149 FERC ¶ 61,250
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Cheryl A. LaFleur, Chairman;
Philip D. Moeller, Tony Clark,
and Norman C. Bay.

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.	Docket Nos. ER13-1944-000
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.	ER13-1943-000 ER13-1943-001
PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. Duquesne Light Company	ER13-1924-000
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.	ER13-1945-000
Entergy Services, Inc.	ER13-1955-000
Cleco Power LLC	ER13-1956-000
	(not consolidated)

ORDER ON COMPLIANCE FILINGS

(Issued December 18, 2014)

Paragraph Numbers

1. On July 10, 2013, pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Power Act (FPA),[1] PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM) submitted, in Docket No. ER13-1944-000 revisions to Article IX of the MISO-PJM Joint Operating Agreement (MISO-PJM JOA)[2] to comply with the interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000 (PJM Compliance Filing).[3] On July 10, 2013, in Docket No. ER13-1924-000, PJM Transmission Owners submitted their proposal to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 (PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing).[4]

2. On July 10, 2013, pursuant to section 206 of the FPA, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (MISO) and the MISO Transmission Owners submitted: (1) in Docket No. ER13-1943-000 revisions to Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA to comply with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 (July 10 Filing);[5] and (2) in Docket No. ER13-1943-001, supplementing with four eTariff records (together constituting the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing). On July 10, 2013, in Docket No. ER13-1945-000, MISO also individually submitted revisions to Attachment FF of MISO's Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (MISO Tariff) to identify the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation arrangements (MISO Attachment FF Filing).

---

[1] 16 U.S.C. § 824e (2012).

[2] Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA governs Coordinated Regional Transmission Expansion Planning between MISO and PJM.

[3] *Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities*, Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 (2011), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2012), *aff'd sub nom. S.C. Pub. Serv. Auth. v. FERC*, No. 12-1232, 2014 WL 3973116 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 15, 2014).

[4] Tariff records filed by the entities are listed in Appendix D to this order.

[5] Unless otherwise noted, we refer to MISO individually, and MISO and MISO Transmission Owners together, as MISO. The footnote will indicate if the statement or argument was made individually by MISO or jointly by MISO and the MISO Transmission Owners.

3. On July 10, 2013, pursuant to section 206 of the FPA, Entergy Services, Inc. (Entergy), on behalf of the Entergy Operating Companies,[6] submitted in Docket No. ER13-1955-000 revisions to Attachment K of its Open Access Transmission Tariff (Entergy Tariff) to comply with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 (Entergy Compliance Filing).

4. On July 10, 2013, pursuant to section 206 of the FPA, Cleco Power LLC (Cleco) submitted in Docket No. ER13-1956-000 its proposal to comply with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 (Cleco Compliance Filing).

5. In this order, we reject in part and conditionally accept in part, subject to further compliance filings, the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing and MISO Attachment FF Filing, as discussed below. We also conditionally accept the PJM Compliance Filing and PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, subject to further compliance filings, as discussed below. Additionally, we reject as moot the Entergy Compliance Filing and Cleco Compliance Filing, as discussed below.

I. Background

6. In Order No. 1000, the Commission adopted a package of reforms addressing transmission planning and cost allocation that, taken together, are designed to ensure that Commission-jurisdictional services are provided at just and reasonable rates and on a basis that is just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential. In particular, the Commission determined that the transmission planning requirements of Order No. 890[7] were too narrowly focused geographically and failed to provide for adequate analysis of the benefits associated with interregional transmission facilities in neighboring transmission planning regions.[8] The Commission concluded that

[6] The Entergy Operating Companies consist of: Entergy Arkansas, Inc.; Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, L.L.C.; Entergy Louisiana, LLC; Entergy Mississippi, Inc.; Entergy New Orleans, Inc.; and Entergy Texas, Inc.

[7] *Preventing Undue Discrimination and Preference in Transmission Service*, Order No. 890, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,241, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 890-A, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,261 (2007), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 890-B, 123 FERC ¶ 61,299 (2008), *order on reh'g*, Order No. 890-C, 126 FERC ¶ 61,228, *order on clarification*, Order No. 890-D, 129 FERC ¶ 61,126 (2009).

[8] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 369.

interregional transmission coordination reforms were necessary.[9] Thus, the Commission required each public utility transmission provider to establish further procedures with each of its neighboring transmission planning regions for the purpose of: (1) coordinating and sharing the results of the respective regional transmission plans to identify possible interregional transmission facilities that could address regional transmission needs more efficiently or cost-effectively than separate regional transmission facilities;[10] and (2) jointly evaluating those interregional transmission facilities that the pair of neighboring transmission planning regions identify, including those proposed by transmission developers and stakeholders.[11] The Commission defined an interregional transmission facility as "one that is located in two or more transmission

[9] *Id.* P 370.

[10] While the Commission required public utility transmission providers to establish further procedures with each of its neighboring transmission planning regions to coordinate and share the results of their respective regional transmission plans to identify possible interregional transmission facilities that could address regional transmission needs more efficiently or cost-effectively than separate regional transmission facilities, the Commission neither required nor precluded public utility transmission providers from conducting interregional transmission planning. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 1000, FERC Stat. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 399 (clarifying that "the interregional transmission coordination requirements that [the Commission] adopt[s] do not require formation of interregional transmission planning entities or creation of a distinct interregional transmission planning process to produce an interregional transmission plan" and, "[t]o the extent that public utility transmission providers wish to participate in processes that lead to the development of interregional transmission plans, they may do so and, as relevant, rely on such processes to comply with the requirements of this Final Rule."). The Commission also required "the developer of an interregional transmission project to first propose its transmission project in the regional transmission planning processes of each of the neighboring regions in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located." *Id.* P 436.

[11] Order No 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 493 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 396). The Commission clarified that "the requirement to coordinate with neighboring regions applies to public utility transmission providers within a region as a group, not to each individual public utility transmission provider acting on its own. For example, within an RTO or ISO, the RTO or ISO would develop an interregional cost allocation method or methods with its neighboring regions on behalf of its public utility transmission owning members." Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 630 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 584).

planning regions." [12] Furthermore, the Commission required each public utility transmission provider to describe the methods by which it will identify and evaluate interregional transmission facilities and to include a description of the type of transmission studies that will be conducted to evaluate conditions on neighboring systems for the purpose of determining whether interregional transmission facilities are more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission facilities.[13] Consistent with the requirement that public utility transmission providers must describe the methods by which they will identify and evaluate interregional transmission facilities, the Commission explained that "each public utility transmission provider must explain in its OATT how stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission facilities for the public utility transmission providers in neighboring transmission planning regions to evaluate jointly."[14]

7. In addition, in Order No. 1000, the Commission required that each public utility transmission provider in a transmission planning region have, together with the public utility transmission providers in its own transmission planning region and a neighboring transmission planning region, a common method or methods for allocating the costs of a new interregional transmission facility among the beneficiaries of that transmission facility in the two neighboring transmission planning regions in which the transmission facility is located.[15] The Commission also required that each public utility transmission provider's interregional cost allocation method or methods satisfy six interregional cost allocation principles.[16] To be eligible for interregional cost allocation, an interregional transmission facility must be selected in the relevant transmission planning regions' regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation.[17]

---

[12] *Id.* P 494 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 482 n.374).

[13] *Id.* P 493 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 398).

[14] *Id.* P 522.

[15] Order No. 1000, FERC Stat. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 578, 582; Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 626.

[16] Order No. 1000, FERC Stat. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 603.

[17] *Id.* P 400.

II. Compliance Filings

A. PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000) and MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1943-001)

8. MISO and PJM submit revisions to Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA to comply with the interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. PJM states that it and MISO propose to base their filings on their existing MISO-PJM JOA, which was executed December 31, 2003 and accepted by the Commission in March 2004,[18] because they believe that "[it] currently meets, and in many instances, exceeds, the interregional [transmission] coordination requirements of Order No. 1000."[19]

9. MISO also proposes revisions to Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000. MISO Transmission Owners join MISO in support of section III.C (Interregional Cost Allocation) of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing to the extent that the filing proposes revisions to section 9.4.3.2 (Cross-Border Project Shares) of the MISO-PJM JOA.[20]

10. MISO and PJM note that that they made separate filings to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 because MISO, PJM, and the PJM Transmission Owners disagree on some of the proposed MISO-PJM JOA revisions to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[21] MISO and PJM explain that, consistent with Order No. 714,[22] PJM has served as the official filing party for the MISO-PJM JOA, with MISO filing a certificate

---

[18] *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,251, at PP 56-57 (2004).

[19] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 5-6.

[20] Section 9.4.3.2 of the MISO-PJM JOA refers to the interregional cost allocation methods of the MISO-PJM JOA.

[21] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

[22] *See Electronic Tariff Filings*, Order No. 714, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,276 (2008), *order on clarification*, Order No. 714-A, 147 FERC ¶ 61,115 (2014) .

of concurrence with the Commission.[23] As a result of their disagreement, MISO states that it is submitting the entire currently existing MISO-PJM JOA[24] with its proposed revisions, contemporaneously withdrawing its existing certificate of concurrence,[25] and submitting proposed changes to the existing MISO-PJM JOA[26] to comply with Order No. 1000. Notwithstanding this disagreement, MISO and PJM state that they mutually agree to the proposed revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA related to interregional transmission coordination procedures.[27] With respect to those proposed revisions of the MISO-PJM JOA, MISO and PJM have individually filed substantively identical language, with minor adjustments in their respective filings to reflect that the discussion is being provided from the perspective of either MISO or PJM.[28]

---

[23] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3 n.8; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 9.

[24] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35 ("Tab A-1 – Redlined Version of Existing JOA (deleting the existing Certificate of Concurrence and adding the entire text of the existing MISO-PJM JOA to the MISO Tariff"), Tab A-1. The eTariff records filed in Docket No. ER13-1943-000 correspond to the redlined edits provided in Tab A-1.

[25] *Id.* at 9.

[26] *Id.* at 35 ("Tab A-2 – Redlined Version of Revised JOA Provisions (proposing changes to the existing MISO-PJM JOA"), Tab A-2. MISO specifies that PJM agrees to all proposed revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA included in Tab A to the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing with the exception of the changes MISO proposes to section 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA (Cost Allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects), with which PJM and the PJM Transmission Owners disagree. *See* MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2 n.5.

[27] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3-4; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2 n.5.

[28] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

B. PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1924-000)

11. PJM Transmission Owners contend that the current MISO-PJM JOA already complies with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[29] PJM Transmission Owners state that, although they do not propose any revision to transmission rate design, they made this filing because it concerns matters for which they are responsible under the PJM Open Access Transmission Tariff (PJM Tariff).[30]

C. MISO Attachment FF Filing (Docket No. ER13-1945-000)

12. MISO proposes revisions to Attachment FF of the MISO Tariff, which MISO states addresses the requirement in Order No. 1000 that the tariff identify MISO's interregional arrangements that are in the form of agreements. MISO specifies that its revisions to Attachment FF of the MISO Tariff identify the newly proposed procedures established for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between MISO and its neighboring transmission planning regions (i.e., PJM, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (SPP), and Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning (SERTP)).[31] MISO requests an effective date of January 1, 2014 for its proposed revisions, but notes that the specific agreements with regions may have different effective dates.[32]

D. Entergy Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1955-000) and Cleco Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1956-000)

13. Entergy and Cleco propose to comply with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000 through their participation in the MISO Transmission Expansion Planning (Regional Planning)

---

[29] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 1-2.

[30] *Id.* at 1 n. 2 ("Under Section 9.1 of the PJM Tariff and Article 7 of the [Consolidated Transmission Owners Agreement], the PJM Transmission Owners have the exclusive authority and responsibility to submit filings under section 205 "'in or relating to . . . the transmission rate design under the PJM Tariff.'").

[31] MISO Attachment FF Filing, Docket No. ER13-1945-000, at 2.

[32] *Id.* at 5.

process.[33] Entergy and Cleco note that, due to their then-pending integration into MISO, the Commission accepted their participation in the MISO regional transmission planning process as a means for them to comply with the regional requirements of Order No. 1000.[34]

III. Notice of Filings and Responsive Pleadings

A. PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000)

15. Notice of the PJM Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by the entities noted in Appendix A to this order. Motions to intervene out-of-time were submitted by PPL PJM Companies on September 10, 2013 and by MISO Transmission Owners on December 23, 2013. Protests and comments were filed by the entities noted in Appendix B to this order and are addressed below. On September 24, 2013, Wind Parties submitted a comment out-of-time.

16. Answers to the PJM Compliance Filing were filed by the entities noted in Appendix C to this order and are addressed below.

B. MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1943-001)

17. Notice of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by the entities noted in Appendix A to this order. A motion to intervene out-of-time was submitted by PPL PJM Companies on September 10, 2013. Protests and comments were filed by the entities noted in Appendix B to this order and are addressed below. On September 24, 2013, Wind Parties submitted a comment out-of-time.

---

[33] *See* Entergy Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1955-000, at 1-2; Cleco Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1956-000, at 1.

[34] Entergy Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1955-000, at 2; Cleco Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1956-000, at 1-3 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 142 FERC ¶ 61,215 (2013) (MISO First Regional Compliance Order)).

18. Answers to the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing were filed by the entities noted in Appendix C to this order and are addressed below.

C. PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1924-000)

19. Notice of the PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by the entities noted in Appendix A to this order. Motions to intervene out-of-time were submitted by PPL PJM Companies on September 10, 2013, by Dominion Resources on September 12, 2013, and by MISO Transmission Owners on December 23, 2013. Protests and comments were filed by the entities noted in Appendix B to this order and are addressed below. On September 24, 2013, Wind Parties submitted a comment out-of-time.

20. Answers to the PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing were filed by the entities noted in Appendix C to this order and are addressed below.

D. MISO Attachment FF Filing (Docket No. ER13-1945-000)

21. Notice of the MISO Attachment FF Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by the entities noted in Appendix A to this order. A motion to intervene out-of-time was submitted by PPL PJM Companies on September 10, 2013. Protests and comments were filed by the entities noted in Appendix B to this order and are addressed below. On September 24, 2013, Wind Parties submitted a comment out-of-time.

22. Answers to the MISO Attachment FF Filing were filed by the entities noted in Appendix C to this order and are addressed below.

E. Entergy Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1955-000)

23. Notice of the Entergy Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by the entities noted in Appendix A to this order. No protests, comments, or answers were filed.

F. Cleco Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1956-000)

24. Notice of the Cleco Compliance Filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 78 Fed. Reg. 43,192 (2013), with interventions and protests due on or before September 9, 2013. Notices of intervention and timely motions to intervene were filed by

the entities noted in the Appendix A to this order. No protests, comments, or answers were filed.

IV. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

25. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2014), the notices of intervention and timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding. In addition, given the early stage of these proceedings and the absence of undue prejudice or delay, we grant the late-filed motions to intervene.

26. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2014), prohibits an answer to a protest or an answer unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept the answers filed in these proceedings because they have provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

27. We reject the Entergy Compliance Filing and Cleco Compliance Filing as unnecessary to meet the requirements of Order No. 1000. Because Entergy's and Cleco's integration into MISO occurred on December 19, 2013, we find that Entergy and Cleco should rely on MISO's compliance with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000. Accordingly, we find that the Entergy Compliance Filing and Cleco Compliance Filing are moot and reject them.

28. Finally, the protest NIPSCO filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1944-000, ER13-1945-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1924-000 raises the same issues that NIPSCO raised in its complaint against MISO and PJM in Docket No. EL13-88-000.[35] We address the issues NIPSCO raises in its protest in the order addressing NIPSCO's complaint in

[35] *See* NIPSCO, Complaint, Docket No. EL13-88-000, at 2 (filed Sept. 11, 2013) (stating that it "recognizes that elements of its comprehensive reforms . . . may be beyond the mandates of Order No. 1000" and "to ensure its proposals are addressed on the merits and not dismissed for want of proper procedures and in order to present a comprehensive solution, NIPSCO is filing this [s]ection 206 Complaint in conjunction with its September 9, 2013 protest of the MISO and PJM Order No. 1000 interregional compliance filings").

Docket No. EL13-88-000, which is being issued concurrently with this order.[36] We note that the Commission's determinations in this order do not preclude any Commission action on the issues raised in Docket No. EL13-88-000.

