

Preface

PJM

DE

DC

IL

IN

KY

MD

MI

NJ

NC

OH

PA

TN

VA

WV



RTEP Update Since December 31, 2010

PJM President and CEO Terry Boston issued the accompanying PJM Board statement on behalf of the PJM Board on February 28, 2011 entitled, “Planning for Transmission in the 21st Century.” In that context, the statement also addresses the Board’s decision to suspend the PATH line in light of reduced load growth rates in PJM’s January, 2011 published load forecast.

Preliminary 2011 PJM RTEP process analysis suggests that the need for the PATH line has moved several years into the future beyond 2015. This has led the PJM Board to direct transmission owners to suspend efforts on the PATH line pending a more complete analysis in the 2011 RTEP. **Section 5** of this report discusses the PATH suspension.

PJM’s 2011 RTEP process will also address the impact of the lower load forecast and other factors on all approved RTEP upgrades, including the MAPP project.



Statement of Terry Boston, President and CEO,
on behalf of the PJM Board of Managers

Planning for Transmission in the 21st Century

February 28, 2011

One of PJM’s core functions is planning for new transmission facilities that are needed to ensure the future reliability of our regional electricity system that serves 54 million people. PJM’s independent analysis is an important component of the process by which FERC and the States exercise their respective authority over the construction, siting and cost recovery for major new transmission lines in our region.

Through the current Regional Transmission Expansion Plan (RTEP), PJM has identified -- over a 15-year horizon -- when the forecasted power flows in specific areas of the grid would violate national and local standards for reliable operation of the bulk electric system. This process necessarily requires estimating the future demand for electricity, as well as analyzing the committed resources that will serve the demand, in order to determine when and where future power flows will exceed the thermal and voltage limitations of existing transmission facilities.

While any estimate of future economic activity and its effect on both demand and supply is inherently uncertain, PJM generally has found, based on its experience, that the magnitude of uncertainty was limited and that FERC-approved “bright line” tests such as are currently used in the RTEP process could reasonably define the expected date of future reliability violations, thereby allowing PJM to plan for new transmission facilities.

Recent dramatic swings in economic forecasts and evolving public policies (particularly with respect to renewable energy) are adding greater uncertainty to our planning studies. Uncertainty about generation retirements, particularly in response to potential changes in environmental regulations, may also be diminishing the robustness of the current planning criteria.

Moreover, a set of new and greater uncertainties -- not just with load growth estimates but also other key indicators relevant to planning assessments -- are complicating the analysis of future reliability needs. In particular, the growth of Demand Response can contribute to lower expectations for future peak demand, thereby extending the time period when transmission upgrades are needed.

This Board supports both the enhanced competition within PJM markets that comes with greater Demand Response participation and greater opportunities for renewable energy -- but we recognize these factors add significant complexity to analyses of the system’s future needs.

Although the current planning studies have become volatile due to significant changes in economic forecasts, this Board remains committed to sharing with PJM stakeholders the latest results of PJM’s completed analysis. We report whatever the forecasts are and we respond impartially.



The Potomac Appalachian Transmission Highline (PATH)

Based on analysis conducted in 2007, the PJM Board approved a 765 kV line between the existing Amos substation in West Virginia and the proposed Kemptown substation in Maryland. Subsequent analysis extended the "required in-service date" by which the line was needed to resolve reliability violations to 2015.

As part of its 2011 RTEP, and in response to a request by a Virginia Hearing Examiner, PJM is conducting a series of analyses using the most current economic forecasts and Demand Response commitments, as well as potential new generation resources. Preliminary analysis reveals the expected reliability violations that necessitated PATH have moved several years into the future.

Based on these latest results, the Board has decided to hold the PATH project in abeyance in its 2011 RTEP. The Board further directs the sponsoring Transmission Owners to suspend current development efforts on the PATH project, subject to those activities necessary to maintain the project in its current state, while PJM conducts more rigorous analysis of the potential need for PATH as part of its continuing RTEP process. This action, however, does not, at this time, constitute a directive by PJM to the sponsoring Transmission Owners to cancel or abandon the PATH project.

PJM will complete this more rigorous analysis of the PATH project and other transmission requirements and then report the results to stakeholders when it is available. The Board will review this comprehensive analysis as part of its consideration of the 2011 Regional Transmission Expansion Plan.

