic and/or public policy drivers (“Incremental Multi-Driver Method”).

(i) In determining whether a Multi-Driver Project may be designated to more than one entity, PJM shall consider whether: (i) the project consists of separable transmission elements, which are physically discrete transmission components, such as, but not limited to, a transformer, static var compensator or definable linear segment of a transmission line, that can be designated individually to a Designated Entity to construct and own and/or finance; and (ii) each entity satisfies the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(f). Separable transmission elements that qualify as Transmission Owner Upgrades shall be designated to the Transmission Owner in the Zone in which the facility will be located.

Attachment B

Revisions to the PJM Operating Agreement
(Clean Format)

1.5 Procedure for Development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

1.5.1 Commencement of the Process.

(a) The Office of the Interconnection shall initiate the enhancement and expansion study process if: (i) required as a result of a need for transfer capability identified by the Office of the Interconnection in its evaluation of requests for interconnection with the Transmission System or for firm transmission service with a term of one year or more; (ii) required to address a need identified by the Office of the Interconnection in its on-going evaluation of the Transmission System's market efficiency and operational performance; (iii) required as a result of the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the Transmission System's compliance with NERC Reliability Standards, more stringent reliability criteria, if any, or PJM planning and operating criteria; (iv) required to address constraints or available transfer capability shortages, including, but not limited to, available transfer capability shortages that prevent the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(b), constraints or shortages as a result of expected generation retirements, constraints or shortages based on an evaluation of load forecasts, or system reliability needs arising from proposals for the addition of Transmission Facilities in the PJM Region; or (v) expansion of the Transmission System is proposed by one or more Transmission Owners, Interconnection Customers, Network Service Users or Transmission Customers, or any party that funds Network Upgrades pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8. The Office of the Interconnection may initiate the enhancement and expansion study process to address or consider, where appropriate, requirements or needs arising from sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, scenario analyses, and Public Policy Objectives.

(b) The Office of the Interconnection shall notify the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants of, as well as publicly notice, the commencement of an enhancement and expansion study. The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants shall notify the Office of the Interconnection in writing of any additional transmission considerations they would like to have included in the Office of the Interconnection's analyses.

1.5.2 Development of Scope, Assumptions and Procedures.

Once the need for an enhancement and expansion study has been established, the Office of the Interconnection shall consult with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees, as appropriate, to prepare the study's scope, assumptions and procedures.

1.5.3 Scope of Studies.

In conducting the enhancement and expansion studies, the Office of the Interconnection shall not limit its analyses to bright line tests to identify and evaluate potential Transmission System limitations, violations of planning criteria, or transmission needs. In addition to the bright line tests, the Office of the Interconnection shall employ sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses, and shall also consider Public Policy Objectives in the studies and analyses, so as to mitigate the possibility that bright line metrics may inappropriately include

or exclude transmission projects from the transmission plan. Sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses shall take account of potential changes in expected future system conditions, including, but not limited to, load levels, transfer levels, fuel costs, the level and type of generation, generation patterns (including, but not limited to, the effects of assumptions regarding generation that is at risk for retirement and new generation to satisfy Public Policy Objectives), demand response, and uncertainties arising from estimated times to construct transmission upgrades. The Office of the Interconnection shall use the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses in evaluating and choosing among alternative solutions to reliability, market efficiency and operational performance needs. The Office of the Interconnection shall provide the results of its studies and analyses to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee to consider the impact that sensitivities, assumptions, and scenarios may have on Transmission System needs and the need for transmission enhancements or expansions. Enhancement and expansion studies shall be completed by the Office of the Interconnection in collaboration with the affected Transmission Owners, as required. In general, enhancement and expansion studies shall include:

- (a) An identification of existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System's physical, economic and/or operational capability or performance, with accompanying simulations to identify the costs of controlling those limitations. Potential enhancements and expansions will be proposed to mitigate limitations controlled by non-economic means.
- (b) Evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions, including alternatives thereto, needed to mitigate such limitations.
- (c) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential transmission expansions and enhancements, demand response programs, and other alternative technologies as appropriate to maintain system reliability.
- (d) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions for the purposes of supporting competition, market efficiency, operational performance, and Public Policy Requirements in the PJM Region.
- (e) Identification, evaluation and analysis of upgrades to support Incremental Auction Revenue Rights requested pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8.
- (f) Identification, evaluation and analysis of upgrades to support all transmission customers, including native load and network service customers.
- (g) Engineering studies needed to determine the effectiveness and compliance of recommended enhancements and expansions, with the following PJM criteria: system reliability, operational performance, and market efficiency.
- (h) Identification, evaluation and analysis of potential enhancements and expansions designed to ensure that the Transmission System's capability can support the simultaneous feasibility of all stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(b). Enhancements and expansions related to stage 1A

Auction Revenue Rights identified pursuant to this Section shall be recommended for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan together with a recommended in-service date based on the results of the ten (10) year stage 1A simultaneous feasibility analysis. Any such recommended enhancement or expansion under this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3(h) shall include, but shall not be limited to, the reason for the upgrade, the cost of the upgrade, the cost allocation identified pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.6(m) and an analysis of the benefits of the enhancement or expansion, provided that any such upgrades will not be subject to a market efficiency cost/benefit analysis.

1.5.4 Supply of Data.

(a) The Transmission Owners shall provide to the Office of the Interconnection on an annual or periodic basis as specified by the Office of the Interconnection, any information and data reasonably required by the Office of the Interconnection to perform the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, including but not limited to the following: (i) a description of the total load to be served from each substation; (ii) the amount of any interruptible loads included in the total load (including conditions under which an interruption can be implemented and any limitations on the duration and frequency of interruptions); (iii) a description of all generation resources to be located in the geographic region encompassed by the Transmission Owner's transmission facilities, including unit sizes, VAR capability, operating restrictions, and any must-run unit designations required for system reliability or contract reasons; the (iv) current local planning information, including all criteria, assumptions and models used by the Transmission Owners, such as those used to develop Supplemental Projects. The data required under this Section shall be provided in the form and manner specified by the Office of the Interconnection.

(b) In addition to the foregoing, the Transmission Owners, those entities requesting transmission service and any other entities proposing to provide Transmission Facilities to be integrated into the PJM Region shall supply any other information and data reasonably required by the Office of the Interconnection to perform the enhancement and expansion study.

(c) The Office of the Interconnection also shall solicit from the Members, Transmission Customers and other interested parties, including but not limited to electric utility regulatory agencies within the States in the PJM Region, Independent State Agencies Committee, and the State Consumer Advocates, information required by, or anticipated to be useful to, the Office of the Interconnection in its preparation of the enhancement and expansion study, including information regarding potential sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, scenario analyses, and Public Policy Objectives that may be considered.

(d) The Office of the Interconnection shall supply to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees reasonably required information and data utilized to develop the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. Such information and data shall be provided pursuant to the appropriate protection of confidentiality provisions and Office of the Interconnection's CEII process.

(e) The Office of the Interconnection shall provide access through the PJM website, to the Transmission Owner's local planning information, including all criteria, assumptions and models

used by the Transmission Owners in their internal planning processes, including the development of Supplemental Projects (“Local Plan Information”). Local Plan Information shall be provided consistent with: (1) any applicable confidentiality provisions set forth in the Operating Agreement, section 18.17; (2) the Office of the Interconnection’s CEII process; and (3) any applicable copyright limitations. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Office of the Interconnection may share with a third party Local Plan Information that has been designated as confidential, pursuant to the provisions for such designation as set forth in the Operating Agreement, section 18.17 and subject to: (i) agreement by the disclosing Transmission Owner consistent with the process set forth in this Operating Agreement; and (ii) an appropriate non-disclosure agreement to be executed by PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., the Transmission Owner and the requesting third party. With the exception of confidential, CEII and copyright protected information, Local Plan Information will be provided for full review by the Planning Committee, the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, and the Subregional RTEP Committees.

1.5.5 Coordination of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(a) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed in accordance with the principles of interregional coordination with the Transmission Systems of the surrounding Regional Entities and with the local transmission providers, through the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committee.