B. Substantive Matters

30. We find that the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, MISO Attachment FF Filing, PJM Compliance Filing, and PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing partially comply with the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation requirements in Order No. 1000, subject to the modifications discussed below. Accordingly, we reject in part and conditionally accept in part, subject to further compliance filings, the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing and MISO Attachment FF Filing,[37] as discussed below. We also conditionally accept PJM Compliance Filing and PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, subject to further compliance filings, as discussed below. We direct MISO, PJM, and PJM Transmission Owners to submit the further compliance filings within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order.

1. Interregional Transmission Coordination Requirements

a. General Requirements

31. The Commission required each public utility transmission provider through its regional transmission planning process to coordinate with the public utility transmission providers in each of its neighboring transmission planning regions within its interconnection to implement the interregional transmission coordination requirements adopted in Order No. 1000.[38] The Commission also required public utility transmission providers in each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions develop the same language to be included in each public utility transmission provider's OATT that describes the interregional transmission coordination procedures for that particular pair of

[36] *See Northern Indiana Public Serv. Corp. v. Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 149 FERC 61,248 (2014).

[37] We note that our determination in this order related to Attachment FF is limited to the newly proposed procedures established for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between MISO and PJM. The proposed procedures for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between MISO and its other neighboring transmission planning regions (i.e., SPP and SERTP) will be addressed in subsequent Commission orders in other proceedings. *See supra* P 12.

[38] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 415.

regions.[39] Alternatively, if the public utility transmission providers so choose, the Commission allowed these procedures to be reflected in an interregional transmission coordination agreement among the public utility transmission providers within neighboring transmission planning regions that is filed with the Commission.[40]

i. Compliance Filings

32. MISO and PJM propose to comply with the interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000 through their existing MISO-PJM JOA.[41] With regard to scope, PJM indicates that MISO and PJM are adjacent transmission systems in the eastern interconnection with several ties on PJM's western border.[42]

33. PJM states that it and MISO believe that the MISO-PJM JOA currently meets, and in many instances exceeds, the interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000.[43] Nevertheless, PJM states that they have agreed to revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA to further clarify and improve upon the existing coordination of interregional transmission facilities between MISO and PJM.[44]

34. MISO states that it and PJM agree on common language related to interregional transmission coordination and the interregional allocation of costs for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects but disagree on other aspects of interregional cost allocation.[45] As a result of their disagreement on certain revisions, MISO and PJM note that that they are making separate filings to comply with the interregional requirements of Order No. 1000 in order to allow the Commission to consider their respective proposals.[46]

---

[39] *Id.* PP 346, 475; Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 223.

[40] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 346, 475, *order on reh'g.,* Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 223.

[41] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 5.

[42] *See id.* at 6.

[43] *Id.* at 5-6.

Id. at 4.

[45] *See* MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

[46] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3; MISO and MISO

(continued ...)

35. MISO and PJM request that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA revisions become effective either January 1, 2014 or June 1, 2014, depending on the date that the Commission acts on MISO's and PJM's respective filings to comply with the regional transmission planning and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[47] MISO specifically requests an effective date of January 1, 2014 if the Commission either: (1) finds that the tariff revisions accepted by the Commission on March 22, 2013 in the MISO First Regional Compliance Order and PJM First Regional Compliance Order[48] are sufficient for purposes of allowing MISO's and PJM's respective regional transmission planning and cost allocation provisions to be implemented effectively in conjunction with the interregional transmission coordination process and cost allocation method proposed in this proceeding, without waiting for favorable Commission action on the further regional compliance filings that MISO and PJM are respectively due to submit by July 22, 2013; or (2) accepts by January 1, 2014, the key provisions of MISO's and PJM's respective further regional compliance filings due on July 22, 2013.[49] MISO asserts that these preconditions are necessary because its proposed revisions depend on the preceding or approximately concurrent implementation of MISO's and PJM's respective regional transmission planning processes in accordance with the Commission's requirements.[50]

36. In the alternative, MISO requests an effective date of June 1, 2014, in the event that neither of these preconditions is present by January 1, 2014.[51] PJM also requests "such effective date as requested by MISO and granted by the Commission" in the alternative.[52]

Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

[47] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 25; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 36.

[48] MISO First Regional Compliance Order, 142 FERC ¶ 61,215; *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 142 FERC ¶ 61,214 (2013) (PJM First Regional Compliance Order).

[49] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 36.

[50] *Id.*

[51] *Id.*

[52] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 25.

ii. Commission Determination

37. We find that MISO and PJM have partially complied with the general interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. Specifically, we find that MISO and PJM comply with the requirement to coordinate with the neighboring public utility transmission providers within its interconnection to implement the interregional transmission coordination requirements adopted in Order No. 1000 because MISO and PJM are neighboring transmission planning regions in the eastern interconnection with interconnections at several points along the MISO/PJM seam. However, MISO and PJM partially comply with the requirement of Order No. 1000 that each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions develop the same language to describe the interregional transmission coordination procedures for that particular pair of regions. While MISO and PJM have both submitted generally common language governing interregional transmission coordination, their individual tariff language contains some non-substantive differences. Although MISO and PJM state that these minor differences in their respective filings are needed to reflect whether the discussion is from the perspective of either MISO or PJM,[53] we find that some of the differences do not serve this purpose and therefore are not necessary.[54] In addition, as further discussed below in the Cost Allocation section of this order, MISO and PJM have submitted competing provisions regarding interregional cost allocation. Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing that revises the MISO-PJM JOA to: (1) adopt identical language to govern the interregional transmission coordination between MISO and PJM, with any differences limited to those needed to reflect that the discussion is from the perspective of either MISO or PJM; and (2) include a common interregional cost allocation method consistent with our directives below in the Cost Allocation section of this order.

38. We also find that MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals for cost allocation methods for Cross-Border Market Efficiency and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability projects only partially comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements in Order No. 1000 because the cost allocation methods do not explicitly apply to an interregional transmission facility, as defined by Order No. 1000. Order No. 1000 defines an interregional transmission facility as "a transmission facility that is

[53] *See* MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

[54] *E.g.*, PJM Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.2 (Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0); MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.3.2 (Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

located in two or more transmission planning regions."[55] However, the term "interregional transmission facility" is not used in the MISO-PJM JOA. Instead, the MISO-PJM JOA includes two types of transmission facilities: Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects. The MISO-PJM JOA identifies these transmission facilities as "cross-border allocation projects."[56] While the MISO-PJM JOA does not exclude a transmission project that is located in both MISO and PJM, it does not explicitly state these types of transmission facilities must be located in both MISO and PJM.

39. It is our understanding that, since their inception, the cross-border transmission planning process and the related cost allocation methods in the MISO-PJM JOA have applied to transmission facilities located in one RTO *and* transmission facilities that cross the seam and are located in both RTOs. Our understanding is based on the following statements about the MISO-PJM JOA. First, the language of the MISO-PJM JOA does not prohibit such transmission projects from crossing the border between MISO and PJM.[57] In addition, the Commission's various orders addressing the original cross-border

[55] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 482 n.374.

[56] Currently, a cross-border allocation project is a project that meets the criteria for either a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project or a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project specified in sections 9.4.3.1.1 and 9.4.3.1.2 of the MISO-PJM JOA respectively. *See* PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Allocation Project) (1.0.0).

[57] To qualify as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project, a transmission project must: (1) have an estimated transmission project cost of $20,000,000 or greater; (2) be evaluated as part of a Coordinated System Plan or joint study process; (3) meet a threshold benefit to cost ratio of 1.25; (4) qualify as an economic transmission enhancement or expansion under the terms of the PJM Regional Transmission Expansion Plan and also qualify as a market efficiency transmission project under the MISO Tariff; and (5) address one or more constraints for which at least one dispatchable generator in the adjacent market has a generator load distribution factor of five percent or greater with respect to serving load in that adjacent market. To qualify as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project under the existing MISO-PJM JOA, a transmission project must: (1) by agreement of the Joint RTO Planning Committee, be needed to efficiently meet applicable reliability criteria; (2) be a baseline reliability transmission project as defined under the MISO or PJM Tariffs; (3) result in an allocation of transmission project costs to the RTO in which the transmission project is not constructed (i.e., the cross-border RTO) of at least $10,000,000; (4) involve the cross-border RTO's contribution of at least five percent of the total loading on the constrained facility, as determined based on the

(continued ...)

cost allocation proposals do not prohibit such transmission projects from being located in both RTOs.[58] Second, MISO and PJM Transmission Owners in their compliance filings confirm that Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects can be located in both RTOs, and this claim is not disputed in any pleadings. Specifically, MISO describes a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project as one that "can be located solely within MISO or PJM and is not limited to the tie-line situation addressed by Order No. 1000 with regard to the Commission's requirements for an interregional cost allocation method."[59] In the testimony that accompanies MISO's proposal, Ms. Curran describes a tie-line that would be addressed by MISO's proposal as a transmission facility that interconnects to the transmission facilities of transmission owners in MISO and in PJM.[60] Finally, PJM Transmission Owners, in their interregional compliance filing, state that, in contrast to Order No. 1000's cost allocation requirements (which apply to new transmission facilities located in both regions), the MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation methods apply both to new transmission facilities connecting the two regions and to new transmission facilities located in either RTO.[61]

40. Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing to revise the definition of cross-border allocation projects consistent with the definition of interregional transmission facility in Order No. 1000 to explicitly allow for transmission projects that are located in two or more transmission planning regions. As the Commission finds below in the Cost Allocation section of this order, in rejecting MISO's proposal to remove the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method for the purposes of complying with Order No. 1000, the existing Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation was developed as a result of a Commission directive, which Order No. 1000 cannot be construed as altering or superseding. Therefore, any proposed cost allocation method that MISO and PJM seek to apply to interregional transmission projects that address regional reliability transmission needs must continue to "allocat[e] to the

---

Coordinated System Plan power flow model; and (5) have an in-service date after December 31, 2007.

[58] *See, e.g.*, *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,102, at n.1 (2009).

[59] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, Tab D (Testimony of Jennifer Curran) at 10 (Curran Test.).

[60] *Id.*, Curran Test. at 12.

[61] *See* PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000 at 5.

customers in each RTO the cost of new transmission facilities that are built in one RTO but provide benefits to customers in the other RTO"[62] and apply to interregional transmission facilities, which are defined as facilitates "that [are] located in two or more transmission planning regions."[63] The Commission expects that, with these revisions, the plain language of the MISO-PJM JOA will indicate that the cross-border transmission planning process and the related cost allocation methods in the MISO-PJM JOA apply to transmission facilities located in one RTO *and* transmission facilities that cross the seam and are located in both RTOs.

41. We also conditionally accept certain MISO and PJM proposed revisions, effective January 1, 2014, subject to modifications.[64] We find that MISO's and PJM's proposed effective date is reasonable because the Commission has sufficiently addressed MISO's and PJM's regional Order No. 1000 compliance filings[65] to allow MISO's and PJM's respective regional transmission planning and cost allocation provisions to be implemented in conjunction with the interregional transmission coordination procedures proposed in this proceeding.

b. Implementation of the Interregional Transmission Coordination Requirements

i. Data Exchange and Identifying Interregional Transmission Facilities

42. In Order No. 1000, the Commission required each public utility transmission provider to establish procedures with each of its neighboring transmission planning regions to coordinate and share the results of their respective regional transmission plans

---

[62] *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc*., 109 FERC ¶ 61,168, at P 60 (2004).

[63] Order No 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 494 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 482 n.374).

[64] *See e.g.*, determinations on Data Exchange and Identifying Interregional Transmission Facilities, Procedure for Joint Evaluation, Cross-Border Market Efficiency and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, and Miscellaneous.

[65] *See* PJM First Regional Compliance Order, 142 FERC ¶ 61,214; *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,128 (2014); MISO First Regional Compliance Order, 142 FERC ¶ 61,215; *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 147 FERC ¶ 61,127 (2014).

to identify interregional transmission facilities.[66] As part of this requirement, the Commission required the public utility transmission providers to enhance their existing regional transmission planning process to provide for the identification of interregional transmission facilities that may be more efficient or cost-effective solutions to their respective regional transmission needs.[67] The Commission also required each public utility transmission provider to adopt interregional transmission coordination procedures that provide for the exchange of transmission planning data and information at least annually.[68] The Commission found that the interregional transmission coordination procedures must include the specific obligations for sharing transmission planning data and information rather than only an agreement to do so.[69] However, the Commission did not dictate the specific procedures or the level of detail for the procedures pursuant to which transmission planning data and information must be exchanged. The Commission allowed each public utility transmission provider to develop procedures to exchange transmission planning data and information, which the Commission anticipated would

[66] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 493 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 396). While the Commission required public utility transmission providers to establish further procedures with each of its neighboring transmission planning regions to coordinate and share the results of their respective regional transmission plans to identify possible interregional transmission facilities that could address regional transmission needs more efficiently or cost-effectively than separate regional transmission facilities, the Commission neither required nor precluded public utility transmission providers from conducting interregional transmission planning. *See, e.g.*, Order No. 1000, FERC Stat. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 399 (clarifying that "the interregional transmission coordination requirements that [the Commission] adopt[s] do not require formation of interregional transmission planning entities or creation of a distinct interregional transmission planning process to produce an interregional transmission plan" and, "[t]o the extent that public utility transmission providers wish to participate in processes that lead to the development of interregional transmission plans, they may do so and, as relevant, rely on such processes to comply with the requirements of this Final Rule."). The Commission also required "the developer of an interregional transmission project to first propose its transmission project in the regional transmission planning processes of each of the neighboring regions in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located." *Id.* P 436.

[67] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 396; *see also id.* P 398.

[68] *Id.* P 454.

[69] *Id.* P 455.

reflect the type and frequency of meetings that are appropriate for each pair of regions and will accommodate each pair of region's transmission planning cycles.[70]

43. In addition, the Commission required the developer of an interregional transmission project to first propose its transmission project in the regional transmission planning processes of each of the neighboring regions in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located.[71] Thus, the Commission required that each public utility transmission provider explain in its OATT how stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission facilities for joint evaluation.[72]

(a) Compliance Filings

44. MISO and PJM state that Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA currently addresses coordinated regional transmission planning and provides for joint planning between MISO and PJM through two formal committees:[73] (1) the Joint Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) Planning Committee,[74] which is comprised of staff representatives from both RTOs, and (2) the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee,[75] which is a committee open to stakeholders from both regions.[76]

45. MISO and PJM propose that the Joint RTO Planning Committee and the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee: (1) meet at least annually to

---

[70] *Id.*

[71] *Id.* P 436, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 506.

[72] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 522.

[73] *See* PJM Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX (Coordinated Regional Transmission Expansion Planning) (0.0.0); MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX (Coordinated Regional Transmission Expansion Planning) (30.0.0).

[74] The responsibilities and activities of the Joint RTO Planning Committee are detailed in section 9.1.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA. *See* PJM Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1 (Joint RTO Planning Committee) (0.0.0).

[75] The responsibilities and activities of the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee are detailed in section 9.1.2 of the MISO-PJM JOA. *See id.* § 9.1.2 (Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee) (0.0.0).

[76] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 11; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 10.

review each RTO's regional plan for integration into the Coordinated System Plan[77] or inter-RTO transmission plan[78] and (2) review and consider whether a Coordinated System Plan study should be performed. MISO and PJM state that a Coordinated System Plan study will be initiated if: (i) each RTO in the Joint RTO Planning Committee votes in favor of performing a Coordinated System Plan study or (ii) after two consecutive years during which a Coordinated System Plan study has not been conducted and one RTO votes in favor of performing a Coordinated System Plan study.[79] MISO and PJM state that the Joint RTO Planning Committee will inform the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee whether it decides to initiate a Coordinated System Plan study.[80] MISO and PJM explain that, if a study will be conducted, the Joint RTO Planning Committee will determine a mutually agreeable starting date that takes into consideration each RTO's regional planning cycles.[81]

46. MISO and PJM state that each of their respective annual regional plans are integrated into the Coordinated System Plan, including any market-based additions to the system infrastructure and jointly-identified Network Upgrades,[82] as well as alternatives to

[77] "The Coordinated System Plan is the result of the coordination of the regional planning that is conducted under [the MISO-PJM JOA]. [MISO and PJM] will coordinate any studies required to assure the reliable, efficient, and effective operation of the transmission system. Results of such coordinated studies will be included in the Coordinated System Plan." PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.2 (Coordinated System Plan) (0.0.0).

