



Initial Review and Screening 2023 RTEP Proposal Window 2 - Cluster No. 1

June 04, 2024

For Public Use

This page is intentionally left blank.

2023 RTEP Proposal Window No. 1 - Cluster No. 2

As part of its 2023 RTEP process cycle of studies, PJM identified clustered groups of flowgates that were put forward for proposals as part of 2023 RTEP Window No. 2. Specifically, Cluster No. 1 - discussed in this Initial Review and Screening report - includes those flowgates listed in **Table 1**.

Table 1. 2023 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 – Cluster No. 1 List of Flowgates

Flowgate	kV Level	Driver
2023W2-PSEG-T15, 2023W2-PSEG-T14, 2023W2-PSEG-T13, 2023W2-PSEG-T9, 2023W2-PSEG-T8, 2023W2-PSEG-T5, 2023W2-PSEG-T6, 2023W2-PSEG-T3, 2023W2-PSEG-T4, 2023W2-PSEG-T1, 2023W2-PSEG-T10, 2023W2-PSEG-T2	69	PSEG FERC Form 715 N-1-1 Thermal

Proposals Submitted to PJM

PJM conducted 2023 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 for 30 days beginning March 6, 2024 and closing April 5, 2024. During the window, two entities submitted four 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. 2023 RTEP Proposal Window No. 2 – Cluster No. 1 List of Proposals

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
627	GREENFIELD	New 230kV XLPE Circuit using (345kV rated 5000kcmil cable) from Jackson Road 230kV Station to Cedar Grove 230kV Station	84.58	Y
998	GREENFIELD	Construct a new dual manhole and conduit system out of Jackson Rd on Madison Street to Riverview Drive. The existing E-759 would be reconfigured to utilize the new duct back to Jackson Rd. The existing N-664 would be rerouted underground between Rt. 80 and Rt. 46 off ramp. This would free up part of the existing E-759 and N-664 circuit to be reconfigured and tap into the I-633. The other new circuit of approximately 4.5mi would exit Jackson Road underground and rise up overhead before the Vreeland Ave Railroad Crossing. The circuit would then continue overhead on the other side of Riverview Drive to run a new pole line	60.56	N

Proposal ID#	Project Type	Project Description	Total Construction Cost M\$	Cost Capping Provisions (Y/N)
		and create a new circuit between Jackson and Cedar Grove. Open positions will be utilized at Jackson Road and Cedar Grove to accommodate the new circuits. The breakers at Cedar Grove will need to be replaced with 3000A continuous 63kA fault duty breakers.		
496	GREENFIELD	New 230kV XLPE Circuit using (230kV rated 3500kcmil cable) from Jackson Road 230kV Station to Cedar Grove 230kV Station	78.89	Y
716	GREENFIELD	Build a 7.6 mile 230 kV underground line from the JCPL Montville Substation to the PSEG Jackson Rd Substation. Expand the Montville 230 kV to a breaker and a half configuration by adding one new bay on the west side of the yard to terminate the new line. At Jackson Rd, terminate the new line in the open bay position next to transformer 40.	211.08	Y

Initial Review and Screening

PJM has completed an initial review and screening of the proposals listed in **Table 2** and PJM identified the option described in the preceding section 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:

1. *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.
2. *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.
3. *Initial Feasibility Review* – PJM reviewed the overall proposed implementation plan to determine if the project, as proposed, can feasibly be constructed.
4. *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:

PJM's initial performance review showed that all 4 proposals solve the posted/intended reliability criteria violations and none created a new reliability violation.

Proposal 627 and 496 both provided a significant reliability margins at a relatively small additional cost with minimal development risk/impact where proposal 998 and 716 did not. For future expandability, proposal 627 provided an option for future operation at 345kV that enables more efficient integration with the existing transmission backbone in the area.

Initial feasibility reviews yielded the following results:

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.

The submitted proposals to provide the following additional benefits as identified by the proposing entity:

- **Proposal 627:** None noted.
- **Proposal 998:** None noted.
- **Proposal 496:** None noted.
- **Proposal 716:** None noted.

Initial Review Conclusions and next steps

Based on this information, all four proposals solve the violations, however proposal No. 998 and 716 don't provide enough margin for future needs. Proposal 627 however offers a significant reliability margin enhancement for the overall system. In addition, proposal No. 716 is not the most cost effective solution. Proposal No. 496 and 627 appear to be comparable and are both cost effective solution, however proposal No. 627 provides future expandability at a nominal additional cost and relative negligible right of way and constructability incremental risk. Considering PJM's initial review and screening, proposal 627 appears to be the more efficient or cost effective solution in Cluster No. 1. 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.