Managing Uncertainties in Transmission Planning

Through the Regional Planning Process Task Force and other forums, PJM stakeholders are evaluating the current planning criteria and considering better ways to manage all factors utilized in the exercise of transmission planning.

The PJM Board strongly supports this effort. We consider this collaboration to be one of PJM's most important stakeholder initiatives. While we do not presuppose any specific outcome at this time, we ask PJM members to bring forth recommendations by this fall so that PJM might make appropriate filings and then enact improvements in the planning process at the beginning of 2012.

This region's electricity system faces more challenges in the next 10 years than any other period over the last 100 years. Transmission planners are on the leading edge – identifying future needs amidst growing uncertainties such as a changing fuel mix, increased storage possibilities, greater demand participation, as well as fluctuating forecasts for economic recovery.

We urge stakeholders to find innovative ways to manage these complexities well so that this region keeps -- for the long-term future -- the reliable electric service that drives our economy.

2010 RTEP Report

The report you are reading is published annually by PJM to convey the results of planning studies throughout the previous calendar year and to explain the rationale behind why transmission system upgrades are needed. This document discusses system drivers, reliability criteria violations and upgrades themselves for reporting purposes to facilitate greater Regional Transmission Expansion Plan (RTEP) understanding.

Fundamentally, the RTEP is that ongoing, body of PJM Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee (TEAC) presentation materials and published RTEP Baseline Assessment reports which remains PJM's authoritative source of RTEP information and data.

- PJM TEAC materials can be accessed online from PJM's website via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/committees/teac.aspx>.
- PJM RTEP Baseline Assessment reports can also be accessed online from PJM's website via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/planning/rtep-development/baseline-reports.aspx>.

Audience

PJM has crafted this report in particular with federal and state regulators and their staffs in mind to explain and emphasize the interrelationship among the following:

- system upgrade drivers (e.g., load growth, generation addition, generation deactivation)

- reliability criteria violations (e.g., thermal transmission constraints, voltage limits)
- system enhancements needed (e.g., new facilities, upgrades to existing facilities)

Readers of this report are encouraged to participate in the ongoing activities of the PJM Transmission Expansion Advisory Committee (TEAC). This forum provides opportunity for stakeholder participation and advice throughout the RTEP process and for remaining apprised of all evolving aspects of PJM's RTEP – plans and process alike.

Order 890 Compliance

PJM expanded its stakeholder process in 2008 in compliance with FERC's Order 890 to enhance coordinated, open and transparent planning at both regional and local level. PJM and stakeholders already conduct a compliant planning process filed with the Commission and incorporated in Schedule 6 of the PJM Operating Agreement (OA). Valuable stakeholder discussions culminated in the establishment of three Sub-Regional RTEP Committees – Mid-Atlantic, Western and Southern – commissioned to review proposed upgrades of more local concern.

Each Sub-Regional RTEP Committee increases the opportunity for direct stakeholder participation in the planning process from initial assumption setting stages through review of the planning analyses, violations, and alternative transmission expansions. The Subregional RTEP Committee provides a more local forum for gathering and considering planning issues. Interested parties can access Sub-regional RTEP Committee planning process information from PJM's website via the following URL links:

- PJM Mid-Atlantic Sub-Regional RTEP Committee: <http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/committees/ssrtep-ma.aspx>.
- PJM Western Sub-Regional RTEP Committee: <http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/committees/ssrtep-w.aspx>.
- PJM Southern Sub-Regional RTEP Committee: <http://www.pjm.com/committees-and-groups/committees/ssrtep-s.aspx>.

Through the activities of these committees, all PJM stakeholders have a forum to raise issues, propose solutions or alternatives and conduct other related discussions. These meetings are open to all stakeholders interested in the issues under consideration.

Scope of Upgrades Discussed

In 2010 alone, the PJM Board approved over 400 individual Bulk Electric System (BES) upgrades. However, to put reasonable parameters around the scope and length of this report, the upgrades discussed here are generally those whose cost exceeds \$5 million. A complete list of all approved RTEP upgrades, a brief description of facility and driver as well as current status can be found on PJM's website via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/planning/rtep-upgrades-status/construct-status.aspx>.