[78] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6.

[79] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 16-17; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 13; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(a)(ii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (0.0.0).

[80] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(a)(ii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (0.0.0).

[81] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(a)(iii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (0.0.0).

[82] The MISO-PJM JOA provides that Network Upgrades shall have the same meaning as defined in the MISO and PJM Tariffs. PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. II (Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Definitions) (0.0.0). Network Upgrades is defined in the MISO Tariff as "[a]ll or a portion of the modifications or additions to transmission related facilities that are integrated with and support the Transmission Provider's overall Transmission System for the general benefit of all Users

(continued ...)

Network Upgrades that were considered.[83] MISO and PJM explain that this joint annual review will include evaluation of transmission issues, including issues from each RTO's market operations and annual planning processes or third parties.[84] MISO and PJM add that, as the decision-making body for the Coordinated System Plan, the Joint RTO Planning Committee is required to meet a minimum of twice per year and may meet more frequently during the development of a Coordinated System Plan as agreed to by MISO and PJM.[85]

47. PJM also states that the MISO-PJM JOA includes the coordination of any studies needed to ensure the reliability or operation of the transmission system, including ongoing analysis of interconnection and long-term firm transmission service requests,[86] the results of which are included in the Coordinated System Plan.[87] MISO explains that it and PJM perform the coordination studies used to develop the Coordinated System Plan every three years. MISO states that, during the off years, the Joint RTO Planning Committee and the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee review discrete reliability problems or operability issues that arise due to changing system conditions and perform sensitivity analyses, as required.[88] PJM notes that, to the extent the Joint RTO Planning Committee combines with or participates in similarly established

---

of such Transmission System." MISO, FERC Electric Tariff (Definitions) (33.0.0). Network Upgrades is defined in the PJM Tariff as "[m]odifications or additions to transmission-related facilities that are integrated with and support the Transmission Provider's overall Transmission System for the general benefit of all users of such Transmission System." PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, OATT, § I.1.26 (Definitions – L – M – N) (3.1.0).

[83] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.1 (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (0.0.0).

[84] *Id.* § 9.1.1.1 (Joint RTO Planning Committee Responsibilities) (1.0.0).

[85] *Id.* § 9.1.1 (Joint RTO Planning Committee) (1.0.0).

[86] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 14; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6.

[87] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 14; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6.

[88] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6 (citing PJM Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(a) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (2.0.0)).

joint planning committees among multiple planning entities, MISO's and PJM's coordinated planning analyses may be integrated into the joint coordinated planning analyses conducted by the multiple parties.[89]

48. MISO and PJM state that the current MISO-PJM JOA process used to exchange data provides that the Joint RTO Planning Committee establishes a schedule rotating responsibility for data management coordination of stakeholder meetings, coordination of analysis activities, report preparation and other activities it deems appropriate.[90]

49. MISO and PJM propose to require that certain data and information will be exchanged annually, while other data and information will be exchanged upon request.[91] Specifically, MISO and PJM propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to require each RTO to share the following information on an annual basis, during the first quarter of a calendar year:[92]

(1) Power flow models for projected system conditions for up to a 10 year planning horizon that include planned generation development and retirements, planned transmission faculties and seasonal load projects;

(2) System stability models with detailed dynamic modeling of generators and other active elements;

---

[89] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 14; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 12 (citing PJM Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.2 (Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0)).

[90] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 19-20; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 16; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1.1(h) (Joint RTO Planning Committee Responsibilities) (1.0.0).

[91] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 19; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000, at 15.

[92] MISO's and PJM's proposed revisions further note the annual data exchange will be completed during the first quarter of the calendar year, unless MISO and PJM agree in writing to a different timeline for the data exchange. *See* PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2.1 (Annual Data and Information Exchange Requirement) (1.0.0).

(3) Production cost models for projected system conditions for the planning horizon that includes generation and load forecasts and planned transmission facilities;

(4) Assumptions used in the development of power flow, stability and production cost models; and

(5) Contingency lists for use in power flow, stability and production cost analyses.[93]

50. With respect to this annual information, MISO and PJM propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to state that (1) the models will be consistent with those used in each RTO's planning processes, (2) the format used will be agreed upon by the RTOs, and (3) the RTOs can use "best available information." PJM notes that, if the RTOs agree, data compiled through other multi-regional modeling efforts can be used to satisfy the data exchange requirement.[94]

51. MISO and PJM further propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to provide that each RTO will provide the other with the following data and information *upon request*:

(1) Any data previously exchanged in accordance with section 9.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA;

(2) Short circuit models for transmission systems that are relevant to the coordination of transmission planning between the RTOs;

(3) Each RTO's regional plan, any long-term or short-term reliability assessment documents produced by each RTO, as well as the time of each planning enhancement and the estimated in-service date;

(4) Status update of expansion studies;

(5) Identification and status of interconnection and long-term firm transmission service requests received and included in associated studies;

---

[93] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 19-20; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 16; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2.1 (Data and Information Exchange) (1.0.0).

[94] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2.1 (Data and Information Exchange) (1.0.0).

(6) Transmission system maps (bulk transmission system and relevant lower voltage transmission system maps) in electronic and hard copy format; and

(7) Such other data and information as needed by each RTO to plan its own system accurately and reliably and to assess impacts of conditions existing on the neighboring system.[95]

52. With respect to stakeholder input in the identification of potential interregional transmission solutions, MISO and PJM propose that the Joint RTO Planning Committee shall provide a minimum of 60 days advance notice of the annual Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting to review transmission issues identified by the Joint RTO Planning Committee following evaluation of each RTO's annual regional planning report.[96] MISO and PJM propose that stakeholders may identify and submit transmission issues and supporting analysis for review and consideration by the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee and Joint RTO Planning Committee at least 30 days prior to the annual Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting. MISO and PJM further propose that, if the Joint RTO Planning Committee chooses to conduct a Coordinated System Plan study, those issues reviewed by the Joint RTO Planning Committee and Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee will be considered when developing potential remedies.[97] Furthermore, MISO and PJM propose that stakeholder input will be solicited for potential remedies to identified issues.[98]

---

[95] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 20-21; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 16-17; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2.2 (Data and Information Exchange upon Request) (1.0.0).

[96] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(a)(i) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0); MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Article IX, § 9.3.5.2(a)(i) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).

[97] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(iv) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0); MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(iv) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).

[98] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(iv) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0); MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(iv) (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).

(b) Protests/Comments

53. Duke-American Transmission and Wind Parties protest the frequency of MISO's and PJM's proposed Coordinated System Plan study. Duke-American Transmission requests that the Commission direct MISO and PJM to establish a required minimum frequency for conducting Coordinated System Plan studies.[99] Duke-American Transmission argues that this change is necessary because, if MISO and PJM are not required to conduct Coordinated System Plan studies at some minimum frequency, such as every two years, they may not identify interregional transmission facilities to more efficiently and cost-effectively address local and regional transmission needs. Wind Parties support the inclusion of a backstop provision to allow a single region to initiate a Coordinated System Plan in the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee process.[100] However, Wind Parties note that the Coordinated System Plan backstop provision may not be sufficient to ensure that all cost effective and efficient interregional transmission projects are considered and receive reasonable evaluation to determine if their benefits exceed their costs. Wind Parties argue that the requirement that two years pass without agreement between MISO and PJM before the backstop mechanism applies will cause the study of potentially beneficial projects to be delayed two years.[101]

54. MISO Transmission Owners contend that MISO's and PJM's proposed revisions concerning participation in multi-party studies could create an obligation for MISO to participate in transmission studies merely because PJM agrees to participate, without regard to whether there is merit to MISO's participation. MISO Transmission Owners support MISO's participation in regional and interregional transmission study and planning when there is a reason for MISO to be involved, such as a need for inclusion of MISO data or consideration of impacts on the MISO transmission operations or impacts that MISO operations may have on other parts of the Eastern Interconnection. But MISO Transmission Owners do not want MISO drawn into potentially costly and time consuming studies when there is no need for MISO involvement or no benefit to be gained from MISO participation. MISO Transmission Owners state that the balance is best struck by maintaining the existing language that directs Joint RTO Planning Committee involvement in studies that involve both MISO and PJM interests, and otherwise allows MISO and PJM to participate individually.[102] MISO Transmission

---

[99] Duke-American Transmission Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2.

[100] Wind Parties Protest, Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER14-1945-000, at 4.

[101] *Id.* at 4-5.

[102] MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 5.

Owners argue that Order No. 1000 does require the broad level of participation that MISO and PJM propose.[103]

(c) Answers

55. PJM contends that MISO and PJM comply with the data exchange requirements of Order No. 1000. PJM argues that they meet this requirement by preparing a regional transmission planning report that documents the RTO's respective regional transmission plan and each agreeing to share, on an ongoing basis (1) information stemming from its regional transmission planning process that may be necessary or appropriate for effective coordination between the regions[104] and (2) identified transmission solutions that may affect the neighboring RTO's system.[105] PJM argues that these activities are consistent with the requirement in Order No. 1000 to improve coordination of neighboring transmission regions' activities.[106] For further support, PJM points to the proposed revisions to the Coordinated System Plan study process section of the MISO-PJM JOA that provide that "the study scope will include evaluation of issues identified and evaluated by the Joint RTO Planning Committee and the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee 'to further evaluate potential solutions' consistent with criteria previously accepted by the Commission and set forth in section 9.4.3.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA."[107]

56. MISO and PJM disagree with the concerns regarding the frequency of Coordinated System Plan studies and/or argument that the Commission should require

[103] *Id.* at 4-5.

[104] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 13-14 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2 (Data and Information Exchange) (1.0.0)).

[105] *Id.* (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.1 (Single Party Planning) (1.0.0)).

[106] *Id.* at 14 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 415).

[107] *Id.* (citing PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 17; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ii) (1.0.0)). PJM states that the criteria for cross-border reliability or market efficiency projects generally comply with the Final Rule as the criteria require, inter alia, that a proposed project must qualify as a reliability or market efficiency project under each RTO's respective tariffs; the project costs must meet a minimum threshold and it must satisfy a specific benefit-to-cost ratio on the criteria detailed in section 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA.

MISO and PJM to establish a required minimum frequency for conducting Coordinated System Plan studies.[108] MISO and PJM also disagree with Wind Parties' request that the Commission require MISO and PJM to modify the proposed MISO-PJM JOA to allow one party to initiate a Coordinated System Plan study after one year of disagreement.[109] MISO and PJM state that these concerns over the frequency of Coordinated System Plan studies are unwarranted and no change should be made to MISO's and PJM's proposal for Coordinated System Plan studies. MISO and PJM state that they have committed to the annual exchange of regional transmission plans and the review of associated identified transmission issues. MISO and PJM explain that this review of transmission issues will include stakeholder involvement through the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee. MISO and PJM further explain that transmission projects are also introduced in their respective individual transmission planning processes as a control against unreasonable refusals to perform Coordinated System Plan studies in the Joint RTO Planning Committee. Based on these safeguards, MISO and PJM argue that concerns that the performance of Coordinated System Plan studies can be unilaterally controlled or hindered by either RTO are unfounded.[110]

57. MISO and PJM argue that the Coordinated System Plan study process exceeds the requirements of Order No. 1000, which does not require interregional transmission planning. In support, MISO and PJM point out that Order No. 1000 requires only coordination and sharing of regional transmission plans "to identify possible interregional transmission facilities that could address transmission needs more efficiently or cost-effectively than separate regional transmission facilities."[111] MISO and PJM also note that Order No. 1000 does not require that a Coordinated System Plan study be performed on all proposed projects, even if the Joint RTO Planning Committee's and/or Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee's review of identified transmission issues indicates that such studies are necessary.[112] MISO and PJM add that

[108] MISO and PJM Joint Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 4 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing Duke-American Transmission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 5-7; Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 12-13).

[109] *Id.* (citing Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER14-1945-000, at 5).

[110] *Id.* at 4-5

[111] *Id.* at 5 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 396, 399; Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 511).

[112] *Id.* at 6-7.

requiring them to conduct a Coordinated System Plan study every year, even when not necessitated by identified transmission issues, would be unduly resource intensive, administratively burdensome, and potentially wasteful.[113]

58. MISO and PJM note that they have committed to annually exchange regional plans and to jointly review transmission issues that may have an interregional impact. MISO and PJM explain that stakeholders will be involved in the annual transmission issue review – which could include proposed solutions to these issues –through the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee.[114] MISO and PJM further explain that following the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee's review of the identified transmission issues, "the [Joint RTO Planning Committee] will take into consideration the input received from the [Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee] to determine whether or not there is a need to perform a Coordinated System Plan study."[115] MISO and PJM argue that this process will ensure that the need to perform a study will be considered with respect to all projects.[116]

59. MISO argues that MISO Transmission Owners' concerns that the proposed revisions for participation in multi-party studies could create an obligation for MISO to be required to participate in a study with a third-party is unfounded. MISO states that neither RTO can unilaterally obligate the other RTO to participate in a study in which it does not see value. For support, MISO notes that the MISO-PJM JOA states that the decision whether to participate in a multi-party study is made by the Joint RTO Planning Committee, whose decisions require agreement between the representatives of MISO and PJM. MISO claims that the provision's use of the word "may" makes participation in such studies optional.[117]

(d) Commission Determination

60. We find that the MISO-PJM JOA partially complies with the data and information exchange requirements of Order No. 1000. With respect to MISO's and PJM's

---

[113] *Id.* at 5.

[114] *Id.* at 6 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.2 (Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee) (1.0.0)).

[115] *Id.* (citing MISO Attachment FF Filing, Docket No. ER13-1945-000, at 13).

[116] *Id.*

[117] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 37-38 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1.2 (1.0.0)).

requirement to share results of their regional transmission plans, the MISO-PJM JOA provides that they will do so in order to facilitate effective transmission coordination between the regions.[118] The MISO-PJM JOA also provides that MISO and PJM will annually share transmission planning data and information. Specifically, among other things, MISO and PJM will exchange power flow models for projected system conditions for the transmission planning horizon (up to the next ten years) that include planned generation development and retirements, planned transmission facilities and seasonal load projections, system stability models, production cost models, and the underlying assumptions and contingency lists used in those models.[119] In addition, the MISO-PJM JOA includes proposed revisions requiring MISO and PJM to provide other data and information needed for each to plan its own system accurately and reliably and to assess the impact of conditions existing on the system of the other party.[120]

61. Subject to our directive above in the General Requirements section of this order that MISO and PJM must revise the definition of cross-border allocation projects consistent with the definition of interregional transmission facility in Order No. 1000 to explicitly allow for transmission projects that are located in two or more transmission planning regions, we find that the MISO-PJM JOA complies with the requirements to identify interregional transmission facilities. The MISO-PJM JOA provides for coordination of information resulting from each RTO's transmission planning activities necessary to fulfill that party's obligations under its tariff.[121] The MISO-PJM JOA also provides for the development of a Coordinated System Plan as well as procedures for coordinating generator or merchant transmission interconnection requests and any long-term firm transmission service reservation. In addition, each party agrees to assist in the preparation of a Coordinated System Plan applicable to MISO's and PJM's systems. The MISO-PJM JOA also explains that the Coordinated System Plan will integrate MISO's and PJM's respective transmission expansion plans, including any market-based additions to system infrastructure and Network Upgrades identified jointly by MISO and PJM, and will set forth actions to resolve any impacts that may result across the seams between MISO's and PJM's systems due to the integration.[122] The MISO-PJM JOA also

---

[118] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1.1 (Joint RTO Planning Committee Responsibilities) (1.0.0);. *Id.* § 9.2.2(g) (Data and Information Exchange Upon Request) (1.0.0); *Id.* § 9.2 (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).

[119] *Id.* § 9.2.1 (Annual Data and Information Exchange Requirement) (1.0.0).

[120] *Id.* § 9.2.2 (Data and Information Exchange Upon Request) (1.0.0).

[121] *Id.* § 9.3.1 (Single Party Planning) (1.0.0).