(b) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed taking into account the processes for coordinated regional transmission expansion planning established under the following agreements:

- Joint Operating Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., which is found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/joa-complete.ashx>;
- Northeastern ISO/RTO Planning Coordination Protocol, which is described at Schedule 6-B and found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/northeastern-iso-rto-planning-coordination-protocol.ashx>;
- Joint Operating Agreement Among and Between New York Independent System Operator Inc., which is found at <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/agreements/nyiso-pjm.ashx>;
- Interregional Transmission Coordination Between the SERTP and PJM Regions, which is found at Operating Agreement, Schedule 6-A ;
- Allocation of Costs of Certain Interregional Transmission Projects Located in the PJM and SERTP Regions, which is located at Tariff, Schedule 12-B;
- Joint Reliability Coordination Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc.; PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. and Progress Energy Carolinas.

(i) Coordinated regional transmission expansion planning shall also incorporate input from parties that may be impacted by the coordination efforts, including but not limited to, the Members, Transmission Customers, electric utility regulatory agencies in the PJM Region, and the State Consumer Advocates, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the applicable regional coordination agreements.

(ii) An entity, including existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers, may submit potential Interregional Transmission Projects pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8.

(c) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed by the Office of the Interconnection in consultation with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee during the enhancement and expansion study process.

(d) The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall be developed taking into account the processes for coordination of the regional and subregional systems.

1.5.6 Development of the Recommended Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(a) The Office of the Interconnection shall be responsible for the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan and for conducting the studies, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses on which the plan is based. The Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, including the Regional RTEP Projects, the Subregional RTEP Projects and the Supplemental Projects shall be developed through an open and collaborative process with opportunity for meaningful participation through the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees.

(b) The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees shall each facilitate a minimum of one initial assumptions meeting to be scheduled at the commencement of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan process. The purpose of the assumptions meeting shall be to provide an open forum to discuss the following: (i) the assumptions to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of the potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission Facilities; (ii) Public Policy Requirements identified by the states for consideration in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iii) Public Policy Objectives identified by stakeholders for consideration in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iv) the impacts of regulatory actions, projected changes in load growth, demand response resources, energy efficiency programs, price responsive demand, generating additions and retirements, market efficiency and other trends in the industry; and (v) alternative sensitivity studies, modeling assumptions and scenario analyses proposed by the Committee participants. Prior to the initial assumptions meeting, the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and Subregional RTEP Committees participants will be afforded the opportunity to provide input and submit suggestions regarding the information identified in items (i) through (v) of this subsection. Following the assumptions meeting and prior to performing the evaluation and analyses of transmission needs, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine the range of assumptions to be used in the studies and scenario analyses, based on the advice and recommendations of the Transmission Expansion

Advisory Committee and Subregional RTEP Committees and, through the Independent State Agencies, the statement of Public Policy Requirements provided individually by the states and any state member's assessment or prioritization of Public Policy Objectives proposed by other stakeholders. The Office of the Interconnection shall document and publicly post its determination for review. Such posting shall include an explanation of those Public Policy Requirements and Public Policy Objectives adopted at the assumptions stage to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of transmission needs. Following identification of transmission needs and prior to evaluating potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission System the Office of the Interconnection shall publicly post all transmission need information identified as described further in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) herein to support the role of the Subregional RTEP Committees in the development of the Local Plan and support the role of Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The Office of the Interconnection shall also post an explanation of why other Public Policy Requirements and Public Policy Objectives introduced by stakeholders at the assumptions stage were not adopted.

(c) The Subregional RTEP Committees shall also schedule and facilitate meetings related to Supplemental Projects, as described in the Tariff, Attachment M-3.

(d) After the assumptions meeting(s), the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees shall facilitate additional meetings and shall post all communications required to provide early opportunity for the committee participants (as defined in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.3(b) and 1.3(c)) to review, evaluate and offer comments and alternatives to the following arising from the studies performed by the Office of the Interconnection, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses: (i) any identified violations of reliability criteria and analyses of the market efficiency and operational performance of the Transmission System; (ii) potential transmission solutions, including any acceleration, deceleration or modifications of a potential expansion or enhancement based on the results of sensitivities studies and scenario analyses; and (iii) the proposed Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. These meetings will be scheduled as deemed necessary by the Office of the Interconnection or upon the request of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee or the Subregional RTEP Committees. The Office of the Interconnection will provide updates on the status of the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan at these meetings or at the regularly scheduled meetings of the Planning Committee.

(e) In addition, the Office of the Interconnection shall facilitate periodic meetings with the Independent State Agencies Committee to discuss: (i) the assumptions to be used in performing the evaluation and analysis of the potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission Facilities; (ii) regulatory initiatives, as appropriate, including state regulatory agency initiated programs, and other Public Policy Objectives, to consider including in the Office of the Interconnection's transmission planning analyses; (iii) the impacts of regulatory actions, projected changes in load growth, demand response resources, energy efficiency programs, generating capacity, market efficiency and other trends in the industry; and (iv) alternative sensitivity studies, modeling assumptions and scenario analyses proposed by Independent State Agencies Committee. At such meetings, the Office of the Interconnection also shall discuss the current status of the enhancement and expansion study process. The Independent State Agencies

Committee may request that the Office of Interconnection schedule additional meetings as necessary. The Office of the Interconnection shall inform the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the Subregional RTEP Committees, as appropriate, of the input of the Independent State Agencies Committee and shall consider such input in developing the range of assumptions to be used in the studies and scenario analyses described in section (b), above.

(f) Upon completion of its studies and analysis, including sensitivity studies and scenario analyses the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the violations, system conditions, economic constraints, and Public Policy Requirements as detailed in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) to afford entities an opportunity to submit proposed enhancements or expansions to address the posted violations, system conditions, economic constraints and Public Policy Requirements as provided for in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). Following the close of a proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection shall: (i) post all proposals submitted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c); (ii) consider proposals submitted during the proposal windows consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(d) and develop a recommended plan. Following review by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee of proposals, the Office of the Interconnection, based on identified needs and the timing of such needs, and taking into account the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses considered pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3, shall determine, which more efficient or cost-effective enhancements and expansions shall be included in the recommended plan, including solutions identified as a result of the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations, and scenario analyses, that may accelerate, decelerate or modify a potential reliability, market efficiency or operational performance expansion or enhancement identified as a result of the sensitivity studies, modeling assumption variations and scenario analyses, shall be included in the recommended plan. The Office of the Interconnection shall post the proposed recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee. The Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee shall facilitate open meetings and communications as necessary to provide opportunity for the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee participants to collaborate on the preparation of the recommended enhancement and expansion plan. The Office of the Interconnection also shall invite interested parties to submit comments on the plan to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and to the Office of the Interconnection before submitting the recommended plan to the PJM Board for approval.

(g) The recommended plan shall separately identify enhancements and expansions for the three PJM subregions, the PJM Mid-Atlantic Region, the PJM West Region, and the PJM South Region, and shall incorporate recommendations from the Subregional RTEP Committees.

(h) The recommended plan shall separately identify enhancements and expansions that are classified as Supplemental Projects.

(i) The recommended plan shall identify enhancements and expansions that relieve transmission constraints and which, in the judgment of the Office of the Interconnection, are economically justified. Such economic expansions and enhancements shall be developed in

accordance with the procedures, criteria and analyses described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.7 and 1.5.8.

(j) The recommended plan shall identify enhancements and expansions proposed by a state or states pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9.

(k) The recommended plan shall include proposed Merchant Transmission Facilities within the PJM Region and any other enhancement or expansion of the Transmission System requested by any participant which the Office of the Interconnection finds to be compatible with the Transmission System, though not required pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.1, provided that (1) the requestor has complied, to the extent applicable, with the procedures and other requirements of the Tariff, Parts IV and VI; (2) the proposed enhancement or expansion is consistent with applicable reliability standards, operating criteria and the purposes and objectives of the regional planning protocol; (3) the requestor shall be responsible for all costs of such enhancement or expansion (including, but not necessarily limited to, costs of siting, designing, financing, constructing, operating and maintaining the pertinent facilities), and (4) except as otherwise provided by the Tariff, Parts IV and VI with respect to Merchant Network Upgrades, the requestor shall accept responsibility for ownership, construction, operation and maintenance of the enhancement or expansion through an undertaking satisfactory to the Office of the Interconnection.