Queued Interconnection Requests

Generation and merchant transmission interconnection requests are a key part of PJM's RTEP process. Network upgrades discussed in this report are for those queued interconnection

requests that have completed System Impact Studies. From a “going-forward” RTEP power flow modeling perspective, PJM's RTEP process specifies that planning studies model all generation on-line that have a completed System Impact Study. Of these generators, only those with executed Interconnection Service Agreements (ISAs) are permitted to back-off an identified transmission constraint. Over ten years experience with queue activity and generation withdrawal rates has demonstrated that, in this manner, PJM's interconnection process encompasses sound, consistent and reliable planning, minimizing the need for retooling studies that would otherwise be necessitated by those generator interconnection requests that withdraw from the planning process.

For reporting purposes, please note that PJM has included many tables with statistical information about interconnection request activity through queue W4, the window for which closed on January 31, 2011.

RTEP Process information...

This report does not describe the RTEP process itself in great detail. The reader is directed to a number of online resources, including those noted below, to pursue greater understanding of the RTEP process. Detailed information on the RTEP process itself can be found in the following resources, available on PJM's website, as noted further, following:

- The M-14 series of PJM Manuals describe the specific business rules under which PJM effects the entire RTEP Process. Specifically, Manual 14B addresses the details associated with the methodologies associated with the planning

studies and upgrades derived from them as discussed in this report. PJM Manual 14B, “Regional Planning Process” can be found via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/~media/documents/manuals/m14b.ashx>.

- The PJM Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, codifies the overall provisions under which PJM executes its Regional Transmission Expansion Planning Protocol, more familiarly known (and used throughout this document) as the “PJM RTEP Process.” The PJM Operating Agreement can be found on PJM’s website via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/documents/agreements/~media/documents/agreements/oa.ashx>.
- The PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) describes the interconnection request process for generating resource interconnection, merchant transmission interconnection as well as specific process provisions to address long-term firm transmission service and Auction Revenue Rights. The PJM OATT can be found via the following URL link: <http://www.pjm.com/documents/agreements/~media/documents/agreements/tariff.ashx>.

Table of Contents



Section 1: Executive Summary	1		
1.0: Executive Summary	1		
1.0.1 – Approved Upgrades	2		
1.0.2 – 2010 Compliance with NERC Criteria	2		
1.0.3 – Expansion Planning Drivers	3		
1.0.4 – Trends that Drove 2010 RTEP Results	4		
1.0.5 – PJM Baseline Backbone Facilities	7		
1.0.6 – Amos - Welton Springs - Kempton (PATH) 765 kV Line	7		
1.0.7 – Possum Point - Indian River (MAPP) 500 kV Line	8		
1.0.8 – Northern New Jersey	8		
1.0.9 – Susquehanna - Roseland	8		
1.0.10 – Aging Infrastructure – Mt. Storm - Doubs 500 kV Rebuild	9		
1.0.11 – Construction Status of Backbone Facilities	9		
1.0.12 – Market Efficiency	9		
1.0.13 – Interregional Coordination	10		
1.0.14 – Market Integration – American Transmission Systems, Inc. (ATSI)	12		
1.0.15 – Impacts of 2011 PJM Load Forecast on 2011 RTEP Process	12		
Section 2: PJM Transmission System Expansion Drivers	13		
2.0: Transmission Planning = Reliability Planning + Market Efficiency	15		
2.0.1 – System Description	16		
2.1: Load Growth Forecasts	17		
2.1.1 – Methods and Econometrics	17		
		2.1.2 – Comparison: 2009 and 2010	18
		2.1.3 – Forecast Trends: 2007 through 2009	19
		2.1.4 – Forecast for 2015 Baseline Analysis	23
		2.2: Demand Side Response (DSR)	27
		2.2.1 – DSR as Load Forecast Input	27
		2.2.2 – Load Management and Energy Efficiency	27
		2.2.3 – DSR as an Alternative to System Expansion	29
		2.3: Generation Interconnection Requests	31
		2.3.1 – Queue Activity	32
		2.3.2 – Fuel Mix	35
		2.3.3 – Renewables	37
		2.3.4 – Wind-Powered Generating Resources	37
		2.3.5 – Small Generators	41
		2.3.6 – Behind-the-Meter Generation	41
		2.3.7 – Distributed Generation	41
		2.4: Generator Deactivations	43
		2.5: Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	45
		2.6: Related Transmission Drivers	49
		2.6.1 – Operational Performance	49
		2.6.2 – Long-Term Firm Transmission Service Requests (LTFTSRs)	49
		2.6.3 – Long-Term Auction Revenue Rights (ARRs)	50

