

(c) Project Proposal Windows

(c)(2) Proposals from all entities (both existing Transmission Owners and Nonincumbent Developers) that indicate the entity intends to be a Designated Entity, also must contain information to the extent not previously provided pursuant to Section 1.5.8(a) demonstrating: (i) technical and engineering qualifications of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company relevant to construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (ii) experience of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company in developing, constructing, maintaining, and operating the type of transmission facilities contained in the project proposal; (iii) the emergency response capability of the entity that will be operating and maintaining the proposed project; (iv) evidence of transmission facilities the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company previously constructed, maintained, or operated; (v) the ability of the entity or its affiliate, partner, or parent company to obtain adequate financing relative to the proposed project, which may include a letter of intent from a financial institution approved by the Office of the Interconnection or such other evidence of the financial resources available to finance the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project; (vi) the managerial ability of the entity, its affiliate, partner, or parent company to contain costs and adhere to construction schedules for the proposed project, including a description of verifiable past achievement of these goals; (vii) a demonstration of other advantages the entity may have to construct, operate, and maintain the proposed project, including any binding cost commitment proposal to cap project construction costs the entity may wish to submit; and (viii) any other information that may assist the Office of the Interconnection in evaluating the proposed project. To the extent that an entity submits a cost containment proposal the entity shall submit sufficient information for the Office of Interconnection to determine the binding nature of the proposal with respect to critical elements of project development.

(e) Criteria for Considering Inclusion of a Project in the Recommended Plan. In determining whether a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project proposed pursuant to Section 1.5.8(c), individually or in combination with other Short-term Projects or Long-lead Projects, is the more efficient or cost-effective solution and therefore should be included in the recommended plan, the Office of the Interconnection, taking into account sensitivity studies and scenario analyses considered pursuant to Section 1.5.3 of this Schedule 6, shall consider the following criteria, to the extent applicable: (i) the extent to which a Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would address and solve the posted violation, system condition, or economic constraint; (ii) the extent to which the relative benefits of the project meets a Benefit/Cost Ratio Threshold of at least 1.25:1 as calculated pursuant to Section 1.5.7(d) of this Schedule 6; (iii) the extent to which the Short-term Project or Long-lead Project would have secondary benefits, such as addressing additional or other system reliability, operational performance, economic efficiency issues or federal Public Policy Requirements or state Public Policy Requirements identified by the states in the PJM Region; (iv) the ability to timely complete the project and project development feasibility; and (iv) other factors such as cost-effectiveness, including the quality and legal enforceability of any voluntarily-submitted, binding cost commitment proposal related to Transmission Facilities which caps project construction costs (either in whole or in part), project

total return on equity (including incentive adders), or capital structure. ~~revenue requirements, either in whole or in part, the ability to timely complete the project, and project development feasibility.~~ In scrutinizing the cost of proposals, the Office of Interconnection shall determine, and include in TEAC and PJM Board materials, for each proposal window finalist proposal, regardless of whether the proposal relates to an Upgrade of existing facilities and/or a greenfield project, the comparative risks to be borne by ratepayers as a result of the proposal's inclusion of a binding cost commitment proposal or the use of non-binding cost estimates. The materials provided to the TEAC and PJM Board shall describe, in a clear and transparent manner, the method -by which the Office of Interconnection scrutinized the cost aspects of each finalist proposal, including any binding cost commitments. In evaluating any ROE or capital structure proposal, PJM is not making a determination that the ROE or capital structure results in just and reasonable rates, which shall be addressed in the required rate filing with the FERC. Stakeholders seeking to dispute a particular ROE analysis utilized in the selection process shall address such disputes with the Designated Entity in the applicable rate proceeding where the Designated Entity seeks approval of such rates from the Commission.