



Initial Review and Screening 2021 RTEP Proposal Window 1 - Cluster No. 12

October 5, 2021

For Public Use

This page is intentionally left blank.

2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 - Cluster No. 12

As part of its 2021 RTEP process cycle of studies, PJM identified clustered groups of flowgates that were put forward for proposals as part of 2021 RTEP Window No. 1. Specifically, Cluster No. 12 - discussed in this Initial Review and Screening report - includes those flowgates listed in **Table 1**.

Table 1. 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 – Cluster No. 12 List of Flowgates

Flowgate	kV Level	Driver
AEP -T9, AEP -T10, AEP -T11, AEP -T12, AEP -T13, AEP -T14	69	Thermal

Proposals Submitted to PJM

PJM conducted 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 for 60 days beginning July 2, 2021 and closing August 31, 2021. During the window, several entities submitted two 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. 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1– Cluster No.12 List of Proposals

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
116	Upgrade	Bancroft-Milton Rebuild	56.729	N
336	Greenfield	Cabell Station Expansion and Cut In	13.684	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. No significant difference among the two proposals as to their respective ability to solve the identified reliability criteria violations
2. 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.

Additional Benefits

In order to ensure that PJM develops more efficient or cost effective transmission solutions to identified regional needs, RTEP Process consideration must be given to the additional 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 must be 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 2021 Window No. 1 screening has identified potential benefits beyond solving identified reliability criteria violations. Based on the information provided by the sponsor, proposal [No. of Proposal] will address needs associated with aging infrastructure following a review of the information provided by the sponsor of the proposal. These needs are outlined below:

The Bancroft - Milton 69 kV line is mostly comprised of 1920s and 1930s steel lattice construction and has experienced 28 momentary outages and 10 permanent outages since 2015, resulting in 840,000 CMI.

Initial Review Conclusions and next steps

Given the possible additional benefits associated with Proposal No. 116 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. 116, would not be resolved by Proposal No. 336, leaving the RTEP exposed to increased costs as then the scopes of work for both proposals would need to be pursued and costs for both scopes of work would be incurred. PJM will conduct a final review with stakeholders for Proposal No. 116 and make a final determination as which project to recommend for PJM Board approval.