Section 3: PJM’s RTEP Process	51	Section 4: Integrating Public Policy Drivers	71
3.0: RTO Obligations	51	4.0: The Role of Public Policy in the RTEP Process	71
3.1: RTEP Process Description	53	4.0.1 – Federal Initiatives	73
3.1.1 – Types of RTEP Upgrades	54	4.0.2 – State Initiatives	73
3.1.2 – Planning Criteria Compliance	55	4.0.3 – At-Risk Generation	73
3.2: NERC Planning Criteria	57	4.0.4 – Impacts on Approved Backbone Facilities	73
3.2.1 – NERC Category A	57	4.0.5 – RTEP Sensitivity Studies	74
3.2.2 – NERC Category B	57	4.1: RPS, Demand Resources, Energy Efficiency and At-Risk Generation	75
3.2.3 – NERC Category C	58	4.1.1 – Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) Parameters Background	75
3.2.4 – NERC Category D	58	4.1.2 – At-Risk Generation Parameters Background	75
3.2.5 – Contingencies Considered	58	4.1.3 – Demand Resources and Energy Efficiency (EE) Parameters	77
3.2.6 – Compliance with NERC Criteria	58	4.1.4 – Sensitivity Analysis Results	78
3.3: RTEP Methodology – Thermal Analysis	61	4.2: Off-Shore Wind Conceptual Study	79
3.3.1 – Load Deliverability	61	4.2.1 – Public Policy Trend	79
3.3.2 – Generator Deliverability	62	4.2.2 – Scope and Input Assumptions	80
3.3.3 – N-1-1 Thermal	62	4.2.3 – Study Findings	83
3.4: Other Reliability Studies	63	4.2.4 – Next Steps	84
3.4.1 – Short Circuit Studies	63	4.3: Impacts of Generator Deactivation Retirement	85
3.4.2 – Stability Analyses	64	4.3.1 – Eddystone and Cromby Retirements	86
3.5: RTEP Methodology – Reactive Analysis	65	4.3.2 – Hudson Unit #1	88
3.5.1 – Reactive Analysis – Deliverability	65		
3.5.2 – Reactive Analysis – PV Curves	66		
3.5.3 – N-1-1 Voltage	66		
3.6: Addressing Sub-Regional RTEP Issues	67		
3.6.1 – Order 890 Compliance	67		
3.6.2 – Reviewing Sub-Regional RTEP Upgrades	68		
3.7: Public Policy Drivers	69		

Section 5: 2015 Baseline – PATH Analysis	91	Section 6: 2015 Baseline MAPP Analysis	139
5.0: PATH Line Background	91	6.0: MAPP Line Background	139
5.1: Summary of Key 2015 Modeling Assumptions	93	6.1: Summary of Key Modeling Assumptions	141
5.1.1 – Compliance with NERC Criteria	98	6.1.1 – Compliance with NERC Criteria	145
5.2: PATH Need – Thermal Deliverability Analysis	99	6.2: MAPP Need – Reactive Analysis	147
5.3: PATH Need – Reactive Analysis	105	6.2.1 – Reactive Analysis Background	147
5.3.1 – Reactive Analysis Background	105	6.2.2 – Load Deliverability	147
5.3.2 – Load Deliverability – Reactive Violations	105	6.2.3 – PV Analysis	150
5.3.3 – PV Analysis	116	6.3: Sensitivity Analyses – MAPP Impacts	153
5.4: N-1-1 Analysis	121	6.4: MAPP Alternatives	155
5.5: Description of Alternatives	125	6.4.1 – Northern Alternative	156
5.5.1 – Liberty / LS Power	125	6.4.2 – Comparison of Project Characteristics	156
5.5.2 – Dominion Alternatives	126	6.5: RTEP Comparison of Alternatives	157
5.5.3 – Harrison - Dickerson Alternative	127	6.5.1 – Reactive Analysis	157
5.5.4 – Reactive-Only Alternative	128	6.5.2 – Northern Option Conceptual Study Results	159
5.5.5 – Comparison of Project Characteristics	129	6.5.3 – MAPP Project Validated	160
5.6: RTEP Comparison of Alternatives	131	Section 7: 2015 Baseline – Northern New Jersey Analysis	161
5.6.1 – Thermal Analysis	131	7.0: Northern New Jersey (NNJ) System Conditions	161
5.6.2 – Reactive Comparison	133	7.0.1 – Persistent Reliability Criteria Violations	162
5.6.3 – Reactive-only Voltage Sensitivity Study	134	7.1: Summary of Key Modeling Assumptions	163
5.6.4 – Transfer Capability / FCITC	135	7.1.1 – Compliance with NERC Criteria	168
5.6.5 – Real and Reactive Losses	136	7.2: Northern New Jersey Criteria Violations	169
5.6.6 – Construction Feasibility of Liberty	136	7.3: An Alternative Northern New Jersey (NNJ) Solution	171
5.6.7 – PATH Project Validated	136	7.3.1 – NNJ 230 kV Alternative	171
5.7 – RTEP Update Since December 31, 2010	137	7.3.2 – Branchburg -Roseland-Hudson (B-R-H)Removed from the RTEP	171

