

Design Element	Solution
Assumptions Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PJM-facilitated Regional and Subregional Meetings on EOL Planning plus individual TO meetings. • TOs provide (and PJM posts) all TO planning criteria assumptions as well as EOL assessment methodologies and assumptions 30 days before meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Criteria</u> should be quantifiable and include details about associated criteria thresholds. Each TO proposing EOL driven projects should have and share an established, company-approved, public set of quantifiable criteria that can be replicated by external entities. • Stakeholder comments 15 days after meeting. • The TOs shall provide written responses within 10 days of stakeholder comments. • The TOs shall provide enough information for stakeholders to understand how assets will be prioritized for replacement, how the replacement versus maintenance decision is made, how assets rank relative to other assets on the system and the system average values. The level of detail will be sufficient to enable stakeholders to replicate the TO decision-making process for EOL facilities. • 30 days after assumptions meeting, PJM provides assumptions to be used in performing the evaluation as well as any concerns with TO-provided assumptions.
Needs Meeting(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To include a review of system needs and drivers of needs, based on application of TO methodology and assumptions used to plan EOL projects. • PJM-facilitated Regional and Subregional Meetings on EOL Planning. • At least 25 days after the Assumptions Meeting. • 10 days prior to Needs Meeting, TOs provide and PJM posts all PJM or TO system needs, Criteria Assessments and drivers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>Criteria assessments</u> should include at a minimum: asset scoring data inputs, analysis, and final results. Criteria assessments should also assess EOL priority ranking relative to entire system under study. All TO facilities need to continue to be part of the overall system level average. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For developed criteria thresholds used to justify the replacement of an asset, the TO's will provide system level averages specific to that type/class of asset to support their established criteria threshold. These system level averages will include but not be limited to any data inputs used to rank and prioritize an individual asset's replacement against another asset of same type/class located on the TO's system. ○ <u>Drivers</u> contributing to EOL determination (including performance, condition and risk) should be included. TOs will provide quantifiable values pertaining to what is driving facility selection.

	<p>These values must include system level averages. As applicable, TOs shall provide documentation developed of condition assessments (e.g. photographs, engineer field reports, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On an annual basis, the TOs must provide a complete list of all assets (CB, TF, Line, Station, etc.), and their relative ranking from highest priority to lowest priority, and the associated input data supporting their ranked priorities, in order to discuss prioritization rather than just dealing with individual projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders provide written comments within 10 days after meeting for TO consideration. • TOs provide written responses, including all additional information requested, prior to Solutions Meeting(s). Subsequent Solutions meetings will be deferred until all information is provided. • TOs should also identify the specific company that owns the asset being assessed and if the asset is currently a transmission or distribution asset, as well as what entity will be owning, operating and maintaining the replacement facilities. • When EOL transmission projects are replacing distribution assets, the TO also provides drivers to support a transmission improvement over a distribution improvement, including the supporting evidence that demonstrates the transmission alternative is lower in cost and/or the distribution alternative would not meet the needs. Finally, for any EOL project that is replacing a distribution facility, the TO must demonstrate that the distribution needs are imminent. • TOs must coordinate TO EOL process with their yearly local reliability planning to better demonstrate why a more expensive solution might be brought forward. • Needs meetings must occur prior to the individual TO finalizing its annual budget. This coordination is critical to ensure that TO are not planning ahead of PJM and other stakeholders and then just pushing through their already decided upon solutions. • Nothing precludes any TO from having additional stakeholder meetings or communications regarding a Local Plan that affects such stakeholders in addition to the Planning Meetings.
Solutions Meeting(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PJM-facilitated Regional and Subregional Meetings on EOL Planning • TOs shall share and post their potential solutions, as well as any alternatives identified by the TOs or stakeholders, at least 10 days in advance of the Solutions Meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only EOL solutions that include the following information will be brought forward for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Asset specific EOL scoring data inputs, analysis, and final results ▪ Asset specific EOL priority ranking relative to entire system under study ▪ Asset specific EOL Quantifiable values pertaining to what is driving the selection of the

	<p style="text-align: center;">facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Projects not meeting this minimum criteria can be brought forward as part of a new, TO-specific Order 890 compliant planning process. ● No fewer than 25 days after the Needs Meeting but after all information requested at Needs Meeting is provided, each Regional TEAC or Subregional RTEP Committee shall schedule and facilitate a minimum of one Regional TEAC or Subregional RTEP Committee meeting to review potential solutions for the identified criteria violations (Solutions Meeting). ● Stakeholders may provide comments on the potential solutions to the TO for consideration either prior to or by 10 days following the Solutions Meeting. ● The TO shall review and consider comments that are received within 10 days of the meeting and shall respond or provide feedback in writing no later than 20 days after the Solutions Meeting.
Alternative Solutions Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PJM-facilitated Regional and Subregional Meetings on EOL Planning ● No more than 10 days after the initial Solutions Meeting, any stakeholder shall share and PJM shall post alternative solutions to the TO potential solutions. ● No more than 20 days after the alternative solutions are posted, the Regional TEAC or subregional RTEP Committee shall schedule and facilitate the Alternative Solutions Meeting to review and discuss the TO's and stakeholders' alternative solutions.
Final Solutions Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● PJM-facilitated Regional and Subregional Meetings on EOL Planning ● No fewer than 20 days after the Alternative Solutions Meeting, the Regional TEAC or subregional RTEP Committee shall schedule the Final Solutions Meeting to review and discuss the TO's solution and for the TOs to respond to questions. ● The TOs shall share and post their selected solution no fewer than 10 days before the Final Solutions Meeting. TOs shall provide justification and documentation for their selected solution. ● The Regional TEAC or subregional RTEP Committee shall facilitate the Final Solutions Meeting to review and discuss the TO's solution and for the TOs to respond to questions.
Finalization of Projects for Local Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Each TO will finalize for submittal to PJM EOL Projects that were introduced through the Regional TEAC or subregional RTEP committees from January through May for inclusion in the finalized PJM RTEP base case for that planning year. ● The TOs shall provide a written response 10 days prior to the Local Plan being submitted for integration into the RTEP. ● Projects for the Local Plan will not be final "finalized" until the conclusion of Dispute Resolution (if applicable)

Dispute Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disputes shall be resolved in accordance with the procedures set forth at Schedule 5 of the Operating Agreement. • This is not limited to process disputes and shall include disputes about a TO's assumptions, needs, or solution decisions to select one or more EOL Projects into the Local Plan.
CEII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Stakeholders who have completed PJM's CEII Request form and have executed the PJM CEII NDA in accordance with the PJM and FERC processes for CEII as defined at 18 CFR §388.113 (c), PJM and the TOs shall make available the decision-making process and all information discussed above used in performing the needs identification and evaluation, including, but not limited to: i) all assumptions and methodology, including any criteria, guidelines, models, and supporting evidence that PJM and each TO uses to identify issues, develop alternatives and recommend solutions; ii) the impacts of regulatory actions, projected changes in load growth, demand response resources, energy efficiency programs, price responsive demand, generating additions and retirements, market efficiency and other trends in the industry; and (iii) alternative sensitivity studies, modeling assumptions and scenario analyses. • TOs will communicate any concerns that proposed changes or alternatives may negatively impact TO risk profile and how.