[122] *Id.* § 9.3.5.1 (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

provides that, on an annual basis, MISO and PJM shall conduct an annual evaluation of transmission issues, including those submitted by stakeholders.[123] Following this annual evaluation, the Joint RTO Planning Committee will determine the need to perform a Coordinated System Plan.[124]

62. MISO and PJM also agree to form ad hoc study groups as needed to address localized seams issues or to perform targeted studies of particular areas, transmission needs or potential expansions and to ensure the coordinated reliability and efficiency of the systems. Under the direction of MISO and PJM, study groups will formalize how activities will be implemented.

63. We deny Duke-American Transmission's and Wind Parties' request that the Commission require MISO and PJM to conduct a Coordinated System Plan study more frequently. The MISO-PJM JOA provides that a Coordinated System Study will be performed (i) if each party in the Joint RTO Planning Committee votes in favor of conducting a Coordinated System Plan study; or (ii) if after two consecutive years a Coordinated System Plan study has not been performed, and either MISO or PJM votes in favor of conducting such study.[125] We agree with MISO and PJM that Order No. 1000 does not require a Coordinated System Plan study to be performed more frequently, such as annually, regardless of whether such a study is necessary.

64. We find that the procedures regarding participation in multi-party studies in the joint evaluation process proposed by MISO and PJM comply with the requirements of Order No. 1000. Contrary to MISO Transmission Owners' assertion, the proposed provisions do not create an obligation for MISO to participate in a study with a third-party because PJM agrees to participate in such a study. We agree with MISO that the proposed language does not unilaterally obligate the other RTO to participate in a study in which it does not see value. Further, we agree with MISO that the provision's use of the word "may" makes participation in such studies optional. Therefore, we will not require MISO and PJM to remove this proposed provision from the MISO-PJM JOA.

65. We find, however, that MISO and PJM have not complied with Order No. 1000's requirement to explain how stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission facilities for joint evaluation.[126] The Commission required the

---

[123] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2.a(i) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[124] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2.b(ii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[125] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2.a (ii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[126] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 522.

developer of an interregional transmission project to first propose its interregional transmission project in the regional transmission planning processes of each of the neighboring regions in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located, which will trigger the procedure under which the public utility transmission providers, acting through their regional transmission planning process, will jointly evaluate the proposed transmission project.[127] It is unclear where and when, in MISO's and PJM's respective regional transmission planning processes, stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission projects. We acknowledge that MISO uses a competitive solicitation process to identify and select regional transmission projects for purposes of cost allocation. However, MISO should be able to create a point in its regional transmission planning process where stakeholders and transmission developers can submit ideas for interregional transmission projects that MISO then submits to the Joint RTO Planning Committee.[128] Alternatively, MISO and PJM could decide to allow stakeholders and transmission developers to submit proposals for interregional transmission projects to the Joint RTO Planning Committee. If MISO and PJM opt for this alternative, we note that the process must be transparent so that stakeholders and transmission developers understand why their interregional transmission project does or does not move forward in the process. Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a compliance filing revising the MISO-PJM JOA and their respective OATT to either (1) make clear how and where stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission projects for joint evaluation through MISO's and PJM's regional transmission planning processes, or (2) allow stakeholders and transmission developers to propose interregional transmission projects and explain how the process is transparent so that stakeholders and transmission developers understand why their interregional transmission project does or does not move forward in the process.

---

[127] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 506.

[128] The Commission found that Attachment FF to the MISO Tariff and MISO's Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual "indicate when and where the [MISO Regional Planning process] sponsors of transmission, generation and demand response have an opportunity to provide their input regarding the development of base-line assumptions (i.e., an identification of the resources [MISO] assumes are going to exist in the future and where load will be located) and the potential solutions, including alternatives, being considered by [MISO] to meet future needs[]" and "clearly indicate how [MISO] will select the preferred solution from competing alternatives such that all types of resources are considered on a comparable basis." MISO Order No. 890 Compliance Order II, 127 FERC ¶ 61,169 at P 22 (citations omitted).

ii. Procedure for Joint Evaluation

66. In Order No. 1000, the Commission required each public utility transmission provider to establish procedures with each of its neighboring transmission planning regions in its interconnection to jointly evaluate interregional transmission facilities.[129] The submission of an interregional transmission project in each regional transmission planning process will trigger the procedure under which the public utility transmission providers, acting through their regional transmission planning processes, will jointly evaluate the proposed transmission project.[130]

67. The Commission required that joint evaluation be conducted in the same general timeframe as, rather than subsequent to, each transmission planning region's individual consideration of the proposed interregional transmission project.[131] The Commission explained that, to meet the requirement to conduct the joint evaluation in the same general time frame, it expected public utility transmission providers to develop a timeline that provides a meaningful opportunity to review and evaluate through the interregional transmission coordination procedures information developed through the regional transmission planning process and, similarly, provides a meaningful opportunity to review and use in the regional transmission planning process information developed in the interregional transmission coordination procedures.[132]

68. In addition, the Commission required that the compliance filing by public utility transmission providers in neighboring transmission planning regions include a description of the types of transmission studies that will be conducted to evaluate

---

[129] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 493 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 396). *See also* Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 435. As explained above in the Data Exchange and Identifying Interregional Transmission Facilities section of this order, a developer must first propose an interregional transmission project in each regional transmission planning processes in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located.

[130] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 506.

[131] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 506 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 439).

[132] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 439. Order No. 1000 does not require that interregional transmission projects be evaluated simultaneously by both regions or in joint sessions of both regions' stakeholders. *Id.* P 438.

conditions on their neighboring transmission systems for the purpose of determining whether interregional transmission facilities are more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission facilities.[133] Additionally, the Commission directed each public utility transmission provider to develop procedures by which differences in the data, models, assumptions, transmission planning horizons, and criteria used to study a proposed interregional transmission project can be identified and resolved for purposes of jointly evaluating a proposed interregional transmission facility.[134]

(a) Compliance Filings

69. MISO and PJM propose to jointly evaluate identified transmission solutions as part of the Coordinated System Plan study process. The Joint RTO Planning Committee will be responsible for the screening and evaluation of potential transmission solutions, including evaluating the proposed transmission projects for designation as a cross-border allocation project.[135] After completion of the Coordinated System Plan study, the Joint RTO Planning Committee shall produce a report detailing the transmission issues evaluated, studies performed, solutions considered, and, if applicable, cross-border allocation projects recommended with the associated cost allocation.[136] MISO and PJM state that they will provide this report to the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee for review and comment[137] and post the final Coordinated System Plan report on their respective websites.[138] MISO and PJM explain that the Joint RTO Planning Committee's recommended cross-border allocation projects that were identified in the Coordinated System Plan study shall be reviewed by each RTO through its regional transmission plans and presented to its Board for approval and implementation under its

[133] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 398; Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 493. The Commission did not require any particular type of studies be conducted. Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 398.

[134] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 437; Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 506, 510.

[135] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(vii) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[136] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[137] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 14 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0)).

[138] *Id.* (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0)).

regional procedures.[139] MISO and PJM note that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA provides an expedited approval process for upgrades identified as critical.[140] Specifically, MISO and PJM propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to state that "[c]ritical upgrades for which the need to begin development is urgent will be reviewed by each Party in accordance with their procedures and presented to the Parties' Boards for approval as soon as possible after identification through the coordinated planning process."[141]

70. MISO and PJM argue that their proposal is consistent with Order No. 1000's requirement that coordination and joint evaluation take place in the same general timeframe as each region's consideration of its regional transmission plan because the scheduling of the Joint RTO Planning Committee annual review will take into consideration each RTO's planning cycle to provide a meaningful opportunity to review and use such information in the regional transmission planning process.[142] MISO and PJM note that the Coordinated System Plan also identifies actions to resolve any cross-border impacts and describes the results of the joint transmission analysis, as well as provides an explanation, if necessary, of the procedures, methodologies and business rules applied in preparing and completing the analysis.[143]

71. MISO and PJM propose to revise the Coordinated System Plan study process to provide that the planning models will be developed pursuant to procedures established by the Joint RTO Planning Committee that are consistent with the models and assumptions used in each RTO's most recently completed planning cycle. MISO and PJM propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to state that "[t]he [Joint RTO Planning Committee] will develop joint study models consistent with the models and assumptions used for the regional transmission planning cycle most recently completed"[144] and that "[p]arties will

---

[139] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(x) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[140] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 18; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 14-15. Each RTO reserves the right to identify required transmission upgrades to its Board for approval at any time. PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(x) (Coordinated System Plan Study Process) (1.0.0).

[141] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(x) (Coordinated System Plan Study Process) (1.0.0).

[142] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(a)(i) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[143] *Id.* § 9.3.5.1 (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[144] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

develop compromises on assumptions when feasible and will incorporate study sensitivities as appropriate when different regional assumptions must be accommodated."[145]

(b) Protests/Comments

72. Nine Public Interest Organizations, Duke-American Transmission, and Wind Parties are concerned that the provisions of the MISO-PJM JOA limit the ability of the regions to jointly evaluate potential interregional transmission solutions. Specifically, Nine Public Interest Organizations contend that cost-effective and efficient interregional transmission projects may remain stuck in the regional transmission planning process whenever either MISO or PJM refuses to jointly study the project through the proposed Coordinated System Plan study process. Nine Public Interest Organizations reason that, if an interregional transmission project is under evaluation in both regional transmission planning processes, it should be studied in the interregional transmission planning process as well. Nine Public Interest Organizations also argue that, if both MISO and PJM have chosen to study such a transmission project in their regional process, they should not object to an interregional transmission study, where common models, assumptions and other data, models, assumptions, planning horizons and criteria can be applied to the transmission project. Nine Public Interest Organizations recommend requiring either a full Coordinated System Plan or a more specific study whenever an interregional transmission project is under review in both regional transmission planning processes.[146]

73. Duke-American Transmission asserts that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA revisions should require the RTOs to study all proposed interregional transmission projects. Duke-American Transmission contends that, under the proposed provisions of the MISO-PJM JOA, even if the RTOs decide to conduct a Coordinated System Plan study in a given year, there is no requirement that the RTOs jointly evaluate all or any of the transmission projects proposed by developers and stakeholders. Duke-American Transmission states that the MISO and PJM proposal merely allows developers and other stakeholders to provide input on what transmission issues should be considered in the interregional transmission planning study and potential solutions to those issues. Duke-American Transmission argues that the MISO-PJM JOA provisions would allow the RTOs to decide which projects they will study in the proposed Coordinated System Plan study.[147]

---

[145] *Id.*

[146] Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 13.

[147] Duke-American Transmission Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 8.

74. Similarly, Wind Parties contend that interregional transmission projects proposed by stakeholders other than MISO and PJM, such as merchant transmission providers, may never be studied if neither MISO nor PJM is willing to support the need for a study of these proposed transmission projects. Wind Parties argue that MISO and PJM may protect their interests and those of their member transmission owners by avoiding evaluation of interregional transmission projects proposed by others. To address these concerns, Wind Parties request that the Commission require changes to the MISO-PJM JOA and the respective tariffs that will allow one party to initiate a Coordinated System Plan study after one year of disagreement and require MISO and PJM to develop a reasonable path for third parties to initiate a Coordinated System Plan.[148]

75. Organization of MISO States argues that MISO and PJM fail to address how MISO's and PJM's developer selection processes will be coordinated in the proposed interregional transmission coordination procedures. It explains that MISO and PJM have very different processes for selecting which entity will construct, own, and operate transmission projects that are approved by the RTO.[149] Due to these differences, Organization of MISO States claims that the timeframes for project identification and developer selection are not consistent across MISO and PJM and, therefore, under MISO's and PJM's respective competitive processes, the transmission owner for a cross-border project will not be identified until the respective RTO's competitive process has concluded. Organization of MISO States adds that the timeline suggested by the MISO-PJM JOA provisions do not comport with the project selection process or the consequent transmission owner selection process set forth in the PJM Tariff. Organization of MISO

[148] Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 5-6.

[149] Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 16. Organization of MISO States points out that, in MISO, baseline reliability projects are assigned to the incumbent transmission owner(s), and the designated entity for market efficiency projects and Multi-Value Projects that proceed through a competitive bidding process is determined after the MISO Board has approved the transmission project as part of the MISO Transmission Expansion Plan process. Organization of MISO States conversely explains that the competitive selection process adopted by PJM is a project sponsorship method that simultaneously identifies the project and the developer of that project after the transmission need or problem has been identified by PJM so, as a result, there will be no PJM-recommended or PJM-proposed transmission projects until after the conclusion of PJM's competitive project selection process. *Id.* at 16-17.

States argues that MISO and PJM must clarify how the steps in their proposals will work given the difference in the competitive selection processes.[150]

76. AEP states that, because interregional transmission solutions must meet three sets of criteria (i.e., PJM's criteria, MISO's criteria, and the MISO-PJM JOA criteria) instead of the single set of criteria that must be satisfied by regional transmission projects, the evaluation process contains a bias in favor of regional transmission projects and against interregional transmission solutions. AEP states that developers are discouraged from proposing interregional transmission projects because of the difficulty in designing transmission projects that could satisfy all three sets of criteria.[151] AEP argues that modest adjustments to the current MISO-PJM JOA process for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects would improve interregional transmission planning significantly. Specifically, AEP contends that the joint benefit to cost threshold and associated requirements in the MISO-PJM JOA should be eliminated and replaced with each RTO using its own regional benefit to cost threshold and requirements. AEP claims that, if each RTO performs its own market efficiency study using its own benefit metrics and requirements, then there would be no need for a joint benefit calculation metric because the joint benefit calculation would add little to the evaluation of a transmission project. AEP states that in that instance the MISO-PJM JOA would only need to address how a proposed interregional transmission project should be submitted to each RTO for evaluation as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project.[152]

77. With respect to projects in the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project category, AEP argues that the RTOs should eliminate the joint study criteria and requirements. AEP suggests that instead the RTOs should apply their respective regional study criteria and requirements but enhance their requirements. AEP contends that both RTOs should include in their respective regional transmission study analysis transmission facilities that are located in the neighboring RTO footprint so that all reliability impacts on either RTO are identified and addressed. AEP states that the reliability impacts in one RTO that affect its neighbor should be accounted for in each region's reliability study. AEP asserts that violations identified in one RTO through planning studies conducted by the other RTO must be addressed by both RTOs and that solutions can be included in the appropriate regional transmission expansion plans.[153] AEP also argues that each RTO should include testing conditions similar to those utilized in the other RTO footprint

---

[150] *Id.* at 16-18.

[151] AEP Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, at 3-4.

[152] *Id.* at 11.

[153] *Id.* at 8-9

when conducting its regional reliability testing. AEP notes that, when one RTO is testing for load deliverability in its footprint, it should also model similar load deliverability conditions in the adjacent area of the other RTO because the emergency conditions (e.g., extreme weather) that cause the load deliverability testing in its footprint are likely to exist in the adjacent areas that are located right across the seam in the other RTO footprint. AEP contends that the RTOs should also ensure that the generation deactivations modeled by one RTO in its reliability testing are included in the reliability testing conducted by the neighboring RTO.[154] AEP asserts that, if MISO and PJM incorporate these two enhancements into their respective regional reliability study processes, then a joint reliability study will not be necessary or particularly helpful to identifying and evaluating interregional transmission solutions.[155]

78. With respect to MISO's and PJM's proposed procedure for critical upgrades, Organization of MISO States supports an expedited approval process exception for reliability projects that may have a justifiable need. However, Organization of MISO States questions what would constitute a critical upgrade for which the need to begin development is urgent in the context of the MISO-PJM JOA procedures because there is no corresponding definition of "need" or "urgent" in the MISO-PJM JOA. Organization of MISO States contends that, without further clarification in the MISO-PJM JOA, some projects that should not be granted expedited review could be considered for such a process and exempt from a full regional review cycle to assess the necessity and compatibility of the transmission project within each respective region.[156] Organization of MISO States suggests that MISO and PJM include in this section of the MISO-PJM JOA a definition of "need" and "urgent," similar to the language in the respective MISO and PJM Tariffs and associated Business Practice Manual. Organization of MISO States argues that providing this clarification within the MISO-PJM JOA will provide groups (such as the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Joint RTO Planning Committee, and other MISO and PJM stakeholders) with the information necessary to evaluate and justify a particular interregional transmission project for expedited approval post-Joint RTO Planning Committee recommendation and ensure that only needed and urgent reliability projects are eligible for the expedited approval process.[157]

---

[154] *Id.* at 9.

