

PJM Interest Identification

1. Improved transparency
2. Consistency within and among zones – in approach, format, presentation, and communication
3. Some form of framework/approach for projects related to aging infrastructure and to supplemental projects
 - Note: PJM believes the framework/approach would likely be different for each TO and include TO engineering judgement based on local differences and, as such, is not suggesting an interest in a single “RTO-wide” method. PJM’s interest stems from its desire to demonstrate a basic level of due diligence in the annual formulation of projects (Baseline and Supplemental) within the RTEP.
4. Verification/Justification – For projects that require Board approval, and supplemental projects to the extent of ensuring there are no adverse system impacts.
5. Method to evaluate Alternatives to replacement-in-kind (Are there better more efficient configurations? Is such an evaluation worthwhile?) – Not required for supplemental projects that have no impact on potential criteria-related RTEP projects.