



Initial Review and Screening 2020 RTEP Proposal Window 1 – Cluster No. 11

Version 2

November 4, 2020

For Public Use

This page is intentionally left blank.

2020 RTEP Proposal Window 1 – Cluster No. 11

As part of its 2020 RTEP process cycle of studies, PJM identified clustered groups of flowgates that were put forward for proposals as part of 2020 RTEP Window No. 1. Specifically, Cluster No. 11 - discussed in this Initial Review and Screening report - includes those flowgates listed in **Table 1**.

Table 1. 2020 RTEP Proposal Window 1 – Cluster No. 11 List of Flowgates

Flowgate	kV Level	Analysis
GD-S480, GD-S483	115kV	Generation deliverability

Proposals Submitted to PJM

PJM conducted 2020 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 for 60 days beginning July 1, 2020 and closing August 31, 2020. During the window, several entities submitted seven proposals through PJM’s Competitive Planner Tool. The proposals are summarized in **Table 2**. Publicly available redacted versions of the proposals can be found on PJM’s web site: <https://www.pjm.com/planning/competitive-planning-process/redacted-proposals.aspx>.

Table 2. 2020 RTEP Proposal Window 1 – Cluster No. 11 List of Proposals

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
494	Upgrade	Pumphrey Transformer Replacement	4.692	N
763	Upgrade	Erdman Reconfiguration	0	N
514	Upgrade	Pumphrey-Graceton Transformer Replacement	9.01	N
420	Upgrade	Constitution-Concord 110567/110568 Re-conductor - Partial 110563/110564 Re-conductor	14.73	N
836	Upgrade	Constitution-Concord 110567/110568 Concord-Monument Street 110563/110564 Re-conductor	20.587	N
962	Upgrade	Pumphrey Transformer, Constitution-Concord 110567/110568 Re-conductor, Partial 110563/110564 Re-conductor	19.422	N

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
191	Upgrade	Pumphrey Transformer, Constitution-Concord 110567/110568 Concord-Monument Street 110563/110564 Re-conductor	25.279	N

Initial Review and Screening

PJM has completed an initial review and screening of the proposals listed in **Table 2** above based on data and information provided by the project sponsors as part of their submitted proposals. This review and screening included the following preliminary analytical quality assessment:

- *Initial Performance Review* – PJM evaluated whether or not the project proposal solved the required reliability criteria violation drivers posted as part of the open solicitation process.
- *Initial Planning Level Cost Review* – PJM reviewed the estimated project cost submitted by the project sponsor and any relevant cost containment mechanisms submitted as well.
- *Initial Feasibility Review* – PJM reviewed the overall proposed implementation plan to determine if the project, as proposed, can feasibly be constructed.
- *Additional Benefits Review* – PJM reviewed information provided by the proposing entity to determine if the project, as proposed, provides additional benefits such as the elimination of other needs on the system

Initial performance reviews yielded the following results:

1. Proposal No. 763 reconfiguration was evaluated and failed to resolve reliability criteria violations
2. No significant difference among the six remaining proposals as to their respective ability to solve the identified reliability criteria violations.
3. No creation of additional reliability criteria violations.

Initial cost reviews provide no significant factors to consider other than the differences in apparent costs. A high level review of the plans identified in the proposals does not reveal any concerns at this stage of review for Proposal Nos. 494 and 514. Additional risks have been identified for Proposal Nos. 836, 962, and 191 due to the need for underground cable installation associated with these proposals.

Additional Benefits

To facilitate PJM’s identification of the more efficient or cost effective transmission solutions to identified regional needs, PJM may consider the secondary benefits a proposal window-submitted project may provide beyond those required to solve identified reliability criteria violations. As discussed in Section 1.1 and Section 1.4.2 of PJM Manual 14B, Transmission Owner Attachment M-3 needs and projects are reviewed to determine any overlap with solutions proposed to solve the violations identified as part of opening an RTEP proposal window.

A review of these overlaps as part of PJM's 2020 Window No. 1 screening has identified potential secondary benefits beyond solving identified reliability criteria violations. Based on the information provided by the sponsor, Proposal No. 494 will address the identified reliability criteria violations posted in the window and the associated aging infrastructure identified following a review of the information provided by the sponsor of the proposal. These needs are outlined below.

- Existing Pumphrey Transformer is 45 years old is expected to be submitted as an Attachment M-3 need in 2022

Initial Review Conclusions and next steps

Given the possible secondary benefits associated with Proposal No. 494 that indicate it will address these aging infrastructure concerns warrant consideration. PJM understands that the aging infrastructure issues identified, which would be resolved through Proposal No. 494, would also be resolved by Proposal Nos. 514, 962, and 191, however these proposals also include additional facility upgrades not found to be required to solve the reliability criteria violations. Proposal Nos. 420 and 191 would not resolve these aging infrastructure concerns, leaving the RTEP exposed to increased costs as then the scope of work for both the proposals would need to be pursued, one to address the identified reliability criteria violations and the other to address the aging infrastructure, and load would have to pay for two projects as opposed to one. PJM will conduct a final review with stakeholders for Proposal No. 494 and make a final determination as which project to recommend for PJM Board approval.