(l) For each enhancement or expansion that is included in the recommended plan, the plan shall consider, based on the planning analysis: other input from participants, including any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion; and, when applicable, relevant projects being undertaken to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of Stage 1A ARRs, to facilitate Incremental ARRs pursuant to the provisions of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.8, or to facilitate upgrades pursuant to the Tariff, Parts II, III, or VI, and designate one or more Transmission Owners or other entities to construct, own and, unless otherwise provided, finance the recommended transmission enhancement or expansion. Any designation under this paragraph of one or more entities to construct, own and/or finance a recommended transmission enhancement or expansion shall also include a designation of partial responsibility among them. Nothing herein shall prevent any Transmission Owner or other entity designated to construct, own and/or finance a recommended transmission enhancement or expansion from agreeing to undertake its responsibilities under such designation jointly with other Transmission Owners or other entities.

(m) Based on the planning analysis and other input from participants, including any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for an enhancement or expansion, the recommended plan shall, for any enhancement or expansion that is included in the plan, designate (1) the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones, or any other party that has agreed to fully fund upgrades pursuant to this Agreement or the PJM Tariff, that will bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion, as and to the extent provided by any provision of the PJM Tariff or this Agreement, (2) in the event and to the extent that no provision of the PJM Tariff or this Agreement assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones from which the cost of such enhancement or expansion shall be recovered through charges established pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, and (3) in the event and to the extent that

the Coordinated System Plan developed under the Joint Operating Agreement Between the Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) in one or more Zones from which the cost of such enhancement or expansion shall be recovered. Any designation under clause (2) of the preceding sentence (A) shall further be based on the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the contributions to the need for, and benefits expected to be derived from, the pertinent enhancement or expansion by affected Market Participants and, (B) subject to FERC review and approval, shall be incorporated in any amendment to the Tariff, Schedule 12 that establishes a Transmission Enhancement Charge Rate in connection with an economic expansion or enhancement developed under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.6(i) and 1.5.7, (C) the costs associated with expansions and enhancements required to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights allocated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7 shall (1) be allocated across transmission zones based on each zone's stage 1A eligible Auction Revenue Rights flow contribution to the total stage 1A eligible Auction Revenue Rights flow on the facility that limits stage 1A ARR feasibility and (2) within each transmission zone the Network Service Users and Transmission Customers that are eligible to receive stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights shall be the Responsible Customers under the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b) for all expansions and enhancements included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan to ensure the simultaneous feasibility of stage 1A Auction Revenue Rights, and (D) the costs associated with expansions and enhancements required to reduce to zero the Locational Price Adder for LDAs as described in the Tariff, Attachment DD, section 15 shall (1) be allocated across Zones based on each Zone's pro rata share of load in such LDA and (2) within each Zone, to all LSEs serving load in such LDA pro rata based on such load.

Any designation under clause (3), above, (A) shall further be based on the Office of the Interconnection's assessment of the contributions to the need for, and benefits expected to be derived from, the pertinent enhancement or expansion by affected Market Participants, and (B), subject to FERC review and approval, shall be incorporated in an amendment to a Schedule of the PJM Tariff which establishes a charge in connection with the pertinent enhancement or expansion. Before designating fewer than all customers using Point-to-Point Transmission Service or Network Integration Transmission Service within a Zone as customers from which the costs of a particular enhancement or expansion may be recovered, Transmission Provider shall consult, in a manner and to the extent that it reasonably determines to be appropriate in each such instance, with affected state utility regulatory authorities and stakeholders. When the plan designates more than one responsible Market Participant, it shall also designate the proportional responsibility among them. Notwithstanding the foregoing, with respect to any facilities that the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan designates to be owned by an entity other than a Transmission Owner, the plan shall designate that entity as responsible for the costs of such facilities.

(n) Certain Regional RTEP Project(s) and Subregional RTEP Project(s) may not be required for compliance with the following PJM criteria: system reliability, market efficiency or operational performance, pursuant to a determination by the Office of the Interconnection. These Supplemental Projects shall be separately identified in the RTEP and are not subject to approval by the PJM Board.

1.5.7 Development of Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions.

(a) Each year the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee shall review and comment on the assumptions to be used in performing the market efficiency analysis to identify enhancements or expansions that could relieve transmission constraints that have an economic impact (“economic constraints”). Such assumptions shall include, but not be limited to, the discount rate used to determine the present value of the Total Annual Enhancement Benefit and Total Enhancement Cost, and the annual revenue requirement, including the recovery period, used to determine the Total Enhancement Cost. The discount rate shall be based on the Transmission Owners’ most recent after-tax embedded cost of capital weighted by each Transmission Owner’s total transmission capitalization. Each year, each Transmission Owner will be requested to provide the Office of the Interconnection with the Transmission Owner’s most recent after-tax embedded cost of capital, total transmission capitalization, and levelized carrying charge rate, including the recovery period. The recovery period shall be consistent with recovery periods allowed by the Commission for comparable facilities. Prior to PJM Board consideration of such assumptions, the assumptions shall be presented to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. Following review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall submit the assumptions to be used in performing the market efficiency analysis described in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7 to the PJM Board for consideration.

(b) Following PJM Board consideration of the assumptions, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform a market efficiency analysis to compare the costs and benefits of: (i) accelerating reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Plan that if accelerated also could relieve one or more economic constraints; (ii) modifying reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Plan that as modified would relieve one or more economic constraints; and (iii) adding new enhancements or expansions that could relieve one or more economic constraints, but for which no reliability-based need has been identified. Economic constraints include, but are not limited to, constraints that cause: (1) significant historical gross congestion; (2) pro-ration of Stage 1B ARR requests as described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 1, section 7.4.2(c); or (3) significant simulated congestion as forecasted in the market efficiency analysis. The timeline for the market efficiency analysis and comparison of the costs and benefits for items in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(b)(i-iii) is described in the PJM Manuals.

(c) The process for conducting the market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) above shall include the following:

(i) The Office of the Interconnection shall identify and provide to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee a list of economic constraints to be evaluated in the market efficiency analysis.

(ii) The Office of the Interconnection shall identify any planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions already included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, which if accelerated would relieve such constraints, and present any such proposed reliability-based enhancements and expansions to be accelerated to the Transmission Expansion Advisory

Committee for review and comment. The PJM Board, upon consideration of the advice of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, thereafter shall consider and vote to approve any accelerations.

(iii) The Office of the Interconnection shall evaluate whether including any additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan or modifications of existing Regional Transmission Expansion Plan reliability-based enhancements or expansions would relieve an economic constraint. In addition, pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c), any market participant may submit to the Office of the Interconnection a proposal to construct an additional Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion to relieve an economic constraint. Upon completion of its evaluation, including consideration of any eligible market participant proposed Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions, the Office of the Interconnection shall present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee a description of new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions for review and comment. Upon consideration and advice of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the PJM Board shall consider any new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Plan and for those enhancements and expansions it approves, the PJM Board shall designate (a) the entity or entities that will be responsible for constructing and owning or financing the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions, (b) the estimated costs of such enhancements and expansions, and (c) the market participants that will bear responsibility for the costs of the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.6(m). In the event the entity or entities designated as responsible for construction, owning or financing a designated new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion declines to construct, own or finance the new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, the enhancement or expansion will not be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan but will be included in the report filed with the FERC in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.6 and 1.7. This report also shall include information regarding PJM Board approved accelerations of reliability-based enhancements or expansions that an entity declines to accelerate.

(d) To determine the economic benefits of accelerating or modifying planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or of constructing additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions and whether such Economic-based Enhancements or Expansion are eligible for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform and compare market simulations with and without the proposed accelerated or modified planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or the additional Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions as applicable, using the Benefit/Cost Ratio calculation set forth below in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d). An Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion shall be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan recommended to the PJM Board, if the relative benefits and costs of the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion meet a Benefit/Cost Ratio Threshold of at least 1.25:1.

