



# Initial Review and Screening 2026 RTEP Proposal Window 2 - Cluster 2

February #, 2021

For Public Use

This page is intentionally left blank.

## 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 - Cluster No. 2

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. 2. Specifically, Cluster No. 2 - discussed in this Initial Review and Screening report - includes those flowgates listed in **Table 1**.

Table 1. 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 – Cluster No. 2 List of Flowgates

Flowgate	kV Level	Analysis
GD-W2-W211	345/138	Winter Generator Deliverability
GD-W2-W214	138	

### Proposals Submitted to PJM

PJM conducted 2021 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 for greater than 60 days (due to holiday time period) beginning on November 3, 2021 and closing on January 12, 2022. During the window, two entities each submitted one proposal 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. 2 – Cluster No. 2 List of Proposals Received

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
408	Upgrade	Install 345 kV Bus Tie Circuit Breaker at Dresden Station	\$4.26	N
442	Greenfield	East Spring 345kV Transmission Project	\$10.4	Y

### 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. 2 screening has not identified potential benefits beyond solving identified reliability criteria violations.

### **Initial Review Conclusions and next steps**

Based on this information, proposal No. 408 appears to be the more efficient or cost effective solution in Cluster No. 2. PJM's initial planning level cost review and initial feasibility review suggests that further constructability review and financial analysis would not materially contribute to the analysis of the other proposals submitted for this cluster.