



Initial Review and Screening 2020 RTEP Proposal Window 1 – Cluster No. 3

December 1, 2020

For Public Use



This page is intentionally left blank.

2020 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 – Cluster No. 3

As part of its 2020 RTEP process cycle of studies, PJM identified clustered groups of flowgates that were put forward for proposals as part of 2020 RTEP Window No. 1. Specifically, Cluster No. 3 - discussed in this Initial Review and Screening report - includes those flowgates listed in **Table 3**.

Table 1. 2020 RTEP Window No. 1 - Cluster No. 3 List of Flowgates

Flowgates	Voltage Level	Driver
N2-ST12	230 kV	Thermal

Proposals Submitted to PJM

PJM conducted 2020 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 for 60 days beginning July 1, 2020 and closing August 31, 2020. 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. 2020 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 – Cluster No. 3 List of Proposals

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Estimated Total Construction Cost (\$, millions)	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
493	Upgrade	Line #2213 Reconductor - Cabin Run to Yardley Ridge - Partial Reconductor	1.11	N
134	Upgrade	Line #2213 Reconductor - Cabin Run to Yardley Ridge - Full Reconductor	1.75	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.

Initial Review Conclusions and Next Steps

Proposal No. 134 offers a full reconductoring of line 2213, while Proposal No. 493 offers to solve the violation through a partial reconductoring of the same line. With the difference in the proposal costs being approximately \$0.65 million, the benefits of completely reconductoring the line, as opposed to partial reconductoring, will prevent the need for future mobilization to the same facility and provide for additional load growth in the area. This difference in cost is minimal and appears appropriate based on these additional benefits.

Based on this information, Proposal No. 134 appears to be the more efficient or cost effective solution in Cluster No. 3. 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.

PJM anticipates conducting a final review that PJM intends to share with stakeholders at the January TEAC after which a final recommendation will be made to the PJM Board for review and approval.