The Benefit/Cost Ratio shall be determined as follows:

Benefit/Cost Ratio = [Present value of the Total Annual Enhancement Benefit for the 15 year period starting with the RTEP Year (defined as current year plus five) minus benefits for years when the project is not yet in-service] ÷ [Present value of the Total Enhancement Cost for the same 15 year period]

Where

Total Annual Enhancement Benefit = Energy Market Benefit + Reliability Pricing Model Benefit

and

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(i) the Energy Market Benefit is as follows:

Energy Market Benefit = [.50] * [Change in Total Energy Production Cost] + [.50] * [Change in Load Energy Payment]

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(v) the Energy Market Benefit is as follows:

Energy Market Benefit = [1] * [Change in Load Energy Payment]
and

Change in Total Energy Production Cost = [the estimated total annual fuel costs, variable O&M costs, and emissions costs of the dispatched resources in the PJM Region without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion] – [the estimated total annual fuel costs, variable O&M costs, and emissions costs of the dispatched resources in the PJM Region with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion]. The change in costs for purchases from outside of the PJM Region and sales to outside the PJM Region will be captured, if appropriate. Purchases will be valued at the Load Weighted LMP and sales will be valued at the Generation Weighted LMP.

and

Change in Load Energy Payment = [the annual sum of (the hourly estimated zonal load megawatts for each Zone) * (the hourly estimated zonal Locational Marginal Price for each Zone without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)] – [the annual sum of (the hourly estimated zonal load megawatts for each Zone) * (the hourly estimated zonal Locational Marginal Price for each

Zone with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)] – [the change in value of transmission rights for each Zone with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion (as measured using currently allocated Auction Revenue Rights plus additional Auction Revenue Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion)]. The Change in the Load Energy Payment shall be the sum of the Change in the Load Energy Payment only of the Zones that show a decrease in the Load Energy Payment.

And

For economic-based enhancements and expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(i) the Reliability Pricing Benefit is as follows:

$$\text{Reliability Pricing Benefit} = [.50] * [\text{Change in Total System Capacity Cost}] + [.50] * [\text{Change in Load Capacity Payment}]$$

and

For economic-based enhancements or expansions for which cost responsibility is assigned pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(v) the Reliability Pricing Benefit is as follows:

$$\text{Reliability Pricing Benefit} = [1] * [\text{Change in Load Capacity Payment}]$$

Change in Total System Capacity Cost = [the sum of (the megawatts that are estimated to be cleared in the Base Residual Auction under the Tariff, Attachment DD) * (the prices that are estimated to be contained in the Sell Offers for each such cleared megawatt without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)] – [the sum of (the megawatts that are estimated to be cleared in the Base Residual Auction under the Tariff, Attachment DD) * (the prices that are estimated to be contained in the Sell Offers for each such cleared megawatt with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)]

and

Change in Load Capacity Payment = [the sum of (the estimated zonal load megawatts in each Zone) * (the estimated Final Zonal Capacity Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD without the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of

days in the study year)] – [the sum of (the estimated zonal load megawatts in each Zone) * (the estimated Final Zonal Capacity Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD with the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion) * (the number of days in the study year)]. The Change in Load Capacity Payment shall take account of the change in value of Capacity Transfer Rights in each Zone, including any additional Capacity Transfer Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion. The Change in the Load Capacity Payment shall be the sum of the change in the Load Capacity Payment only of the Zones that show a decrease in the Load Capacity Payment.

and

Total Enhancement Cost (except for accelerations of planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions) = the estimated annual revenue requirement for the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion.

Total Enhancement Cost (for accelerations of planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions) = the estimated change in annual revenue requirement resulting from the acceleration of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion, taking account of all of the costs incurred that would not have been incurred but for the acceleration of the planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion.

(e) For informational purposes only, to assist the Office of the Interconnection and the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in evaluating the economic benefits of accelerating planned reliability-based enhancements or expansions or of constructing a new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, the Office of the Interconnection shall calculate and post on the PJM website the change in the following metrics on a zonal and system-wide basis: (i) total energy production costs (fuel costs, variable O&M costs and emissions costs);(ii) total load energy payments (zonal load MW times zonal load Locational Marginal Price); (iii) total generator revenue from energy production (generator MW times generator Locational Marginal Price); (iv) Financial Transmission Right credits (as measured using currently allocated Auction Revenue Rights plus additional Auction Revenue Rights made available by the proposed acceleration or modification of a planned reliability-based enhancement or expansion or new Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion); (v) marginal loss surplus credit; and (vi) total capacity costs and load capacity payments under the Office of the Interconnection's Commission-approved capacity construct.

(f) To assure that new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan continue to be cost beneficial, the Office of the Interconnection annually shall review the costs and benefits of constructing such enhancements and expansions. In the event that there are changes in these costs and benefits, the Office of the

Interconnection shall review the changes in costs and benefits with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and recommend to the PJM Board whether the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions continue to provide measurable benefits, as determined in accordance with subsection (d), and should remain in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The annual review of the costs and benefits of constructing new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan shall include review of changes in cost estimates of the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, and changes in system conditions, including but not limited to, changes in load forecasts, and anticipated Merchant Transmission Facilities, generation, and demand response, consistent with the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(i). The Office of the Interconnection will not be required to review annually the costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions with capital costs less than \$20 million if, based on updated cost estimates and the original benefits, the Benefit/Cost Ratio remains at or above 1.25. The Office of the Interconnection shall no longer be required to review costs and benefits of constructing Economic-based Enhancements and Expansions once: (i) a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is granted by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which such enhancements or expansions will be located; or (ii) if a certificate of public convenience and necessity or its equivalent is not required by the state or relevant regulatory authority in which an economic-based enhancement or expansion will be located, once construction activities commence at the project site.

(g) For new economic enhancements or expansions with costs in excess of \$50 million, an independent review of such costs shall be performed to assure both consistency of estimating practices and that the scope of the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions is consistent with the new Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions as recommended in the market efficiency analysis.

(h) At any time, market participants may submit to the Office of the Interconnection requests to interconnect Merchant Transmission Facilities or generation facilities pursuant to the Tariff, Parts IV and VI that could address an economic constraint. In the event the Office of the Interconnection determines that the interconnection of such facilities would relieve an economic constraint, the Office of the Interconnection may designate the project as a “market solution” and, in the event of such designation, the Tariff, Part VI, Subpart B, section 216, as applicable, shall apply to the project.

(i) The assumptions used in the market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) and any review of costs and benefits pursuant to subsection (f) shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (i) Timely installation of Qualifying Transmission Upgrades, that are committed to the PJM Region as a result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.
- (ii) Availability of Generation Capacity Resources, as defined by the RAA, section 1.33, that are committed to the PJM Region as a

result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.

- (iii) Availability of Demand Resources that are committed to the PJM Region as a result of any Reliability Pricing Model Auction pursuant to the Tariff, Attachment DD or any FRR Capacity Plan pursuant to the RAA, Schedule 8.1.
- (iv) Addition of Customer Facilities pursuant to an executed Interconnection Service Agreement or executed Interim Interconnection Service Agreement for which Interconnection Service Agreement is expected to be executed. Facilities with an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement may be included by the Office of the Interconnection after review with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.
- (v) Addition of Customer-Funded Upgrades pursuant to an executed Interconnection Construction Service Agreement or an Upgrade Construction Service Agreement.
- (vi) Expected level of demand response over at least the ensuing fifteen years based on analyses that consider historic levels of demand response, expected demand response growth trends, impact of capacity prices, current and emerging technologies.
- (vii) Expected levels of potential new generation and generation retirements over at least the ensuing fifteen years based on analyses that consider generation trends based on existing generation on the system, generation in the PJM interconnection queues and Capacity Resource Clearing Prices under the Tariff, Attachment DD. If the Office of the Interconnection finds that the PJM reserve requirement is not met in any of its future year market efficiency analyses then it will model Customer Facilities pursuant to an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement, ranked by their commercial probability. Commercial probability utilizes historical data from the PJM interconnection queues to determine the likelihood of a Customer Facility, pursuant to an executed Facilities Study Agreement or suspended Interconnection Service Agreement, reaching commercial operation. If the Office of the Interconnection finds that the PJM reserve requirement is not met in any of its future year market efficiency analyses, following inclusion of the Customer Facilities discussed above in this section 1.5.7(i)(vii), then it will model adequate future generation based on

type and location of generation in existing PJM interconnection queues and, if necessary, add transmission enhancements to address congestion that arises from such modeling.