[155] *Id.* at 9.

[156] Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 13-14.

[157] *Id.* at 14-16.

79. Nine Public Interest Organizations are concerned that MISO's and PJM's proposed revisions regarding the harmonization of models and assumptions between the two regions lack procedures for identifying and resolving differences in data, models, assumptions, planning horizons, and criteria exchanged for the purpose of evaluating potential facilities.[158] Nine Public Interest Organizations allege that MISO and PJM recognize that the models will likely not align perfectly because the MISO-PJM JOA revisions state that "[t]he Parties will develop compromises on assumptions *when feasible* and will incorporate study sensitivities *as appropriate* when different regional assumptions must be accommodated."[159] Nine Public Interest Organizations assert that these data harmonization provisions are insufficient to meet Order No. 1000's requirements because the promise to create procedures for planning models in the future is insufficient and the procedures must be included in the MISO-PJM JOA itself. Nine Public Interest Organizations also argue that the MISO-PJM JOA proposal does not contain necessary details about how differences in data, models, assumptions, planning horizons and criteria will be handled as part of interregional transmission coordination. Nine Public Interest Organizations assert that terms such as "when feasible" and "as appropriate" are too vague and uncertain to constitute criteria in a procedure and that the lack of clear language may lead to a material problem when MISO and PJM disagree about data, models, assumptions, planning horizons and criteria. Nine Public Interest Organizations conclude that the MISO-PJM JOA revisions fail to ensure effective coordination for purposes of joint evaluation and therefore do not to comply with Order No. 1000.[160]

(c) Answers

80. MISO agrees with AEP that, to the extent possible, hurdles to qualification as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project should be minimized. MISO is willing to explore the possibility of eliminating the MISO-PJM JOA's benefits-to-costs ratio criterion in favor of relying on each RTO's regional ratio. MISO states that such a change would need to be vetted in MISO's and PJM's stakeholder processes before being implemented. MISO claims that it proposed changes to the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project criteria to minimize unnecessary hurdles to qualification during the Order No. 1000 compliance discussions with the PJM Transmission Owners but the PJM

[158] Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 10.

[159] *Id.* (citing MISO-PJM JOA at § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (emphasis added by Nine Public Interest Organizations)).

[160] *Id.* at 10-11.

Transmission Owners were not open to changing the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project criteria.[161]

81. However, MISO and PJM disagree with AEP's recommended changes to eliminate the joint study criteria and requirements with respect to projects in the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project category. First, MISO and PJM explain that it is not necessary to include PJM facilities in MISO's own regional studies and MISO facilities in PJM's own regional studies because they already monitor facilities of neighboring systems when performing regional planning analyses. MISO and PJM state that, as part of such monitoring, each RTO would notify its neighbor if a reliability issue was identified that could potentially impact the neighboring system. Second, MISO and PJM explain that it is not necessary to include testing conditions similar to those used by neighboring systems in the regional testing because they currently use the models provided by their neighbors in the tests. MISO and PJM add that they would coordinate with a neighbor if they identified an issue affecting the neighboring RTO in order to confirm the identified issue exists.[162]

82. Duke-American Transmission continues to object to MISO's and PJM's proposed Coordinated System Planning process and the lack of formal procedures for evaluating all interregional transmission projects proposed by developers. Duke-American Transmission argues that, according to Order No. 1000, a developer of an interregional transmission project should first propose its transmission project in the regional transmission planning processes of each of the neighboring regions in which the transmission facility is proposed to be located and a joint interregional evaluation should follow shortly thereafter.[163]

83. Duke-American Transmission argues that the proposed MISO-PJM approach ignores the plain language in Order No. 1000 regarding interregional transmission coordination, provides too much discretion to MISO and PJM and does not require that the RTOs jointly evaluate proposed transmission projects. It argues that the RTOs' proposed annual review of transmission issues- "which could include proposed solutions to these issues"- with stakeholder involvement to determine whether a study should be

[161] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 38-39 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[162] *Id.* at 7.

[163] Duke-American Transmission Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 2-3 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436).

conducted,[164] does not ensure that all proposed interregional transmission projects will receive joint interregional evaluation as required in Order No. 1000.[165]

84. Duke-American Transmission argues that the proposal will introduce uncertainty for transmission facility developers interested in proposing interregional transmission facilities to address customer needs. Duke-American Transmission contends that such an open-ended proposal by the RTOs does not comply with Order No. 1000 because it renders meaningless the language requiring RTOs to "ensure that developers of interregional transmission facilities have an opportunity for their transmission projects to be evaluated."[166] Duke-American Transmission requests that the Commission order MISO and PJM to work with their stakeholders to develop appropriate procedures for evaluating proposed interregional transmission projects and require that such procedures be submitted in a compliance filing for Commission approval.[167]MISO disagrees with the Organization of MISO States' argument that MISO must define "need" and "urgent" in the MISO-PJM JOA. MISO explains that, consistent with the statement in the MISO-PJM JOA that critical upgrades "will be reviewed by each Party in accordance with their procedures," MISO would follow the Out-of-Cycle project review process outlined in section 6.1.1 of MISO's Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual.[168] Section 6.1.1 states that an Out-of-Cycle project must (1) be a Baseline Reliability Project or other reliability project required for compliance with the transmission planning reliability criteria of a member Transmission Owner as posted on the MISO Planning website; (2) address a need that has been identified after the project submittal cutoff date of the prior annual MISO Regional Planning cycle as posted on the MISO webpage; (3) address a new load addition, a change of generator operating status, or a regulatory or legal mandate; and (4) have a required need date with three years of the Out-of-Cycle request date and an expected in-service date within four years of the Out-of-Cycle request date.[169]

---

[164] *Id.* at 4 (quoting MISO and PJM Joint Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 6).

[165] *Id.* (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436).

[166] *Id.* at 4-5 (quoting Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 345).

[167] *Id.* at 5.

[168] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 33 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, §9.3.5.2(b)(x) (1.0.0)).

[169] MISO, Business Practices Manual 20, Transmission Planning, § 6.1.1, *available at* https://www.misoenergy.org/_layouts/MISO/ECM/Redirect.aspx?ID=19215.

85. MISO disagrees with the Organization of MISO States' contention that MISO and PJM fail to address how each RTO's developer selection process will be coordinated in the proposed interregional transmission procedures. First, MISO responds that Order No. 1000 does not require the developer selection process to be particularly addressed as part of interregional compliance filings. Second, MISO points out that the developer selection process used to determine the Transmission Owner will be in accord with the tariff of the RTO that ultimately has functional control of the project. MISO states, for example, that if the transmission project will be under the functional control of PJM, then the PJM developer selection process will be used to determine the Transmission Owner, and vice-versa for a project under MISO's functional control. MISO explains that, for a facility that terminates in both RTOs, an agreement would need to be reached on a case-by-case basis as to the portion of the project that would be owned by the MISO Transmission Owner and PJM Transmission Owner, respectively.[170]

86. MISO and PJM disagree with Nine Public Interest Organizations' contention that MISO's and PJM's proposal fails to provide procedures for harmonizing differences in data, models, assumptions, planning horizons, and criteria. MISO and PJM argue that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA does set forth a process for addressing differences in such regional transmission planning assumptions when developing joint models. MISO and PJM note that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA provides that MISO and PJM will use planning models that are developed in accordance with procedures established by the Joint RTO Planning Committee.[171] MISO and PJM explain that the Joint RTO Planning Committee must then develop joint study models "consistent with the models and assumptions used for the regional planning cycle most recently completed."[172] MISO and PJM note that differences will be resolved through the Joint RTO Planning Committee with stakeholder input from the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee. MISO and PJM state that, as a last resort, the parties may implement the dispute resolution process in Article XIV of the MISO-PJM JOA. MISO and PJM assert that this existing process is consistent with Order No. 1000, which requires transmission providers to "develop procedures by which [differences in data, models, assumptions, planning horizons, and criteria used to study a proposed transmission project] can be

[170] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 34 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[171] MISO and PJM Joint Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 8 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (1.0.0)).

[172] *Id.* (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (1.0.0)).

identified and resolved for purposes of jointly evaluating the proposed interregional transmission facility."[173]

87. MISO and PJM add that the Commission did not direct a specific level of detail for procedures to harmonize data. MISO and PJM point out that the Commission only noted that "joint evaluation of a proposed interregional transmission facility cannot be effective without some effort by neighboring transmission planning regions" to harmonize differences.[174] MISO and PJM contend that that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA addresses the Commission's concern. MISO and PJM note that, without resorting to dispute resolution, they were able to successfully work through certain regional differences to reach agreement on future assumptions on fuel prices, escalation rates, and emission costs for use in the joint models employed in the current Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project study.[175] MISO and PJM argue that the proposed revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA adequately address data harmonization and do not require further modification.[176]

88. Similarly, PJM argues that, while Order No. 1000 requires that neighboring RTOs "harmonize differences in data, models, assumptions, planning horizons and criteria used to study a proposed transmission project,"[177] Order No. 1000 does not require that they be identical. PJM points out that, pursuant to section 9.2 of the proposed MISO-PJM JOA, MISO and PJM are required to exchange specific data and information on an annual basis to use to develop a common model for interregional transmission studies, which PJM intends to use in its studies to represent MISO's regional transmission system for purposes of interregional transmission coordination and planning.[178]

---

[173] *Id.* (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 437).

[174] *Id.* at 9 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 437).

[175] *Id.* (citing MISO's and PJM's presentation to the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee entitled, "MISO-PJM Planning Study IPSAC Meeting – Appendix – JOA Futures Assumptions," dated May 31, 2013, *available at*: https://www.misoenergy.org/Library/Repository/Meeting%20Material/Stakeholder/Workshops%20and%20Special%20Meetings/2013/IPSAC/20130531/20130531%20MISO%20PJM%20IPSAC%20Presentation.pdf).

[176] *Id.*

[177] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 19 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 437).

[178] *Id.*

(d) Commission Determination

89. We find that MISO's and PJM's proposed procedures for joint evaluation of identified interregional transmission facilities partially comply with Order No. 1000. While MISO and PJM's proposal generally complies, as discussed further below, we find that MISO and PJM have not proposed to consider regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements as part of the evaluation of an interregional transmission facility.[179] Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing that revises their proposed interregional transmission coordination procedures so that an interregional transmission facility that may resolve regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements can be considered by each respective regional transmission planning process.

90. Overall, MISO and PJM have proposed joint evaluation procedures that largely satisfy the requirements of Order No. 1000. MISO and PJM propose that their Joint RTO Planning Committee will screen and evaluate potential interregional transmission solutions using a Coordinated System Plan study.[180] Following this study, the Joint RTO Planning Committee will produce a report detailing the transmission issues evaluated, studies performed, solutions considered and, if applicable, recommended cross-border allocation projects.[181] This report is provided to the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee for review and comment.

91. MISO's and PJM's proposals are consistent with Order No. 1000's requirement that the joint evaluation of interregional transmission projects occur in the same general timeframe as each transmission planning regions individual consideration of a proposed

---

[179] Order No. 1000 defined Public Policy Requirements as requirements established by local, state or federal laws or regulations (i.e., enacted statutes passed by the legislature and signed by the executive and regulations promulgated by a relevant jurisdiction, whether within a state or at the federal level). Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 2. Order No. 1000-A clarified that Public Policy Requirements included local laws and regulations passed by a local governmental entity, such as a municipal or county government. Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 319.

[180] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3 (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).

[181] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0). As discussed above in the General Requirements section of this order, we have directed MISO and PJM to revise the definition of "cross-border allocation project" consistent with the definition of "interregional transmission facility" in Order No. 1000.

interregional transmission project. MISO and PJM propose that the scheduling of the Joint RTO Planning Committee annual review will take into consideration each RTO's transmission planning cycle to provide a meaningful opportunity to review and use such information in the regional transmission planning process.

92. We find that MISO's and PJM's proposal also complies with Order No. 1000's requirement that public utility transmission providers in neighboring regions include a description of the types of transmission studies conducted to evaluate conditions on their neighboring transmission systems for the purposes of determining whether interregional transmission projects are more efficient or cost effective than regional transmission facilities. MISO and PJM propose that, upon completion of the Coordinated System Plan study, the Joint RTO Planning Committee shall produce a report, which will include the transmission issues evaluated, studies performed, solutions considered, and, if applicable, recommended cross-border allocation projects.[182]

93. While the proposed evaluation criteria for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects and Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects account for both regions' reliability and economic transmission needs, we find that MISO and PJM have not proposed to consider regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements as part of the evaluation of an interregional transmission facility. In Order No. 1000-A, the Commission explained that

> [i]n Order No. 1000, the Commission determined that interregional transmission coordination neither requires nor precludes longer-term interregional transmission planning, including consideration of transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements. Order No. 1000 stated that whether and how to address this issue with regard to interregional transmission facilities is a matter for public utility transmission providers, through their regional transmission planning processes, to resolve in the development of compliance proposals. We clarify that Order No. 1000 does not require or prohibit consideration of transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements as part of interregional transmission coordination. However, such considerations are required through the regional transmission planning process, which is an integral part of interregional transmission coordination because all interregional transmission projects must be selected in both of the relevant regional transmission planning processes in order

[182] *Id.*

> to receive interregional cost allocation. Therefore, consideration of transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements is an essential part of the evaluation of an interregional transmission project, not as part of interregional transmission coordination, but rather as part of the relevant regional transmission planning processes. As such, we continue to believe that the decision of whether and how to address these issues with regard to interregional transmission facilities in the regional transmission planning processes is a matter for public utility transmission providers to work out with their stakeholders in the development of compliance proposals.[183]

94. In their compliance proposals, MISO and PJM propose to identify interregional transmission facilities by jointly conducting a Coordinated System Plan study prior to evaluating interregional transmission facilities through their respective regional transmission planning processes for selection in their respective regional transmission plans for purposes of interregional cost allocation. They will evaluate proposed interregional transmission facilities using the Cross Border Baseline Reliability and/or Cross Border Market Efficiency criteria that focus exclusively on regional reliability and regional economic needs.[184] Contrary to PJM's assertion that these criteria generally comply with Order No. 1000, we find MISO and PJM's proposal does not comply with the evaluation requirements of Order No. 1000 because MISO and PJM do not have a way in their respective regional transmission process to evaluate proposed interregional transmission facilities that address regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements not captured by the Cross Border Baseline Reliability and Cross Border Market Efficiency Project categories.[185] PJM and MISO's compliance proposal involves

---

[183] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 500.

[184] For example, the criteria require that a Cross Border Market Efficiency Project satisfy MISO's regional criteria for a market efficiency project, which does not consider regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. Thus, an interregional transmission facility that primarily satisfies a regional transmission need driven by public policy requirements, but does not meet the criteria for a market efficiency project in MISO will never be evaluated at the regional level.

[185] *See, e.g.*, PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 14 n.58 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 17; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ii) (1.0.0)) (explaining that the criteria for cross-border reliability or market efficiency projects generally comply with the Final Rule because the criteria require that a proposed project

(continued ...)

interregional transmission planning, which is not required by Order No. 1000. [186] Given that they have chosen to conduct interregional transmission planning, their proposal is inconsistent with Order No. 1000-A's statement that the "consideration of transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements is an essential part of the evaluation of an interregional transmission project, not as part of interregional transmission coordination, but rather as part of the relevant regional transmission planning process."[187] Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing that revises their proposed interregional transmission coordination procedures so that an interregional transmission facility that may resolve regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements can be considered by each respective regional transmission planning process.

95. We find that MISO's and PJM's proposal satisfies Order No. 1000's requirement that each public utility transmission provider develop procedures by which differences in data, models, assumptions, transmission planning horizons, and criteria used to study a proposed interregional transmission project can be identified and resolved for purposes of joint evaluation for several reasons. The proposed provisions of the MISO-PJM JOA provide the steps that the RTOs will take to coordinate transmission planning models and modeling assumptions. The proposed revisions indicate that the RTOs will use transmission planning models that are developed in accordance with the procedures to be established by the Joint RTO Planning Committee. The proposal states that the Joint RTO Planning Committee will develop joint study models consistent with the models and assumptions used for the regional transmission planning cycle most recently completed. The proposal also states that RTOs will develop compromises on assumptions when feasible and will incorporate study sensitivities as appropriate when different regional assumptions must be accommodated. Finally, the proposed JOA provision indicates that known updates will be factored into models and that models will be available for stakeholder review.[188] Given our finding that these revisions comply with Order

---

must qualify as a reliability or market efficiency project under each RTO's respective tariffs).