Section 8: 2015 Baseline Analysis – Aging Infrastructure	173	Section 10: Near-Term Analysis: 2012 through 2014	207
8.0: Background	173	10.1: Applying NERC Standards	207
8.0.1 – Aging Transformers	173	10.2: RPM – Planning Input Parameters	209
8.0.2 – Mt. Storm – Doubs 500 kV Line Rebuild	174	10.2.1 – Role of CETO and CETL in RPM	209
8.1: Mt. Storm – Doubs 500 kV Line Rebuild	175	10.2.2 – LDA CETO and CETL Values	211
8.1.1 – Aging Structures	175	10.3: PJM 2010 RTEP Retool Studies	213
8.1.2 – Scope of Rebuild	176	10.3.0 – Purpose of Retool Studies	213
8.1.3 – RTEP Operational Performance Significance	176	10.3.1 – Scope of Near-Term Retool Analysis	213
8.1.4 – Schedule for Rebuild Completion	176	10.3.2 – 2012 Retool – Need for Susquehanna - Roseland Line Validated	217
Section 9: Near-Term Analysis – 2015	177	10.3.3 – 2012 Retool – Jacks Mountain	219
9.0: Overview	177	10.3.4 – 2013 Retool Study Results	220
9.0.1 – Order 890 Compliance	179	10.3.5 – 2014 Retool Study Results	221
9.1: Modeling Parameters	181	Section 11: Market Integration RTEP Requirements	223
9.2: PJM Mid-Atlantic Sub-Region – 2015	185	11.0: Near-Term Process	223
9.3: PJM Western Sub-Region – 2015	191	11.1: American Transmission Systems, Inc. (ATSI) Integration	225
9.4: PJM Southern Sub-Region – 2015	199	11.1.0 – System Topology	225
9.5: PJM System Stability	203	11.1.1 – Internal Reserve Margin (IRM) Studies	225
9.5.1 – PJM System-Wide Analysis	203	11.1.2 – Deliverability Analyses	225
9.5.2 – Interconnection Request System Studies	203	11.1.3 – Criteria Violations and Upgrades	226
9.5.3 – Operational Performance Issues	204		
9.5.4 – Conclusion	205		

Section 12: Interregional Coordination	227	Section 14: State RTEP Overviews	249
12.0: Overview	227	14.0: PJM Overview	249
12.0.1 – Scope of 2010 Coordination	227	14.0.1 – The PJM System	250
12.0.2 – Interregional Planning Drivers	228	14.0.2 – Load Growth	253
12.1: Eastern Interconnection Studies	231	14.0.3 – New Generator Interconnection Requests	254
12.1.1 – Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative (EIPC)	231	14.0.4 – State Summaries of Generation Powered by Renewable Fuels	254
12.1.2 – Eastern Wind Integration and Transmission Study (EWITS)	232	14.0.5 – PJM RTEP Summaries by Jurisdiction	255
12.2: PJM / NYISO / ISO-NE Focused Study	233	14.1: Delaware/Delmarva Peninsula RTEP Overview	257
12.3: PJM / Midwest ISO Studies	235	14.1.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	258
12.3.1 – Cross-Border Congested Flowgate Study	235	14.1.2 – Generation Interconnection Requests	259
12.4: PJM and Systems South	237	14.1.3 – Anticipated Generation Deactivations	262
12.4.1 – PJM - Duke - TVA Interface Analysis	237	14.1.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	262
12.4.2 – NC Planning Collaborative Coordination	237	14.1.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans on the Delmarva Peninsula	263
		14.1.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	266
Section 13: Market Efficiency Analysis	239	14.2: Northern Illinois RTEP Overview	269
13.0: Overview	239	14.2.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	270
13.1: Simulation Methodology and Assumptions	241	14.2.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	271
13.2: 2010 RTEP Market Efficiency Analysis	243	14.2.3 – Generation Deactivations	278
13.2.0 – Overview	243	14.2.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	280
13.2.1 – 2010 and 2013 Study Year Results	243	14.2.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Northern Illinois	281
13.2.3 – Stakeholder Proposed Upgrades	244	14.2.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	284
13.3: Market Simulation Model Input Assumptions	247	14.3: Indiana RTEP Overview	289
		14.3.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	290
		14.3.2 – Generator Interconnection	290
		14.3.3 – Generation Deactivations	292
		14.3.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	292
		14.3.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Indiana	294
		14.3.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	296