- (viii) Items (i) through (v) will be included in the market efficiency assumptions if qualified for consideration by the PJM Board. In the event that any of the items listed in (i) through (v) above qualify for inclusion in the market efficiency analysis assumptions, however, because of the timing of the qualification the item was not included in the assumptions used in developing the most recent Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection, to the extent necessary, shall notify any entity constructing an Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion that may be affected by inclusion of such item in the assumptions for the next market efficiency analysis described in subsection (b) and any review of costs and benefits pursuant to subsection (f) that the need for the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion may be diminished or obviated as a result of the inclusion of the qualified item in the assumptions for the next annual market efficiency analysis or review of costs and benefits.

(j) For informational purposes only, with regard to Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions that are included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan pursuant to subsection (d) of this section 1.5.7, the Office of the Interconnection shall perform sensitivity analyses consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3 and shall provide the results of such sensitivity analyses to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.

1.5.8 Development of Long-lead Projects, Short-term Projects, Immediate-need Reliability Projects, and Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions.

(a) Pre-Qualification Process.

(a)(1) On September 1 of each year, the Office of the Interconnection shall open a thirty-day pre-qualification window for entities, including existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers, to submit to the Office of the Interconnection: (i) applications to pre-qualify as eligible to be a Designated Entity; or (ii) updated information as described in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a)(3). Pre-qualification applications shall contain the following information: (i) name and address of the entity; (ii) the technical and engineering qualifications of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company; (iii) the demonstrated experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to develop, construct, maintain, and operate transmission facilities, including a list or other evidence of transmission facilities the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company previously developed, constructed, maintained, or operated; (iv) the previous record of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company regarding construction, maintenance, or operation of transmission facilities both inside and outside of the PJM Region; (v) the capability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to adhere to standardized construction, maintenance and operating practices;

(vi) the financial statements of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company for the most recent fiscal quarter, as well as the most recent three fiscal years, or the period of existence of the entity, if shorter, or such other evidence demonstrating an entity's or its affiliate's, partner's, or parent company's current and expected financial capability acceptable to the Office of the Interconnection; (vii) a commitment by the entity to execute the Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement, if the entity becomes a Designated Entity; (viii) evidence demonstrating the ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to address and timely remedy failure of facilities; (ix) a description of the experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company in acquiring rights of way; and (x) such other supporting information that the Office of Interconnection requires to make the pre-qualification determinations consistent with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a).

(a)(2) No later than October 31, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entities that submitted pre-qualification applications or updated information during the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window, whether they are, or will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity. In the event the Office of the Interconnection determines that an entity (i) is not, or no longer will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity, or (ii) provided insufficient information to determine pre-qualification, the Office of the Interconnection shall inform that the entity it is not pre-qualified and include in the notification the basis for its determination. The entity then may submit additional information, which the Office of the Interconnection shall consider in re-evaluating whether the entity is, or will continue to be, pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity. If the entity submits additional information by November 30, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entity of the results of its re-evaluation no later than December 15. If the entity submits additional information after November 30, the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to re-evaluate the application, with the additional information, and notify the entity of its determination as soon as practicable. No later than December 31, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the list of entities that are pre-qualified as eligible to be Designated Entities. If an entity is notified by the Office of the Interconnection that it does not pre-qualify or will not continue to be pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity, such entity may request dispute resolution pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 5.

(a)(3) In order to continue to pre-qualify as eligible to be a Designated Entity, such entity must confirm its information with the Office of the Interconnection no later than three years following its last submission or sooner if necessary as required below. In the event the information on which the entity's pre-qualification is based changes with respect to the upcoming year, such entity must submit to the Office of the Interconnection all updated information during the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window and the timeframes for notification in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a)(2) shall apply. In the event the information on which the entity's pre-qualification is based changes with respect to the current year, such entity must submit to the Office of the Interconnection all updated information at the time the information changes and the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to evaluate the updated information and notify the entity of its determination as soon as practicable.

(a)(4) As determined by the Office of the Interconnection, an entity may submit a pre-qualification application outside the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window for good cause shown. For a pre-qualification application received outside of the annual thirty-day pre-qualification window, the Office of the Interconnection shall use reasonable efforts to process the application and notify the entity as to whether it pre-qualifies as eligible to be a Designated Entity as soon as practicable.

(a)(5) To be designated as a Designated Entity for any project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers must be pre-qualified as eligible to be a Designated Entity pursuant to this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a). This Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) shall not apply to entities that desire to propose projects for inclusion in the recommended plan but do not intend to be a Designated Entity.

(b) **Posting of Transmission System Needs.** Following identification of existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System's physical, economic and/or operational capability or performance in the enhancement and expansion analysis process described in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6 and the PJM Manuals, and after consideration of non-transmission solutions, and prior to evaluating potential enhancements and expansions to the Transmission System, the Office of the Interconnection shall publicly post on the PJM website all transmission need information, including violations, system conditions, and economic constraints, and Public Policy Requirements, including (i) federal Public Policy Requirements; (ii) state Public Policy Requirements identified or agreed-to by the states in the PJM Region, which could be addressed by potential Short-term Projects, Long-lead Projects or projects determined pursuant to the State Agreement Approach in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9, as applicable. Such posting shall support the role of the Subregional RTEP Committees in the development of the Local Plans and support the role of the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee in the development of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. The Office of the Interconnection also shall post an explanation regarding why transmission needs associated with federal or state Public Policy Requirements were identified but were not selected for further evaluation.

(c) **Project Proposal Windows.** The Office of the Interconnection shall provide notice to stakeholders of a 60-day proposal window for Short-term Projects and a 120-day proposal window for Long-lead Projects and Economic-based Enhancements or Expansions. The specifics regarding whether or not the following types of violations or projects are subject to a proposal window are detailed in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m) for Immediate-need Reliability Projects; Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(n) for reliability violations on transmission facilities below 200 kV; Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(o) for violations resulting from individual transmission owner Form 715 Planning Criteria; and Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(p) for violations on transmission substation equipment. The Office of Interconnection may shorten a proposal window should an identified need require a shorter proposal window to meet the needed in-service date of the proposed enhancements or expansions, or extend a proposal window as needed to accommodate updated information regarding system conditions. The Office of the Interconnection may shorten or lengthen a proposal window that is not yet opened based on one or more of the

following criteria: (1) complexity of the violation or system condition; and (2) whether there is sufficient time remaining in the relevant planning cycle to accommodate a standard proposal window and timely address the violation or system condition. The Office of the Interconnection may lengthen a proposal window that already is opened based on or more of the following criteria: (i) changes in assumptions or conditions relating to the underlying need for the project, such as load growth or Reliability Pricing Model auction results; (ii) availability of new or changed information regarding the nature of the violations and the facilities involved; and (iii) time remaining in the relevant proposal window. In the event that the Office of the Interconnection determines to lengthen or shorten a proposal window, it will post on the PJM website the new proposal window period and an explanation as to the reasons for the change in the proposal window period. During these windows, the Office of the Interconnection will accept proposals from existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers for potential enhancements or expansions to address the posted violations, system conditions, economic constraints, as well as Public Policy Requirements.

(c)(1) All proposals submitted in the proposal windows must contain: (i) the name and address of the proposing entity; (ii) a statement whether the entity intends to be the Designated Entity for the proposed project; (iii) the location of proposed project, including source and sink, if applicable; (iv) relevant engineering studies, and other relevant information as described in the PJM Manuals pertaining to the proposed project; (v) a proposed initial construction schedule including projected dates on which needed permits are required to be obtained in order to meet the required in-service date; (vi) cost estimates and analyses that provide sufficient detail for the Office of Interconnection to review and analyze the proposed cost of the project; and (vii) with the exception of project proposals with cost estimates submitted with the proposals that are under \$20 million, a non-refundable fee must be submitted with each proposal, by each proposing entity who indicates an intention to be the Designated Entity, as follows: a non-refundable fee in the amount of \$5,000 for each project with a cost estimate submitted with the proposal that is equal to or greater than \$20 million and less than \$100 million and a non-refundable fee in the amount of \$30,000 for each project with a cost estimate submitted with the proposal that is equal to \$100 million or greater.