[186] *See, e.g.*, Order No. 1000, FERC Stat. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 399 (clarifying that "the interregional transmission coordination requirements that [the Commission] adopt[s] do not require formation of interregional transmission planning entities or creation of a distinct interregional transmission planning process to produce an interregional transmission plan").

[187] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 500.

[188] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

No. 1000, we reject Nine Public Interest Organizations' argument that the MISO-PJM JOA proposal fails to ensure effective coordination for purposes of joint evaluation because it lacks certain procedures for identifying and resolving certain differences and certain terms are vague.

96. We find that Nine Public Interest Organizations' recommendation to require either a full Coordinated System Plan or some more specific study whenever an interregional transmission project is under review in both regional transmission planning processes is unnecessary to meet the requirements of Order No. 1000. Order No. 1000 explains that "submission of the interregional transmission project in each regional transmission planning process will trigger the procedure under which the public utility transmission providers, acting through their regional transmission planning process, will jointly evaluate the proposed transmission project."[189] We find that the annual review of transmission issues provided in the MISO-PJM JOA is sufficient for a stakeholder to present its proposals for consideration. However, we note that Order No. 1000 also stated that the regional transmission planning process should be informed by the evaluation conducted in the interregional transmission coordination process and vice versa.[190] Accordingly, we expect that, if an interregional transmission project is being considered in both regional transmission planning processes, the RTOs will also analyze the interregional transmission project in the interregional transmission coordination process.

97. We disagree with the Organization of MISO States' contention that it is unclear what would constitute a critical upgrade for which the need to begin development is urgent in the context of the MISO-PJM JOA procedures because there is no corresponding definition of "need" or "urgent" in the MISO-PJM JOA. First, we note that Organization of MISO States acknowledges that MISO and PJM currently have language in their tariffs that describe the limited circumstances in which a critical upgrade or critical need may be expedited in the regional transmission process such that the transmission project does not need to go through the normal transmission planning process.[191] Second, we find that the proposed language regarding critical upgrades in the

[189] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436.

[190] *See id.* P 439.

[191] The proposed language states that "[c]ritical upgrades for which the need to begin development is urgent will be reviewed by each Party *in accordance with their procedures* and presented to the Parties' Boards for approval as soon as possible after identification through the coordinated planning process." PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(x) (Coordinated System Plan Study Process) (1.0.0) (emphasis added).

joint evaluation process indicates that a proposed interregional transmission project will first be introduced in the regional transmission planning process to trigger the criteria to expedite the transmission project under each party's tariff provisions. Third, MISO has stated that it would follow the out-of-cycle project review process outlined in section 6.1.1 of MISO's Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual, which states that the out-of-cycle project must be a baseline reliability project and address a need identified after the submittal cutoff date of the prior MISO Regional Planning cycle. Finally, section 1.5.8 of Schedule 6 of the PJM Operating Agreement contains provisions for considering immediate need reliability transmission projects that cannot be considered through the normal transmission planning cycle. Because the RTOs have established procedures for handling transmission projects outside of their normal transmission planning cycle, we find it unnecessary to meet the requirements of Order No. 1000 to require MISO and PJM to further clarify or propose a specific definition of "need" and "urgent" in the MISO-PJM JOA.

98. We find that Duke-American Transmission's and Wind Parties' concerns regarding the potential treatment of third parties' interregional transmission proposals in the interregional transmission planning process may have merit. Based on our finding above in the Data Exchange and Identifying Interregional Transmission Facilities section of this order that MISO and PJM have not complied with Order No. 1000's requirements to explain (1) how stakeholders and transmission developers can propose interregional transmission facilities for joint evaluation and (2) how a proponent of an interregional transmission project may seek to have its interregional transmission project jointly evaluated by the MISO and PJM by submitting the interregional transmission project into MISO's and PJM's regional transmission planning processes, we have directed MISO and PJM either to provide an explanation or propose revisions to comply with these requirements. That compliance filing may address Duke-American Transmission's and Wind Parties' concerns. If it does not, protestors may raise their concerns again in that compliance filing proceeding.

99. We find that Order No. 1000 does not require, as AEP suggests, that the RTOs eliminate the joint benefit to cost threshold and the associated requirements and replace them with their respective regional benefit to cost threshold and requirements. With regard to AEP's request for increased efficiency, MISO in its answer acknowledges its agreement to minimize unnecessary hurdles in the interregional transmission process. Therefore, we encourage MISO and PJM to consider changes in the stakeholder process to reduce any unnecessary hurdles in selecting interregional transmission facilities, as defined in Order No. 1000.[192] We reject AEP's proposed revisions regarding the joint

[192] As discussed above in the General Requirements section of this order, we have directed MISO and PJM to revise the definition of "cross-border allocation project" consistent with the definition of "interregional transmission facility" in Order No. 1000.

study criteria and requirements as beyond the interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. We find that Order No. 1000 does not require further enhanced regional requirements, such as including testing conditions similar to those utilized in the other transmission planning region footprint when each transmission planning region conducts its regional reliability testing or ensuring that the generation deactivations modeled by one transmission planning region in its reliability testing are included in the reliability testing conducted by the neighboring transmission planning region. We find that, for purposes of compliance with Order No. 1000, MISO and PJM adequately coordinate with each other when they identify issues affecting the neighboring transmission planning region. We also find that the MISO and PJM Tariffs state that MISO and PJM include testing conditions similar to those used by their neighboring systems in their own regional testing because they use the models provided by their neighbors. We find sufficient that MISO and PJM coordinate with a neighbor if they identify through their regional transmission planning analysis an issue affecting the neighboring transmission planning region.

iii. Transparency and Stakeholder Participation

100. The Commission required public utility transmission providers, either individually or through their transmission planning region, to maintain a website or e-mail list for the communication of information related to interregional transmission coordination procedures.[193] While public utility transmission providers may maintain such information on an existing public utility transmission provider's website or a regional transmission planning website, the information must be posted in a way that enables stakeholders to distinguish between information related to interregional transmission coordination and information related to regional transmission planning.[194]

101. In order to facilitate stakeholder involvement, the Commission required public utility transmission providers, "subject to appropriate confidentiality protections and [Critical Energy Infrastructure Information] requirements," to "make transparent the analyses undertaken and determinations reached by neighboring transmission planning regions in the identification and evaluation of interregional transmission facilities."[195] The Commission also required that each public utility transmission provider describe in its OATT how the regional transmission planning process will enable stakeholders to

[193] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 458.

[194] *Id.*

[195] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 520 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 465 n.365).

provide meaningful and timely input with respect to the consideration of interregional transmission facilities.[196]

(a) Compliance Filings

102. MISO and PJM propose revisions that are intended to meet the requirements of Order No. 1000 by providing stakeholders with an open and transparent process and the opportunity to provide input into the Coordinated System Plan that will afford them opportunities to participate at every stage of the process.[197] MISO and PJM propose that each RTO provide its own website for communicating information related to interregional transmission coordination procedures. MISO and PJM propose requiring the Joint RTO Planning Committee to ensure that all information is accurate and consistent. MISO and PJM propose that each website must contain, at a minimum, the following: (1) a link to the MISO-PJM JOA;[198] (2) notices of scheduled Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings; (3) links to materials for Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings; and (4) documents related to the Coordinated System Plan studies.[199] PJM provides a link for its interregional transmission coordination webpage, separate from PJM's existing website, titled "Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee - MISO."[200]

103. MISO and PJM propose that, under the interregional transmission coordination process, stakeholders could provide feedback through

---

[196] *Id.* P 522.

[197] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 18.

[198] Related to this proceeding, in Docket No. ER13-1936-000, PJM also proposes to amend Schedule 6 of its Operating Agreement to include the PJM website links to its interregional transmission planning agreements for stakeholders to follow how interregional transmission coordination will be conducted. PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1936-000, at 6. (citing PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, Operating Agreement, Schedule 6, § 1.5.5 (Coordination of the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan) (4.0.0)). This tariff record will be addressed in a separate order.

[199] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 22; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 17; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1.3 (Coordinated System Planning Website) (1.0.0).

[200] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 22.

(1) the opportunity to review the transmission issues identified by the Joint RTO Planning Committee, as well as to identify and submit transmission issues for consideration by the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee and the Joint RTO Planning Committee for the Coordinated System Plan;[201]

(2) the opportunity to review and comment on the study's scope, assumptions, and proposed models if the Joint RTO Planning Committee, in consideration of Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee's input, decides that a Coordinated System Plan study is needed;[202]

(3) the ability to evaluate and provide input on potential remedies for identified transmission issues;[203]

(4) an opportunity to provide input into the development of potential solutions in the Coordinated System Plan study process;[204] and

(5) the opportunity to provide input on the final Coordinated System Plan study report, including recommended cross-border allocation projects, before it is finalized and posted on each RTO's website.[205]

MISO and PJM propose that the Joint RTO Planning Committee, through each RTO's respective electronic distribution lists, provide at least 60 days advance notice of the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting where the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee can review the Coordinated System Plan and

[201] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(a)(i) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[202] *Id.* §§ 9.3.5.2(b)(ii), (b)(vi) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[203] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(vi) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[204] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(vii) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0). Under the proposal, the Joint RTO Planning Committee is responsible for screening and evaluating potential solutions, including the cross-border allocation projects.

[205] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 23-24; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 18; PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

respond with input.[206] MISO and PJM propose that, if the Joint RTO Planning Committee decides to conduct a Coordinated System Study following this meeting, then the Joint RTO Planning Committee will develop scope and assumptions, process, and planning models. MISO and PJM state that the study scope and assumptions and the proposed models used for the study will be documented and provided to the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee for their review and input.[207] MISO and PJM propose that stakeholders review the planning models subject to CEII and confidentiality processes.[208] MISO and PJM propose that, at completion of the study, the Joint RTO Planning Committee provide the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee a report documenting the study (including the transmission issues evaluated, studies performed, solutions considered) and any recommended cross-border allocation projects with associated cost allocation. MISO and PJM propose to make the final study report available on each RTO's website after incorporating any Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee input.[209]

104. MISO and PJM propose to revise the MISO-PJM JOA to provide that, annually, each RTO will prepare a regional transmission planning report that documents its annual regional transmission plan and identifies transmission issues. MISO and PJM propose that these reports will be incorporated into the Coordinated System Plan by the Joint RTO Planning Committee. MISO and PJM explain that the Coordinated System Plan will: (1) integrate the RTOs' respective transmission expansion plans and evaluate their respective transmission issues; (2) identify actions to resolve any cross-border impacts; (3) describe the results of the joint transmission analysis for the combined transmission systems; and (4) explain the procedures, methodologies, and business rules used in preparing the joint transmission analysis.

---

[206] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, §§ 9.3.1 (Single Party Planning), 9.3.2 (Coordinated System Plan), 9.3.5.1 (Development of the Coordinated System Plan), 9.3.5.2(a)(1) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[207] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 18 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, §§ 9.3.5.2(b)(ii), (vi) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0)).

[208] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, §§ 9.3.5.2(b)(ii)-(vi) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[209] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

(b) Protests/Comments

105. Nine Public Interest Organizations contend that the proposed provisions do not assure that all relevant analyses and determinations will be available for stakeholder review in a manner that provides sufficient transparency, especially if MISO and PJM conduct the studies for the Joint Coordinated Study Plan. Nine Public Interest Organizations argue that, although the proposed MISO-PJM JOA requires MISO and PJM to maintain a website containing specified interregional transmission coordination information, it does not specify that it will provide "all documents" or "all documents subject to confidentiality requirements" or list the types of documents that will be provided.[210] Nine Public Interest Organizations request that the Commission require MISO and PJM to post (1) all of the studies and documents (subject to CEII and other Commission-approved confidentiality requirements) related to interregional transmission projects that have been jointly identified and that are under review and (2) the rationales for deciding not to jointly evaluate identified interregional transmission projects proposed by stakeholders.[211]

(c) Answers

106. MISO and PJM assert that the changes requested by Nine Public Interest Organizations are unnecessary and their argument hinges on semantics. MISO and PJM state that "[d]ocuments *related to* Coordinated System Plan studies," which is the language proposed by both MISO and PJM, includes all documents related to performing such studies, subject to applicable confidentiality requirements.[212] MISO and PJM reiterate that the proposed MISO-PJM JOA requires both MISO and PJM to have a webpage on MISO-PJM interregional transmission coordination, which, at a minimum, contains: (1) a link to the MISO-PJM JOA; (2) notice of scheduled Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings; (3) links to materials for Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings; and (4) documents relating to Coordinated System Plans. MISO and PJM state that the models used in both the regional and interregional processes will be available to stakeholders, subject to

---

[210] Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 11-12 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1.1.3 (Administration; Committees) (1.0.0)).

[211] *Id.* at 12.

[212] MISO and PJM Joint Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 10 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 11).

applicable CEII and confidentially requirements. MISO and PJM assert that the access to these materials will ensure that "all relevant analyses and determinations will be available for stakeholder review."[213]

(d) Commission Determination

107. We find that MISO's and PJM's proposed revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA concerning transparency and stakeholder participation comply with the requirements of Order No. 1000. We find that MISO's and PJM's proposed revisions to the MISO-PJM JOA provide sufficient opportunities for stakeholders to participate and provide input into the interregional transmission coordination processes. First, we find that the proposal requiring each RTO to prepare a regional transmission planning report annually that documents its annual regional transmission plan and identifies transmission issues and the Joint RTO Planning Committee to incorporate these reports into the Coordinated System Plan satisfies Order No. 1000's requirement to make transparent the analyses undertaken and determinations reached by neighboring transmission planning regions in the identification and evaluation of interregional transmission facilities. We find that stakeholders will have an opportunity to review the transmission issues identified by the Joint RTO Planning Committee and to identify and submit transmission issues for consideration by the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee and the Joint RTO Planning Committee in the Coordinated System Plan.[214] We also find satisfactory the proposal to afford stakeholders an opportunity to review and comment on the study's scope, assumptions, and proposed models[215] and to further evaluate and provide input for potential remedies for identified transmission issues[216] if the Joint RTO Planning Committee, in consultation with stakeholder input through the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee, decides that a Coordinated System Plan study is needed. Lastly, we find that, consistent with Order No. 1000, the proposed MISO-PJM JOA revisions provide an opportunity for stakeholder input into the draft

[213] *Id.* (quoting Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 11).

[214] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(i) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[215] *Id.* §§ 9.3.5.2(b)(ii), 9.3.5.2 (b)(vi)) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[216] *Id.* §§ 9.3.5.2(b)(iv)), 9.3.5.2(b)(vii) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

Coordinated System Plan study report, which includes recommended cross-border allocation projects,[217] before the study is finalized and posted on each RTO's website.[218] We reject Nine Public Interest Organizations' request that MISO and PJM post to their websites the rationale for not studying identified interregional transmission projects proposed by stakeholders because it goes beyond Order No. 1000's requirement that stakeholders be given opportunity for meaningful and timely input.

108. Additionally, we find that the proposed revisions comply with respect to the requirement in Order No. 1000 to maintain a website or email list for the communication of information related to interregional transmission coordination. First, proposed section 9.1.1.3 of the MISO-PJM JOA provides that each RTO will maintain its own website related to interregional transmission coordination between MISO and PJM that identifies information related to interregional transmission coordination and regional transmission planning. We find that the website proposed by PJM is sufficiently distinguishable from those pages concerning its regional transmission planning process that stakeholder will be able to distinguish interregional transmission planning information from regional transmission planning information. Second, section 9.1.1.3 provides that the Joint RTO Planning Committee will be responsible for ensuring that all documents and information posted on the websites is accurate, and will contain at a minimum (1) a link to the MISO-PJM JOA; (2) notices of Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee meetings and materials; and (3) documents related to Coordinated System Plan studies.[219] These proposed revisions satisfy Order No. 1000. We agree with MISO and PJM that Nine Public Interest Organizations' request that MISO and PJM revise section 9.1.1.3 to the MISO-PJM JOA to add language stating that they must post *all* documents and studies to the website is unnecessary to meet the requirements of Order No. 1000. Section 9.1.1.3(d) sufficiently indicates that MISO and PJM are required to post all documents relating to the Coordinated System Plan studies. We note that, if in practice all these documents are not posted, stakeholders may file a complaint with the Commission pursuant to FPA section 206 raising this issue.

