

Analytical Framework Template #4:
Evaluation Template for Comparing Cost Estimates vs. Cost Containment Proposals

Template to Be Completed by PJM and Posted on PJM Website for Each Finalist Group

	Qualified Developer	PJM Proposal ID	Does the Proposal Solve PJM’s Problem Statement Issue?	Was a Constructability Analysis Performed?	Was an Independent Cost Estimate Completed?	Based on Analytical Framework Template #1’s Three-Pronged Test, was the proposal deemed a Binding Cost Containment Proposal?
Finalist 1						
Finalist 2						
Finalist 3						
Finalist 4						

- A Finalist Must Solve PJM’s Problem Statement Issue in order to be a Finalist.
- Consistent with PJM Policy under Analytical Framework #2, a PJM constructability analysis and independent cost estimate will only be completed on the Finalists.

A. PJM’s review of Risks & Obstacle Identification with Respect to Binding Cost Containment Proposals or Cost Estimates – to Be Completed by PJM and based on Analytical Framework Template #1:

<i>Risk Factor to Cost of Project</i>	<i>Risk Borne* by Finalist 1, Per Contractual Language (insert X, if yes)</i>	<i>Risk Borne* by Finalist 2, Per Contractual Language (insert X, if yes)</i>	<i>Risk Borne* by Finalist 3, Per Contractual Language (insert X, if yes)</i>	<i>Risk Borne* by Finalist 4, Per Contractual Language (insert X, if yes)</i>
Costs Related to Gov’t Approvals, Permitting & Routing Risk				
Costs Related to Land and Land Right Acquisition				
Subsurface Soil and Geotechnical Cost Risk				
Environmental Assessment and Mitigation Costs				
Costs Associated with Designing and				

Engineering Project				
Costs Associated with Procuring Equipment, Supplies, and Other Materials				
Completion of Construction Cost Risk				
Inflation Rate Risk				
PJM Assessment of Overall Cost Cap Strength (Strong, Medium, Weak) **				

* To be based on PJM’s assessment of the disclosures in Section II of Analytical Template Framework #1. A Risk Factor will be considered a “Risk Borne” by a Finalist only if PJM concludes that (a) the Risk Factor is clearly covered by the contractual language contained in Section II.A of Analytical Template Framework #1 and (b) the Finalist’s Binding Cost Containment Proposal does not contain any exclusions, limits or other provisions (other than exclusions quantified on Analytical Framework Template #4 Column K) that could under reasonably foreseeable circumstances enable the Finalist to seek recovery for costs associated with such Risk Factor in excess of the Construction Cost Cap.

** Strong/Medium/Weak Definitions:

DEFINITION OF “STRONG”: 7 or more Risk Factors borne per above matrix (0% ADDER ON ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK TEMPLATE #4 EXCEL SPREADSHEET COLUMN G).

DEFINITION OF “MEDIUM”: 4-6 Risk Factors borne per above matrix (25% ADDER ON ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK TEMPLATE #4 EXCEL SPREADSHEET COLUMN G).

DEFINITION OF “WEAK”: 3 or fewer Risk Factors borne per above matrix or Proposal does not meet the three-pronged Binding Cost Containment Proposal Test in Analytical Framework #1. (50% ADDER ON ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK TEMPLATE #4 EXCEL SPREADSHEET COLUMN G). PJM assessment of Proposal as “WEAK” will result in the Proposal being treated as a Cost Estimate for comparison purposes.

PJM’s “Strong”, “Medium” or “Weak” determination will later be used under the PJM Cost Cap Adjustment under Analytical Template #4, Excel Spreadsheet.

B. Comparative Cost Used for PJM Evaluation Purposes – Note this Comparative Cost is not the same as a cost estimate or a Binding Cost Containment Proposal number and the comparative cost number has no legal weight.

	Qualified Developer	PJM Proposal ID	Comparative Cost Used for PJM Evaluation Purposes
Finalist 1			Cell Q27, Analytical Framework Template #4 Excel Spreadsheet for Finalist 1
Finalist 2			Cell Q27, Analytical Framework Template #4 Excel Spreadsheet for Finalist 2
Finalist 3			Cell Q27, Analytical Framework Template #4 Excel Spreadsheet for Finalist 3
Finalist 4			Cell Q27, Analytical Framework Template #4 Excel Spreadsheet for Finalist 4