(c)(2) Proposals from all entities (both existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers) that indicate the entity intends to be a Designated Entity, also must contain information to the extent not previously provided pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) demonstrating: (i) technical and engineering qualifications of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company relevant to construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (ii) experience of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company in developing, constructing, maintaining, and operating the type of transmission facilities contained in the project proposal; (iii) the emergency response capability of the entity that will be operating and maintaining the proposed project; (iv) evidence of transmission facilities the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company previously constructed, maintained, or operated; (v) the ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to obtain adequate financing relative to the proposed project, which may include a letter of intent from a financial institution approved by the Office of the Interconnection or such other evidence of the financial resources available to finance the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (vi) the managerial ability of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent

company to contain costs and adhere to construction schedules for the proposed project, including a description of verifiable past achievement of these goals; (vii) a demonstration of other advantages the entity may have to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed project, including any cost commitment the entity may wish to submit; and (viii) any other information that may assist the Office of the Interconnection in evaluating the proposed project.

(c)(3) The Office of the Interconnection may request additional reports or information from an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developers that it determines are reasonably necessary to evaluate its specific project proposal pursuant to the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.8(e) and 1.5.8(f). If the Office of the Interconnection determines any of the information provided in a proposal is deficient or it requires additional reports or information to analyze the submitted proposal, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the proposing entity of such deficiency or request. Within 10 Business Days of receipt of the notification of deficiency and/or request for additional reports or information, or other reasonable time period as determined by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity shall provide the necessary information.

(c)(4) The request for additional reports or information by the Office of the Interconnection pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c)(3) may be used only to clarify a proposed project as submitted. In response to the Office of the Information's request for additional reports or information, the proposing entity (whether an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer) may not submit a new project proposal or modifications to a proposed project once the proposal window is closed. In the event that the proposing entity fails to timely cure the deficiency or provide the requested reports or information regarding a proposed project, the proposed project will not be considered for inclusion in the recommended plan.

(c)(5) Within 30 days of the closing of the proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection may notify the proposing entity that additional per project fees are required if the Office of the Interconnection determines the proposing entity's submittal includes multiple project proposals. Within 10 Business Days of receipt of the notification of insufficient funds by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity shall submit such funds or notify the Office of the Interconnection which of the project proposals the Office of the Interconnection should evaluate based on the fee(s) submitted.

(d) **Posting and Review of Projects.** Following the close of a proposal window, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website all proposals submitted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). All proposals addressing state Public Policy Requirements shall be provided to the applicable states in the PJM Region for review and consideration as a Supplemental Project or a state public policy project consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9. The Office of the Interconnection shall review all proposals submitted during a proposal window and determine and present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee the proposals that merit further consideration for inclusion in the recommended plan. In making this determination, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.8(e) and 1.5.8(f). The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and present to the

Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment descriptions of the proposed enhancements and expansions, including any proposed Supplemental Projects or state public policy projects identified by a state(s). Based on review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection may, if necessary conduct further study and evaluation. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and present to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee the revised enhancements and expansions for review and comment. After consultation with the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine the more efficient or cost-effective transmission enhancements and expansions for inclusion in the recommended plan consistent with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6.

(e) **Criteria for Considering Inclusion of a Project in the Recommended Plan.** In determining whether a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c), individually or in combination with other Short-term Projects or Long-lead Projects, is the more efficient or cost-effective solution and therefore should be included in the recommended plan, the Office of the Interconnection, taking into account sensitivity studies and scenario analyses considered pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.3, shall consider the following criteria, to the extent applicable: (i) the extent to which a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would address and solve the posted violation, system condition, or economic constraint; (ii) the extent to which the relative benefits of the project meets a Benefit/Cost Ratio Threshold of at least 1.25:1 as calculated pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d); (iii) the extent to which the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would have secondary benefits, such as addressing additional or other system reliability, operational performance, economic efficiency issues or federal Public Policy Requirements or state Public Policy Requirements identified by the states in the PJM Region; and (iv) other factors such as cost-effectiveness, the ability to timely complete the project, and project development feasibility.

(f) **Entity-Specific Criteria Considered in Determining the Designated Entity for a Project.** In determining whether the entity proposing a Short-term Project, Long-lead Project or Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion recommended for inclusion in the plan shall be the Designated Entity, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider: (i) whether in its proposal, the entity indicated its intent to be the Designated Entity; (ii) whether the entity is pre-qualified to be a Designated Entity pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a); (iii) information provided either in the proposing entity's submission pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a) or 1.5.8(c)(2) relative to the specific proposed project that demonstrates: (1) the technical and engineering experience of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company, including its previous record regarding construction, maintenance, and operation of transmission facilities relative to the project proposed; (2) ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to construct, maintain, and operate transmission facilities, as proposed, (3) capability of the entity to adhere to standardized construction, maintenance, and operating practices, including the capability for emergency response and restoration of damaged equipment; (4) experience of the entity in acquiring rights of way; (5) evidence of the ability of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company to secure a financial commitment from an approved financial institution(s) agreeing to finance the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, if it is accepted into the recommended plan; and (iv) any other factors that may be

relevant to the proposed project, including but not limited to whether the proposal includes the entity's previously designated project(s) included in the plan.

(g) **Procedures if No Long-lead Project or Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion Proposal is Determined to be the More Efficient or Cost-Effective Solution.** If the Office of the Interconnection determines that none of the proposed Long-lead Projects received during the Long-lead Project proposal window would be the more efficient or cost-effective solution to resolve a posted violation, or system condition, the Office of the Interconnection may re-evaluate and re-post on the PJM website the unresolved violations, or system conditions pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b), provided such re-evaluation and re-posting would not affect the ability of the Office of the Interconnection to timely address the identified reliability need. In the event that re-posting and conducting such re-evaluation would prevent the Office of the Interconnection from timely addressing the existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System that give rise to the need for an enhancement or expansion, the Office of the Interconnection shall propose a project to solve the posted violation, or system condition for inclusion in the recommended plan and shall present such project to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. The Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is to be located shall be the Designated Entity(ies) for such project. In determining whether there is insufficient time for re-posting and re-evaluation, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop and post on the PJM website a transmission solution construction timeline for input and review by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee that will include factors such as, but not limited to: (i) deadlines for obtaining regulatory approvals, (ii) dates by which long lead equipment should be acquired, (iii) the time necessary to complete a proposed solution to meet the required in-service date, and (iv) other time-based factors impacting the feasibility of achieving the required in-service date. Based on input from the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and the time frames set forth in the construction timeline, the Office of the Interconnection shall determine whether there is sufficient time to conduct a re-evaluation and re-post and timely address the existing and projected limitations on the Transmission System that give rise to the need for an enhancement or expansion. To the extent that an economic constraint remains unaddressed, the economic constraint will be re-evaluated and re-posted.

(h) **Procedures if No Short-term Project Proposal is Determined to be the More Efficient or Cost-Effective Solution.** If the Office of the Interconnection determines that none of the proposed Short-term Projects received during a Short-term Project proposal window would be the more efficient or cost-effective solution to resolve a posted violation or system condition, the Office of the Interconnection shall propose a Short-term Project to solve the posted violation, or system condition for inclusion in the recommended plan and will present such Short-term Project to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment. The Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the Short-term Project is to be located shall be the Designated Entity(ies) for the Project.

(i) **Notification of Designated Entity.** Within 15 Business Days of PJM Board approval of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall notify the entities that have been designated as the Designated Entities for projects included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of such designations. In such notices, the Office of the

Interconnection shall provide: (i) the needed in-service date of the project; and (ii) a date by which all necessary state approvals should be obtained to timely meet the needed in-service date of the project. The Office of the Interconnection shall use these dates as part of its on-going monitoring of the progress of the project to ensure that the project is completed by its needed in-service date.

(j) **Acceptance of Designation.** Within 30 days of receiving notification of its designation as a Designated Entity, the existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer shall notify the Office of the Interconnection of its acceptance of such designation and submit to the Office of the Interconnection a development schedule, which shall include, but not be limited to, milestones necessary to develop and construct the project to achieve the required in-service date, including milestone dates for obtaining all necessary authorizations and approvals, including but not limited to, state approvals. For good cause shown, the Office of the Interconnection may extend the deadline for submitting the development schedule. The Office of the Interconnection then shall review the development schedule and within 15 days or other reasonable time as required by the Office of the Interconnection: (i) notify the Designated Entity of any issues regarding the development schedule identified by the Office of the Interconnection that may need to be addressed to ensure that the project meets its needed in-service date; and (ii) tender to the Designated Entity an executable Designated Entity Agreement setting forth the rights and obligations of the parties. To retain its status as a Designated Entity, within 60 days of receiving an executable Designated Entity Agreement (or other such period as mutually agreed upon by the Office of the Interconnection and the Designated Entity), the Designated Entity (both existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers) shall submit to the Office of the Interconnection a letter of credit as determined by the Office of Interconnection to cover the incremental costs of construction resulting from reassignment of the project, and return to the Office of the Interconnection an executed Designated Entity Agreement containing a mutually agreed upon development schedule. In the alternative, the Designated Entity may request dispute resolution pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 5, or request that the Designated Entity Agreement be filed unexecuted with the Commission.