109. Additionally, MISO and PJM will document the scope and assumptions including the process and schedule for the conduct of a Coordinated System Study. The scope design will include, as appropriate, evaluation of the transmission system against the

---

[217] As discussed above in the General Requirements section of this order, we have directed MISO and PJM to revise the definition of "cross-border allocation project" consistent with the definition of "interregional transmission facility" in Order No. 1000.

[218] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3.5.2(b)(ix) (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[219] *Id.* § 9.1.1.3 (Coordinated System Planning Website) (1.0.0).

reliability criteria, operational performance criteria, and economic performance criteria applicable to each party. Finally, MISO and PJM will use transmission planning models that are developed in accordance with the procedures established by the Joint RTO Planning Committee. The Joint RTO Planning Committee will develop joint study models consistent with the models and assumptions used for the most recent regional transmission planning cycle. MISO and PJM will develop compromises on assumptions when feasible and will incorporate study sensitivities as appropriate when different regional assumptions must be accommodated. Known updates and revisions to this model will be incorporated in a comprehensive fashion when new base transmission planning models are available. Models will be available for stakeholder review subject to confidentiality and CEII processes of MISO and PJM.[220]

2. Cost Allocation

110. In Order No. 1000, the Commission required each public utility transmission provider in a transmission planning region to have, together with the public utility transmission providers in its own transmission planning region and a neighboring transmission planning region in its interconnection, a common method or methods for allocating the costs of a new interregional transmission facility among the beneficiaries of that transmission facility in the two neighboring transmission planning regions in which the transmission facility is located.[221] The Commission found that the method or methods for interregional transmission cost allocation used by two transmission planning regions may be different from the method or methods used by either of them for regional transmission cost allocation.[222] The Commission added that the method or methods for allocating a region's share of the cost of an interregional transmission facility may differ from the method or methods for allocating the cost of a regional facility within that region.[223] The Commission clarified that it would not require each transmission planning region to have the same interregional cost allocation method or methods with each of its neighbors, but rather that each pair of transmission planning regions could develop its own approach to interregional cost allocation that satisfied both transmission planning

[220] *Id.* § 9.3.5.2.b (Development of the Coordinated System Plan) (1.0.0).

[221] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 578, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 626, 634.

[222] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 733, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 626.

[223] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 733, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 626.

regions' transmission needs and concerns, as long as that approach satisfied the interregional cost allocation principles.[224]

111. The Commission required that, for an interregional transmission facility to be eligible to receive interregional cost allocation, each of the neighboring transmission planning regions in which the interregional transmission facility is proposed to be located must select the facility in its regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation.[225] The Commission clarified that, if one of the regional transmission planning processes does not select the interregional transmission facility to receive interregional cost allocation, neither the transmission developer nor the other transmission planning region may allocate the costs of that interregional transmission facility under the provisions of Order No. 1000 to the region that did not select the interregional transmission facility.[226]

112. The Commission required each public utility transmission provider to show on compliance that its cost allocation method or methods for interregional cost allocation are just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential by demonstrating that each method satisfies the six interregional cost allocation principles described in Order No. 1000.[227] The Commission took a principles-based approach because it recognized that regional differences may warrant distinctions in cost allocation methods among transmission planning regions.[228] The Commission recognized that a variety of methods for cost allocation, including postage stamp cost allocation, may satisfy the set of general principles.[229] The Commission stated that the cost allocation principles do not apply to other new, non-Order No. 1000 transmission facilities and therefore did not foreclose the opportunity for a developer or individual customer to voluntarily assume the costs of a

---

[224] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 627 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 580).

[225] *Id.* PP 628, 635 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 436).

[226] *Id.* P 635.

[227] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 603, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 638.

[228] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 604, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 638.

[229] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 605, *order on reh'g,* Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 683.

new transmission facility.[230] The Commission also explained that Order No. 1000 permits participant funding but not as an interregional cost allocation method.[231]

113. The Commission stated that, in an RTO or ISO transmission planning region, the cost allocation method or methods must be filed in the RTO or ISO OATT; while, in a non-RTO/ISO transmission planning region, the method or methods must be filed in the OATT of each public utility transmission provider in the transmission planning region.[232] The Commission stated that, in either instance, such cost allocation method or methods must be consistent with the interregional cost allocation principles in Order No. 1000.[233] The Commission noted that, if public utility transmission providers in a region or pair of regions could not agree, the Commission would use the record in the relevant compliance filing proceeding(s) as a basis to develop a cost allocation method or methods that meets the Commission's requirements.[234]

114. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 specifies that the costs of a new interregional transmission facility must be allocated to each transmission planning region in which that transmission facility is located in a manner that is at least roughly commensurate with the estimated benefits of that transmission facility in each of the transmission planning regions. In determining the beneficiaries of interregional transmission facilities, transmission planning regions may consider benefits including, but not limited to, those associated with maintaining reliability and sharing reserves, production cost savings and congestion relief and/or meeting Public Policy

[230] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 603, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 638.

[231] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 723-729, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 718, 726-737.

[232] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 578, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 626.

[233] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 578, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 626.

[234] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 607, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 66.

Requirements.[235] Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 precludes an allocation where the benefits received are trivial in relation to the costs to be borne.[236]

115. Order No. 1000 does not prescribe a particular definition of "benefits" or "beneficiaries."[237] The Commission stated in Order No. 1000-A that, "while Order No. 1000 does not define benefits and beneficiaries, it does require the public utility transmission providers in each transmission planning region to be definite about benefits and beneficiaries for purposes of their cost allocation methods."[238] In addition, for a cost allocation method or methods to be accepted by the Commission as Order No. 1000-compliant, the method will have to specify clearly and definitively the benefits and the class of beneficiaries.[239] A benefit used by public utility transmission providers in an interregional cost allocation method or methods must be an identifiable benefit, and the transmission facility cost allocated must be roughly commensurate with that benefit.[240] The Commission stated that, once beneficiaries are identified, public utility transmission providers would then be able to identify what is the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution or assess whether costs are being allocated at least roughly commensurate with benefits.[241] Each regional transmission planning process must provide entities who will receive interregional cost allocation an understanding of the identified benefits on which the cost allocation is based.[242] Order No. 1000-A stated that public utility transmission providers in each transmission planning region, in consultation with their stakeholders, may consider proposals to allocate costs directly to generators as beneficiaries that could be subject to interregional cost allocation, but any such allocation

---

[235] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 622, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 654, 681-682, 691.

[236] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 639.

[237] *Id.* P 624, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 655, 674, 676-679.

[238] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 679.

[239] *Id.* P 678.

[240] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 625.

[241] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 679.

[242] *Id.* P 746 (noting that it would occur prior to the recovery of such costs through a formula rate).

must not be inconsistent with the generator interconnection procedures under Order No. 2003.[243]

116. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2 specifies that a transmission planning region that receives no benefit from an interregional transmission facility that is located in that region, either at present or in a likely future scenario, must not be involuntarily allocated any of the costs of that transmission facility.[244] All cost allocation methods must provide for allocation of the entire prudently incurred cost of a transmission project to prevent stranded costs.[245] To the extent that public utility transmission providers propose a cost allocation method or methods that consider the benefits and costs of a group of new transmission facilities and adequately support their proposal, Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2 would not require a showing that every individual transmission facility in the group of transmission facilities provides benefits to every beneficiary allocated a share of costs of that group of transmission facilities.[246]

117. The Commission clarified in Order No. 1000-A that public utility transmission providers may rely on scenario analyses in the preparation of a regional transmission plan and the selection of new transmission facilities for cost allocation.[247] Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2 would be satisfied if a project or group of projects is shown to have benefits in one or more of the transmission planning scenarios identified by public utility transmission providers in their Commission-approved Order No. 1000-compliant cost allocation methods.[248] The Commission clarified in Order No. 1000-B that, when it made this finding, it did not intend to remove the "likely future scenarios" concept from transmission planning and that likely future scenarios can be an important factor in public

---

[243] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 760, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 680.

[244] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 637, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at PP 684, 689, 691.

[245] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 640, *orer on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 685, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 68.

[246] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 641.

[247] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 690, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 70.

[248] Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 690, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 70.

utility transmission providers' consideration of transmission projects and in the identification of beneficiaries consistent with the cost causation principle.[249]

118. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 specifies that, if a benefit to cost threshold ratio is used to determine whether an interregional transmission facility has sufficient net benefits to qualify for interregional cost allocation, the ratio must not be so large as to exclude a transmission facility with significant positive net benefits from cost allocation.[250] Public utility transmission providers located in the neighboring transmission planning regions may choose to use such a threshold to account for uncertainty in the calculation of benefits and costs. [251] If adopted, such a threshold may not include a ratio of benefits to costs that exceeds 1.25 unless the pair of regions justify and the Commission approves a higher ratio.[252]

119. The Commission stated that Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 did not require the use of a benefit to cost ratio threshold.[253] The Commission did not specify whether or how an interregional benefit-cost threshold should be applied when selecting a project in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation or which costs should be included when calculating a benefit-cost threshold to use in this selection process.[254] However, if a transmission planning region chooses to have such a threshold, Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 limited the threshold to one that is not so high as to block inclusion of many worthwhile transmission projects in the regional transmission plan.[255] The Commission allowed public utility transmission providers in a transmission planning region to use a lower ratio without a separate showing and to use a

---

[249] Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 72.

[250] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 646, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 692.

[251] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 646, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 692.

[252] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 646, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 692.

[253] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 647, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at 693.

[254] Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 at P 64.

[255] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 647, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at 693.

higher threshold if they justify it and the Commission approves a greater ratio.[256] The Commission stated that, if the issue of whether any benefit to cost ratio threshold for an interregional transmission facility may supersede the ratio for a transmission planning region's regional transmission cost allocation should be presented on compliance, the Commission would address it then based on the specific facts in that filing.[257]

120. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4 specifies that costs allocated for an interregional transmission facility must assign costs only to the transmission planning regions in which the interregional transmission facility is located.[258] Costs cannot be assigned involuntarily to a transmission planning region in which that interregional transmission facility is not located.[259] However, interregional transmission coordination must identify consequences for other transmission planning regions, such as upgrades that may be required in a third transmission planning region and, if the transmission providers in the regions in which the interregional transmission facility is located agree to bear costs associated with such upgrades, then the interregional cost allocation method must include provisions for allocating the costs of such upgrades among the beneficiaries in the transmission planning regions in which the interregional transmission facility is located.[260] The Commission noted that, given the option for a transmission planning region in which an interregional transmission facility is not located to voluntarily be assigned costs, regions are free to negotiate interregional transmission arrangements that allow for the allocation of costs to beneficiaries that are not located in the same transmission planning region as any given interregional transmission facility.[261]

121. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 5 specifies that the cost allocation method and data requirements for determining benefits and identifying beneficiaries for an interregional transmission facility must be transparent with adequate documentation to

---

[256] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 647, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at 693.

[257] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 650.

[258] *Id.* P 657, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 696.

[259] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 657, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 696.

[260] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 657, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 696.

[261] Order No. Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 629 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 582).

allow a stakeholder to determine how they were applied to a proposed interregional transmission facility.[262]

122. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 specifies that the public utility transmission providers located in neighboring transmission planning regions may choose to use a different cost allocation method for different types of interregional transmission facilities, such as interregional transmission facilities needed for reliability, congestion relief, or to achieve Public Policy Requirements.[263] Each cost allocation method must be set out clearly and explained in detail in the compliance filing.[264] If public utility transmission providers choose to have a different cost allocation method for each type of transmission facility, there can be only one cost allocation method for each type.[265]

a. Current Cost Allocation Methods

123. The currently effective MISO-PJM JOA includes a cost allocation method for reliability projects, which are referred to in the MISO-PJM JOA as Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, and a cost allocation method for economic projects, which are referred to in the MISO-PJM JOA as Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects.

124. To qualify as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project under the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA, a transmission project must:[266] (1) have an estimated Project Cost of $20,000,000 or greater; (2) be evaluated as part of a Coordinated System Plan or joint study process; (3) meet the threshold benefit to cost ratio as prescribed by the

[262] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 668.

[263] *Id.* P 685.

[264] *Id.*

[265] *Id.* P 686, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 628; *see also* Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 581.

[266] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project) (31.0.0).

MISO-PJM JOA;[267] (4) qualify as an economic transmission enhancement or expansion under the terms of the PJM Regional Plan[268] and also qualify as a Regionally Beneficial Project under the terms of Attachment FF of the MISO Tariff (including all applicable threshold criteria),[269] provided that any minimum Project Cost threshold required to qualify a project under either the PJM Regional Plan or MISO Tariff shall apply the Project Cost of the Cross Border Market Efficiency Project and not the allocated cost; and (5) address one or more constraints for which at least one dispatchable generator in the adjacent market has a Generation-to-Load Distribution Factor of five percent or greater with respect to serving load in that adjacent market, as determined using the Coordinated System Plan power flow model.

125. Under the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA, the costs of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects will be allocated to the respective RTOs in proportion to the net

[267] The benefit to cost ratio threshold for a project to qualify as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project is 1.25 to 1. *See, e.g., id.* § 9.4.3.1.2.1 (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[268] An Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion shall be included in the Regional Transmission Expansion Plan recommended to the PJM Board, if the relative benefits and costs of the Economic-based Enhancement or Expansion meet a benefit to cost ratio threshold of at least 1.25:1. *See* PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, OATT, Operating Agreement, Schedule 6.1, § 1.5.7(d)(4.0.0).

[269] Market Efficiency Projects are Network Upgrades: (i) that are proposed by the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s), ITC(s), Market Participant(s), or regulatory authorities; (ii) that are found to be eligible for inclusion in the MTEP or are approved pursuant to Appendix B, section VII of the ISO Agreement after June 16, 2005, applying the factors set forth in section I.C. of Attachment FF; (iii) that have a project cost of $5 million or more; (iv) that involve transmission facilities with voltages of 345 kV or higher; and that may include any lower voltage transmission facilities of 100kV or above that collectively constitute less than fifty percent of the combined project cost, and without which the 345 kV or higher transmission facilities could not deliver sufficient benefit to meet the required benefit to cost ratio threshold for the project as established in section II.B.1.e, or that otherwise are needed to relieve applicable reliability criteria violations that are projected to occur as a direct result of the development of the 345 kV or higher transmission facilities of the project; (v) that are not determined to be Multi-Value Projects; and (vi) that are found to have regional benefits under the criteria set forth in section II.B.1 of Attachment FF. *See* MISO, FERC Electric Tariff, Attachment FF, (Transmission Expansion Planning Protocol) (31.0.0), § II.B (Market Efficiency Projects).

present value of the total benefits calculated for each RTO pursuant to section 9.4.3.1.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA.[270] The determination of benefits to each RTO begins with the RTOs using a benefit metric to jointly evaluate the benefits to the combined MISO and PJM markets, and to each market individually. The benefit metric is based on the impact of the project on: (1) adjusted production costs (adjusted to account for purchases and sales) and (2) net load payment. The metric is calculated as the sum of 70 percent of the change in adjusted production costs benefit for each RTO attributable to the project and 30 percent of the change in net load payment benefit for each RTO attributable to the project.[271] Under the MISO-PJM JOA, only projects that meet a benefit to cost ratio threshold of 1.25 to 1 will be designated a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project.[272]

126. The currently effective MISO-PJM JOA requires that a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project must (1) by agreement of the Joint RTO Planning Committee, be needed to efficiently meet applicable reliability criteria; (2) be a baseline reliability project as defined under the MISO or PJM tariffs; (3) result in an allocation of project cost to the RTO in which the project is not constructed (i.e., the cross-border RTO) of at least $10,000,000; (4) involve the cross-border RTO's contribution of at least five percent of the total loading on the constrained facility, as determined based on the Coordinated System Plan power flow model; and (5) have an in-service date after December 31, 2007.[273]

Also, under the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA, costs for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects are allocated based on whether or not the project resolves thermal constraints. For Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects that resolve thermal constraints, the MISO-PJM JOA allocates costs based on the relative contribution of the combined load of each RTO to the loading on the constrained facility that created the need for the project.[274] The loading is determined using a joint planning model agreed

---

[270] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2.1.a. (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[271] *See, e.g.*, *id.* § 9.4.3.1.2.1 (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[272] *See, e.g.*, *id.* § 9.4.3.1.2.1(b) (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[273] *See, e.g.*, *id.* § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (31.0.0).