14.4: Eastern Kentucky RTEP Overview	299	14.8: Northeastern North Carolina RTEP Overview	363
14.4.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generations	300	14.8.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	364
14.4.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	301	14.8.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	365
14.4.3 – Generation Deactivations	301	14.8.3 – Generation Deactivations	365
14.4.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	301	14.8.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	366
14.4.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans	302	14.8.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans	366
14.4.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	304	14.8.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	368
14.5: Maryland and District of Columbia RTEP Overview	305	14.9: Ohio RTEP Overview	369
14.5.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	306	14.9.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	370
14.5.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	307	14.9.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	371
14.5.3 – Generation Deactivations	311	14.9.3 – Generation Deactivations	376
14.5.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	312	14.9.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	377
14.5.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Maryland and the District of Columbia	313	14.9.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Ohio	377
14.5.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	316	14.9.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	381
14.6: Southwestern Michigan RTEP Overview	319	14.10: Pennsylvania RTEP Overview	385
14.6.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	320	14.10.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	386
14.6.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	321	14.10.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	387
14.6.3 – Generation Deactivations	321	14.10.3 – Generation Deactivations	395
14.6.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	322	14.10.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	397
14.6.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Southwestern Michigan	322	14.10.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Pennsylvania	397
14.6.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	324	14.10.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	400
14.7: New Jersey RTEP Overview	325	14.11: Northeastern Tennessee RTEP Overview	407
14.7.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	326	14.11.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	407
14.7.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	327	14.11.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	408
14.7.3 – Generation Deactivations	342	14.11.3 – Generation Deactivations	408
14.7.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	345	14.11.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	408
14.7.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in New Jersey	345	14.11.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Northeastern Tennessee	408
14.7.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	350	14.11.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	408

14.12: Virginia RTEP Overview	409	Section 15: Future Challenges	437
14.12.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	410	15.0: Overview	437
14.12.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	411	15.1: Load Forecasting Methodology Enhancements	439
14.12.3 – Generation Deactivations	415	15.1.1 – Methodology Background	439
14.12.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	416	15.1.2 – Proposed Methodology Enhancements	439
14.12.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in Virginia	416	15.2: Demand Resource Saturation	441
14.12.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	422	15.2.1 – Ten Interruption Requirement	441
14.13: West Virginia RTEP Overview	425	15.2.2 – Interruption Duration	442
14.13.1 – Load Growth and Existing Generation	425	15.2.3 – Locational Deliverability Area (LDA) Analysis	443
14.13.2 – Generator Interconnection Requests	426	15.2.4 – Demand Resources Saturation Report Details	443
14.13.3 – Generation Deactivations	430	15.2.5 – Next Steps / Status	443
14.13.4 – Merchant Transmission Interconnection Requests	430	15.3: Renewable Portfolio Requirements	445
14.13.5 – Transmission Expansion Plans in West Virginia	431	15.3.1 – Impacts on Jurisdictions within PJM	445
14.13.6 – Interconnection Requests for Generation Powered by Renewable Fuel Sources	434	15.3.2 – Wind Potential	445
		15.3.3 – Demand Resources and Energy Efficiency (EE)	445
		15.4: The Impact of Emerging Grid Technologies	451
		15.4.1 – Price Responsive Demand and Smart Grid Technology	451
		15.4.2 – Capacity Value – Batteries and Storage	451
		15.5: RTEP Process: Considering Alternate Transmission Proposals	453
		15.5.1 – FERC Transmission Planning NOPR - RM10-23-000	453
		15.5.2 Primary Power Order	454
		15.5.3 – Central Transmission Order	454
		15.6: RTEP Process: Light Load Operational Performance	455
		15.7: 2011 RTEP – PATH Line Suspension	457
		Section 16: Topical Index	459
		Section 17: Glossary	463