(k) **Failure of Designated Entity to Meet Milestones.** In the event the Designated Entity fails to comply with one or more of the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(j); or fails to meet a milestone in the development schedule set forth in the Designated Entity Agreement that causes a delay of the project's in-service date, the Office of the Interconnection shall re-evaluate the need for the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project, and based on that re-evaluation may: (i) retain the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; (ii) remove the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project from the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; or (iii) include an alternative solution in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan. If the Office of the Interconnection retains the Short-term or Long-term Project in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, it shall determine whether the delay is beyond the Designated Entity's control and whether to retain the Designated Entity or to designate the Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is located as Designated Entity(ies) for the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project. If the Designated Entity is the Transmission Owner(s) in the Zone(s) where the project is located, the Office of the Interconnection shall seek recourse through the Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement or FERC, as appropriate. Any modifications to the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan

pursuant to this section shall be presented to the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee for review and comment and approved by the PJM Board.

(l) **Transmission Owners Required to be the Designated Entity.** Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, in all events, the Transmission Owner(s) in whose Zone(s) a project proposed pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) is to be located will be the Designated Entity for the project, when the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project is: (i) a Transmission Owner Upgrade; (ii) located solely within a Transmission Owner's Zone and the costs of the project are allocated solely to the Transmission Owner's Zone; (iii) located solely within a Transmission Owner's Zone and is not selected in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for purposes of cost allocation; or (iv) proposed to be located on a Transmission Owner's existing right of way and the project would alter the Transmission Owner's use and control of its existing right of way under state law. Transmission Owner shall be the Designated Entity when required by state law, regulation or administrative agency order with regard to enhancements or expansions or portions of such enhancements or expansions located within that state.

(m) **Immediate-need Reliability Projects:**

(m)(1) Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify immediate reliability needs that must be addressed within three years or less. For those immediate reliability needs for which PJM determines a proposal window may not be feasible, PJM shall identify and post such immediate need reliability criteria violations and system conditions for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders. Following review and comment, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2) is infeasible. The Office of the Interconnection shall consider the following factors in determining the infeasibility of such a proposal window: (i) nature of the reliability criteria violation; (ii) nature and type of potential solution required; and (iii) projected construction time for a potential solution to the type of reliability criteria violation to be addressed. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2) is infeasible. The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to designate the Transmission Owner as the Designated Entity for the Immediate-need Reliability Project rather than conducting a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(2), including an explanation of the time-sensitive need for the Immediate-need Reliability Project, other transmission and non-transmission options that were considered but concluded would not sufficiently address the immediate reliability need, the circumstances that generated the immediate reliability need, and why the immediate reliability need was not identified earlier. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments to the Office of the Interconnection. All comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website. Based on the comments received from stakeholders and the review by Transmission Expansion Advisory

Committee, the Office of the Interconnection shall, if necessary, conduct further study and evaluation and post a revised recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee. The PJM Board shall approve the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for inclusion in the recommended plan. In January of each year, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website and file with the Commission for informational purposes a list of the Immediate-need Reliability Projects for which an existing Transmission Owner was designated in the prior year as the Designated Entity in accordance with this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(1). The list shall include the need-by date of Immediate-need Reliability Project and the date the Transmission Owner actually energized the Immediate-need Reliability Project.

(m)(2) If, in the judgment of the Office of the Interconnection, there is sufficient time for the Office of the Interconnection to accept proposals in a shortened proposal window for Immediate-need Reliability Projects, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the violations and system conditions that could be addressed by Immediate-need Reliability Project proposals, including an explanation of the time-sensitive need for an Immediate-need Reliability Project and provide notice to stakeholders of a shortened proposal window. Proposals must contain the information required in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) and, if the entity is seeking to be the Designated Entity, such entity must have pre-qualified to be a Designated Entity pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a). In determining the more efficient or cost-effective proposed Immediate-need Reliability Project for inclusion in the recommended plan, the Office of the Interconnection shall consider the extent to which the proposed Immediate-need Reliability Project, individually or in combination with other Immediate-need Reliability Projects, would address and solve the posted violations or system conditions and other factors such as cost-effectiveness, the ability of the entity to timely complete the project, and project development feasibility in light of the required need. After PJM Board approval, the Office of the Interconnection, in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(i), shall notify the entities that have been designated as Designated Entities for Immediate-need Projects included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of such designations. Designated Entities shall accept such designations in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(j). In the event that (i) the Office of the Interconnection determines that no proposal resolves a posted violation or system condition; (ii) the proposing entity is not selected to be the Designated Entity; (iii) an entity does not accept the designation as a Designated Entity; or (iv) the Designated Entity fails to meet milestones that would delay the in-service date of the Immediate-need Reliability Project, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop and recommend an Immediate-need Reliability Project to solve the violation or system needs in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m)(1).

(n) **Reliability Violations on Transmission Facilities Below 200 kV.** Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify reliability violations on facilities below 200 kV. The Office of the Interconnection shall not post such a violation pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) unless the identified violation(s) satisfies one of the following exceptions: (i) the reliability violations are thermal overload

violations identified on multiple transmission lines and/or transformers rated below 200 kV that are impacted by a common contingent element, such that multiple reliability violations could be addressed by one or more solutions, including but not limited to a higher voltage solution; or (ii) the reliability violations are thermal overload violations identified on multiple transmission lines and/or transformers rated below 200 kV and the Office of the Interconnection determines that given the location and electrical features of the violations one or more solutions could potentially address or reduce the flow on multiple lower voltage facilities, thereby eliminating the multiple reliability violations. If the reliability violation is identified on multiple facilities rated below 200 kV that are determined by the Office of the Interconnection to meet one of the two exceptions stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the reliability violations to be included in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the identified reliability violations do not satisfy either of the two exceptions stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall develop a solution to address the reliability violation on below 200 kV Transmission Facilities that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The Office of Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the below 200 kV reliability violations that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to not include the below 200 kV reliability violation(s) in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) proposal window, a description of the facility on which the violation(s) is found, the Zone in which the facility is located, and notice that such construction responsibility for and ownership of the project that resolves such below 200 kV reliability violation will be designated to the incumbent Transmission Owner. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. With the exception of Immediate-need Reliability Projects under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(m), PJM will not select an above 200 kV solution for inclusion in the recommended plan that would address a reliability violation on a below 200 kV transmission facility without posting the violation for inclusion in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website.

(o) **Transmission Owner Form 715 Planning Criteria.** Pursuant to the expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify transmission needs driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders the identified transmission needs driven by individual transmission owner Form 715 Planning Criteria. Such transmission needs shall not be posted pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window and such postings will not be subject to the proposal window process pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). Any project proposal submitted in a proposal window pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) addressing both a posted violation or system condition other than a Form 715 Planning Criteria violation and a transmission need driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria that complies with the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6,

section 1.5.8(c) shall be accepted for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection and, if selected in the proposal window process for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the project proposer may be designated as the Designated Entity for such project. Project proposals submitted in a proposal window that address only a transmission need solely driven by Form 715 Planning Criteria may be considered by the Office of the Interconnection as a potential alternative to a Form 715 Planning Criteria violation but shall not be accepted for consideration under the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) and, if selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan by the Office of the Interconnection, the proposing entity may not be designated as the Designated Entity. The Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders a description of the Form No. 715 projects. The descriptions shall identify the applicable Form 715 Planning Criteria, the Zone in which the facility is located, an explanation of the decision to designate the Transmission Owner as the Designated Entity, and any alternatives considered by the Office of the Interconnection but were not found to be the more efficient or cost effective solution. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website. Based on the comments received from stakeholders and the review by Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee, the Office of the Interconnection may, if necessary, conduct further study and evaluation and post a revised recommended plan for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee.

(p) **Thermal Reliability Violations on Transmission Substation Equipment.** Pursuant to the regional transmission expansion planning process set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, sections 1.5.1 through 1.5.6, the Office of the Interconnection shall identify thermal reliability violations on existing transmission substation equipment. The Office of the Interconnection shall not post such thermal reliability violations pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(b) for inclusion in a proposal window pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) if the Office of the Interconnection determines that the reliability violations would be more efficiently addressed by an upgrade to replace in kind transmission substation equipment with higher rated equipment, excluding power transmission transformers, but including station service transformers and instrument transformers. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the reliability violation does not meet the exemption stated above, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website the reliability violations to be included in a proposal window consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). If the Office of the Interconnection determines that the identified thermal reliability violations satisfy the above exemption to the proposal window process, the Office of the Interconnection shall post on the PJM website for review and comment by the Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee and other stakeholders descriptions of the transmission substation equipment thermal reliability violations that will not be included in a proposal window pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c). The descriptions shall include an explanation of the decision to not include the transmission substation equipment thermal reliability violation(s) in Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) proposal window, a description of the facility on which the thermal violation(s) is found, the Zone in which the facility is located, and notice that such construction

responsibility for and ownership of the project that resolves such transmission substation equipment thermal violations will be designated to the incumbent Transmission Owner. After the descriptions are posted on the PJM website, stakeholders shall have reasonable opportunity to provide comments for consideration by the Office of the Interconnection. All written comments received by the Office of the Interconnection shall be publicly available on the PJM website.

1.5.9 State Agreement Approach.

(a) State governmental entities authorized by their respective states, individually or jointly, may agree voluntarily to be responsible for the allocation of all costs of a proposed transmission expansion or enhancement that addresses state Public Policy Requirements identified or accepted by the state(s) in the PJM Region. As determined by the authorized state governmental entities, such transmission enhancements or expansions may be included in the recommended plan, either as a (i) Supplemental Project or (ii) state public policy project, which is a transmission enhancement or expansion, the costs of which will be recovered pursuant to a FERC-accepted cost allocation proposed by agreement of one or more states and voluntarily agreed to by those state(s). All costs related to a state public policy project or Supplemental Project included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan to address state Public Policy Requirements pursuant to this Section shall be recovered from customers in a state(s) in the PJM Region that agrees to be responsible for the projects. No such costs shall be recovered from customers in a state that did not agree to be responsible for such cost allocation. A state public policy project will be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for cost allocation purposes only if there is an associated FERC-accepted allocation permitting recovery of the costs of the state public policy project consistent with this Section.

(b) Subject to any designation reserved for Transmission Owners in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(l), the state(s) responsible for cost allocation for a Supplemental Project or a state public policy project in accordance with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9(a) may submit to the Office of the Interconnection the entity(ies) to construct, own, operate and maintain the state public policy project from a list of entities supplied by the Office of the Interconnection that pre-qualified to be Designated Entities pursuant to the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(a).

1.5.10 Multi-Driver Project.

(a) When a proposal submitted by an existing Transmission Owner or Nonincumbent Developer pursuant to Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(c) meets the definition of a Multi-Driver Project and is designated to be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan for purposes of cost allocation, the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity for the project as follows: (i) if the Multi-Driver Project does not contain a state Public Policy Requirement component, the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity pursuant to the criteria in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8; or (ii) if the Multi-Driver Project contains a state Public Policy Requirement component, the Office of the Interconnection shall evaluate potential Designated Entity candidates based on the criteria in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8, and provide its evaluation to and elicit feedback from the sponsoring state governmental entities responsible for allocation of all

costs of the proposed state Public Policy Requirement component (“state governmental entity(ies)”) regarding its evaluation. Based on its evaluation of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8 criteria and consideration of the feedback from the sponsoring state governmental entity(ies), the Office of the Interconnection shall designate the Designated Entity for the Multi-Driver Project and notify such entity consistent with the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(i). A Multi-Driver Project may be based on proposals that consist of (1) newly proposed transmission enhancements or expansions; (2) additions to, or modifications of, transmission enhancements or expansions already selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan; and/or (3) one or more transmission enhancements or expansions already selected for inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

(b) A Multi-Driver Project may contain an enhancement or expansion that addresses a state Public Policy Requirement component only if it meets the requirements set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.9(a) and its cost allocations are established consistent with the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(c) If a state governmental entity(ies) desires to include a Public Policy Requirement component after an enhancement or expansion has been included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, the Office of the Interconnection may re-evaluate the relevant reliability-based enhancement or expansion, Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion, or Multi-Driver Project to determine whether adding the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component would create a more cost effective or efficient solution to system conditions. If the Office of the Interconnection determines that adding the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component to an enhancement or expansion already included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan would result in a more cost effective or efficient solution, the state-sponsored Public Policy Requirement component may be included in the relevant enhancement or expansion, provided all of the requirements of the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.10(b) are met, and cost allocations are established consistent with the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(d) If, subsequent to the inclusion in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan of a Multi-Driver Project that contains a state Public Policy Requirement component, a state governmental entity(ies) withdraws its support of the Public Policy Requirement component of a Multi-Driver Project, then: (i) the Office of the Interconnection shall re-evaluate the need for the remaining components of the Multi-Driver Project without the state Public Policy Requirement component, remove the Multi-Driver Project from the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan, or replace the Multi-Driver Project with an enhancement or expansion that addresses remaining reliability or economic system needs; (ii) if the Multi-Driver Project is retained in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan without the state Public Policy Requirement component, the costs of the remaining components will be allocated in accordance with the Tariff, Schedule 12; (iii) if more than one state is responsible for the costs apportioned to the state Public Policy Requirement component of the Multi-Driver Project, the remaining state governmental entity(ies) shall have the option to continue supporting the state Public Policy component of the Multi-Driver Project and if the remaining state governmental entity(ies) choose this option, the apportionment of the state Public Policy Requirement component will remain in place and the remaining state governmental entity(ies) shall agree upon their respective apportionments; (iv) if

a Multi-Driver Project must be retained in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan and completed with the State Public Policy component, the state Public Policy Requirement apportionment will remain in place and the withdrawing state governmental entity(ies) shall continue to be responsible for its/their share of the FERC-accepted cost allocations as filed pursuant to the Tariff, Schedule 12, section (b)(xii)(B).

(e) The actual costs of a Multi-Driver Project shall be apportioned to the different components (reliability-based enhancement or expansion, Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion and/or Public Policy Requirement) based on the initial estimated costs of the Multi-Driver Project in accordance with the methodology set forth in the Tariff, Schedule 12.

(f) The benefit metric calculation used for evaluating the market efficiency component of a Multi-Driver Project will be based on the final voltage of the Multi-Driver Project using the Benefit/Cost Ratio calculation set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.7(d) where the Cost component of the calculation is the present value of the estimated cost of the enhancement apportioned to the market efficiency component of the Multi-Driver Project for each of the first 15 years of the life of the enhancement or expansion.

(g) Except as provided to the contrary in this Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.10 and Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8 applies to Multi-Driver Projects.

(h) The Office of the Interconnection shall determine whether a proposal(s) meets the definition of a Multi-Driver Project by identifying a more efficient or cost effective solution that uses one of the following methods: (i) combining separate solutions that address reliability, economics and/or public policy into a single transmission enhancement or expansion that incorporates separate drivers into one Multi-Driver Project (“Proportional Multi-Driver Method”); or (ii) expanding or enhancing a proposed single driver solution to include one or more additional component(s) to address a combination of reliability, economic and/or public policy drivers (“Incremental Multi-Driver Method”).

(i) In determining whether a Multi-Driver Project may be designated to more than one entity, PJM shall consider whether: (i) the project consists of separable transmission elements, which are physically discrete transmission components, such as, but not limited to, a transformer, static var compensator or definable linear segment of a transmission line, that can be designated individually to a Designated Entity to construct and own and/or finance; and (ii) each entity satisfies the criteria set forth in the Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, section 1.5.8(f). Separable transmission elements that qualify as Transmission Owner Upgrades shall be designated to the Transmission Owner in the Zone in which the facility will be located.