[274] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 3-4; *see, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.2.1.a (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

upon by the RTOs' planning staffs. According to the MISO-PJM JOA, the RTOs use the model to perform a distribution factor analysis (DFAX) using a source comprising the aggregate of RTO generation (network resources) for each RTO and a sink comprising all loads within that RTO. The DFAX analysis determines the MW flow impact attributable to each RTO on the constraint that necessitated the transmission system upgrade. The total load of each RTO for the condition modeled is multiplied by the DFAX analysis associated with that RTO to determine the respective MW flow contribution of that RTO to the constraint. The ratio of the flows determines the extent to which each RTO contributes to the need.[275] Then, the RTOs will quantify the relative impact on each RTO's system, ensuring that the relative contribution of each RTO (including both the aggravating and benefiting contributions of generation and load patterns within each RTO) to the need for a particular upgrade is appropriately captured in ensuing allocations.[276] For Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects that resolve non-thermal constraints under the MISO-PJM JOA, the Joint RTO Planning Committee establishes an interface, comprised of a number of transmission facilities, to serve as a surrogate for cost allocation purposes, and then applies the DFAX analysis to the surrogate interface.[277]

127. Both MISO and PJM Transmission Owners, with PJM's support, submitted separate filings based on the interregional cost allocations in the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[278] MISO agrees with PJM and PJM Transmission Owners that the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method, as it exists in the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA, should be used to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[279] However, MISO disagrees with PJM

---

[275] *Id.* at 4; *see, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.2.1.a (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[276] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.2.1.a (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[277] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 4; *see, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.2.1.b (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[278] *See* PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 1-2; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 9. The MISO Transmission Owners join MISO in support of the proposed revisions to the cost allocation section of the MISO-PJM JOA.

[279] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 19.

Transmission Owners' proposal to also use the MISO-PJM JOA's existing interregional cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects for this purpose. Instead, MISO proposes that only Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects be eligible for interregional cost allocation. MISO proposes to base cost sharing of Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects on (1) whether the project is a tie-line and (2) whether neighboring transmission owners in MISO and PJM voluntarily agree to share costs.[280]

b. MISO's Proposal to Remove Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects

i. Proposal

128. MISO proposes to remove the existing flow-based cost allocation mechanisms for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects (i.e., the DFAX analysis) and instead include provisions that would allow for cost sharing of such projects that are tie-lines that interconnect to the transmission facilities of a MISO and a PJM Transmission Owner, respectively, and potential cost sharing of projects that are not tie lines.[281] MISO proposes to revise the criteria for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects in section 9.4.3.1.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA to state that (1) by agreement of the Joint RTO Planning Committee, the project is needed to efficiently meet applicable reliability criteria and (2) the project must be a baseline reliability project as defined under the MISO or PJM tariffs.[282]

129. According to MISO, in the case of tie-lines, the connected Transmission Owners in MISO and PJM respectively will have ownership and the responsibility to build the

---

[280] *Id.* at 29.

[281] *Id.* at 29-30.

[282] *Id.* at 30. The MISO-PJM JOA currently provides that, to qualify as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project, a project must not only (1) by agreement of the Joint RTO Planning Committee, be needed to efficiently meet applicable reliability criteria and (2) be a baseline reliability project as defined under the MISO or PJM Tariffs; but also (3) result in an allocation of project cost to the RTO in which the project is not constructed (i.e., the cross-border RTO) of at least $10,000,000; (4) involve the cross-border RTO's contribution of at least five percent of the total loading on the constrained facility, as determined based on the Coordinated System Plan power flow model; and (5) have an in-service date after December 31, 2007. *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (31.0.0).

Network Upgrade unless otherwise agreed.[283] For the share of the project cost incurred by any MISO Transmission Owner(s), MISO will recover those costs from the pricing zone(s) of Transmission Owner(s) in accordance with the MISO Tariff, while PJM can allocate its share of the project cost pursuant to its own tariff.[284] For Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects located only in one of the RTOs, the affected Transmission Owners will also coordinate on potential cost sharing. However, in this case, if the affected neighboring Transmission Owners cannot come to agreement on cost sharing, the Transmission Owner(s) in whose pricing zone(s) the project would be constructed may decline to build the project if it is not needed to address a reliability issue located within the MISO pricing zone(s) where it would be located. If the project is needed to address a reliability issue located within the pricing zone where it would be located, then the Transmission Owner(s) in whose zone(s) the facility would be constructed may either elect to construct the project as a baseline reliability project or work with MISO or PJM, as necessary, to identify an alternative Network Upgrade to address the reliability issue.[285]

130. Although MISO proposes to retain the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project in the MISO-PJM JOA, they propose that, going forward, Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects not be eligible for Order No. 1000 interregional cost allocation as projects approved in the RTOs' regional transmission plans for purposes of regional cost allocation.[286]

ii. Supporting Parties' Comments

131. MISO argues that Order No. 1000 conditioned eligibility for interregional cost allocation on the selection of a project in each regional transmission plan for the purpose of regional cost allocation. Further, MISO argues that retaining Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects for the purpose of interregional cost allocation could not be implemented given that transmission projects selected as MISO Baseline Reliability Projects are not eligible for regional cost allocation and the effective MISO-PJM JOA requires a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project located in MISO to be a MISO

[283] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 31.

[284] *Id.*

[285] *Id.* at 31-32.

[286] *Id.* at 30.

Baseline Reliability Project under the MISO Tariff.[287] MISO argues that, because MISO Baseline Reliability Projects are allocated entirely to the pricing zone in which the project is located (i.e., no longer regionally allocated), it would be inconsistent to allocate on a regional basis MISO's share of Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, which MISO asserts are a subset of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects.[288]

132. MISO argues that Order No. 1000 does not require both regions to select a project for interregional cost allocation but instead requires both voluntary interregional cost allocation and regional cost allocation of the proposed interregional project in each region where it will be located.[289] MISO asserts that this requirement underscores MISO's right to refuse involuntary interregional cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects that could not be selected in MISO's regional plan for purposes of regional cost allocation.[290] Further, MISO Transmission Owners argue that the MISO Tariff does not provide the needed regional cost allocation method that could be used for interregional cost allocation,[291] and, thus, there would be no assurance that interregional costs would be allocated appropriately within a region consistent with regional benefits and stakeholder input.[292]

133. MISO Transmission Owners assert that, in order to assure adequate stakeholder input, interregional cost allocation must follow from regional cost allocation.[293] Thus, MISO Transmission Owners insist that the MISO-PJM JOA must be revised because the current Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project provisions do not reflect that MISO Baseline Reliability Projects are no longer subject to regional cost allocation in MISO

---

[287] *Id.* at 33 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (31.0.0)).

[288] *See* MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 7.

[289] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 14 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[290] *Id.*

[291] MISO Transmission Owners Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 5 (filed Nov. 7, 2013).

[292] *Id.* at 3 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 582).

[293] *Id.* at 3-4 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 465, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 635).

and thus cannot have their costs allocated interregionally.[294] MISO Transmission Owners add that the existing MISO-PJM JOA provisions cannot be implemented because the MISO-PJM JOA provisions are predicated upon allocation of Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project costs through flow-based analysis, but MISO Baseline Reliability Project costs can no longer be allocated regionally among pricing zones through flow-based analysis.[295] MISO Transmission Owners argue that they joined with MISO to develop a mechanism that would facilitate cost allocation for reliability projects when the affected Transmission Owners in MISO and PJM are able to reach mutually agreeable terms.[296]

134. MISO asserts that retaining the current cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects could result in similar reliability projects being treated differently with regard to cost allocation based on their proximity to the PJM-MISO seam.[297] MISO also asserts that developing a separate regional cost allocation method only for the PJM planning region would create inconsistencies within MISO and across other planning regions. MISO claims that a separate regional cost allocation method could result in otherwise similar projects being treated differently within MISO for cost allocation purposes based solely on whether the project benefits PJM rather than another neighboring transmission planning area. MISO asserts that an exception to the Order No. 1000 requirement that interregional transmission projects must be selected in a regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation would not address this concern.[298] MISO claims that the allocation of MISO Baseline Reliability Project costs

[294] *Id.* at 4-5.

[295] *Id.* at 5.

[296] MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 3 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.2 (Cross-Border Project Shares) (2.0.0)).

[297] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 32 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[298] *Id.* at 36-37.

to the zone where the project is located is consistent with its proposal to remove the DFAX-based[299] cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[300]

135. According to MISO, coordination of reliability planning between MISO and PJM could nonetheless result in cross-border reliability-related projects that also qualify as Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects, and, in these instances, such projects would be eligible for cost sharing as Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects.[301] MISO argues that, in the event that a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project would also qualify as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project, it is appropriate to treat the project as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project.[302] Therefore, MISO claims that the interregional cost allocation method for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects can allocate reliability-driven benefits, if they produce an economic benefit also.[303]

136. MISO asserts that its proposal is consistent with the Commission's acceptance of its regional transmission cost allocation method.[304] MISO argues that it is appropriate to allocate the costs of projects that qualify only as MISO Baseline Reliability Projects

---

[299] According to the MISO-PJM JOA, the DFAX is the appropriate distribution factor for the condition causing the upgrade. The DFAX calculation determines the MW flow impact attributable to each RTO on the constraint requiring the transmission system to be upgraded. MISO-PJM JOA, § 9.4.3.2.1(a) (Cost Allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects) (2.0.0).

[300] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 36-37 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[301] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 32.

[302] *See* MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 7 (citing MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, Curran Test. at 6; MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 29-30 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[303] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 29-30 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[304] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 34 (stating the Commission endorsed MISO's proposal that (1) MISO Baseline Reliability Projects no longer be regionally allocated but instead allocated entirely to the pricing zone in which the project is located; and (2) to the extent that a project that otherwise qualifies as a MISO Baseline Reliability Project and also satisfies the criteria for a market efficiency project, the project would be treated as a Market Efficiency Project rather than a MISO Baseline Reliability Project).

locally and to reserve regional cost allocation for Market Efficiency Projects and Multi-Value Projects.[305] Further, MISO argues that its proposal is consistent with Order No. 1000's determinations on participant funding.[306] MISO adds that its proposal does not have any immediate or foreseeable impact on the implementation of the MISO-PJM JOA because there has never been an identified Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project in the history of the MISO-PJM JOA nor is there one currently under consideration.[307] MISO argues that its proposal has a workable mechanism for interregional cost allocation applicable to non-tie-line Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, where permitted by the MISO Tariff. [308]

137. MISO argues that, when MISO agreed to the current Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project provisions under Article IX of the MISO-PJM JOA, the MISO Tariff allocated a portion of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects regionally,[309] and, thus, its voluntary agreement was premised on and limited to the regional cost allocation of a portion of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects. MISO asserts that, because MISO Baseline Reliability Projects are no longer subject to regional cost allocation and Order No. 1000 requires eligibility for regional cost allocation in order for a project to be eligible for interregional cost allocation, MISO can neither be deemed required by Order No. 1000 nor deemed to have voluntarily agreed to continue interregional cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects under the MISO-PJM JOA. MISO states that, as a result of this Order No. 1000 requirement, Order No. 1000 has, in effect, superseded the MISO-PJM JOA's provisions of interregional cost allocation for Cross-

[305] According to Attachment FF of the MISO Tariff, a Multi-Value Project is one or more Network Upgrades that address a common set of transmission issues and satisfy the conditions listed in sections II.C.1, II.C.2 and II.C.3 of Attachment FF.

[306] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 723 (clarifying that "regions are free to negotiate interregional transmission arrangements that allow for the allocation of costs to beneficiaries that are not located in the same transmission planning region as any given interregional transmission facility")); MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 8 (citing MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35).

[307] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 34.

[308] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 8.

[309] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 9 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

Border Baseline Reliability Projects. Additionally, MISO argues that Order No. 1000 does not contain any exceptions to the requirement that a proposed interregional project be selected in both regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation, and, therefore, this requirement must apply to the existing cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[310] Therefore, MISO asserts that, because MISO Baseline Reliability Projects can no longer be selected in MISO's regional transmission plan for the purposes of cost allocation, the current MISO-PJM JOA is not required to stipulate or continue the interregional cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects. MISO adds that continuing such interregional cost allocation is inconsistent with Order No. 1000's conditioning of eligibility for interregional cost allocation on eligibility for regional cost allocation.[311]

138. MISO states that its proposal is not an admission that any voluntary cost sharing approach is consistent with Order No. 1000 and that MISO is not arbitrarily seeking to implement voluntary cost sharing for new cost sharing agreements but not for existing ones.[312] MISO notes that its proposal for voluntary cost sharing does not involve interregional cost allocation.[313]

139. MISO argues that it would be unjust and unreasonable for a MISO Transmission Owner's customers to be forced to pay for an upgrade on its system needed to address a reliability issue on a PJM Transmission Owner's system if a cost allocation agreement cannot be reached. MISO asserts that this scenario would be inconsistent with Cost Allocation Principle 2, which prohibits involuntary allocation of costs to regions that receive no benefit from an interregional transmission project located in that region. MISO suggests that, if the MISO Transmission Owner does not construct the upgrade, the PJM Transmission Owner can address the reliability need through an alternative solution.[314]

140. MISO asserts that the Commission has the authority to unilaterally require changes to the MISO-PJM JOA.[315] MISO Transmission Owners also assert that they are

---

[310] *Id.* at 9-10 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 582).

[311] *Id.* at 11-12.

[312] *Id.* at 17(.

[313] *Id.* at 16-17.

[314] *Id.* at 26-27.

[315] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 10-11 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 122 FERC ¶ 61,084,

(continued ...)

not attempting to make a unilateral change to the MISO-PJM JOA but rather that MISO is attempting to resolve the conflict among the local allocation of MISO Baseline Reliability Project costs, the requirements of Order No. 1000, and the MISO-PJM JOA.[316] MISO Transmission Owners further assert that Order No. 1000 and the Commission's instructions in the MISO First Regional Compliance Order contemplated that parties could raise concerns about the compatibility of MISO's regional and interregional cost allocation methods in this proceeding.[317]

141. In addition, MISO Transmission Owners argue that Order No. 1000 does not foreclose proposing revisions to the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method. MISO Transmission Owners contend that Order No. 1000 states only that MISO and PJM are not affirmatively required to make any revisions with respect to Cost Allocation Principle 4 and did not address whether the existing MISO-PJM JOA complied with other principles. Furthermore, MISO Transmission Owners claim that Order No. 1000 contains no presumption in favor of existing agreements, instead directing transmission providers to raise compliance issues in their filings.[318]

142. Finally, MISO Transmission Owners assert that it is in the interest of all parties to have the conflict between the MISO-PJM JOA and Order No. 1000 resolved in this proceeding. MISO Transmission Owners claim that the proposed revisions will allow cost sharing that is consistent with Order No. 1000, the respective regional transmission plans' cost allocation methods, and stakeholder input.[319]

143. MISO asserts that the proposal would facilitate qualification of projects as Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects for the purpose of allowing individual Transmission Owners in MISO and PJM to agree to share the costs of particular projects on a case-by-case basis. MISO claims that the removal of the current cost and facility loading criteria

---

at P 21 (2008); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 106 FERC ¶ 61,251, at PP 36, 38, 48, 55, 57, 75 (2003); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 113 FERC ¶ 61,194, at PP 19, 39 (2005)).

[316] MISO Transmission Owners Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6-7 (filed Nov. 7, 2013).

[317] *Id.* at 7 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 792; MISO First Regional Compliance Order, 142 FERC ¶ 61,215 at P 528).

[318] *Id.* at 8 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 583, 662, 795).

[319] *Id.* at 8-9.

for qualification as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project will increase the likelihood that a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project will be built. MISO adds that the proposed changes in cost allocation will have no impact on the type and level of interregional transmission coordination because the proposed revisions only change how projects identified through the RTOs' interregional transmission coordination provisions will be funded.[320]

144. MISO argues that its proposal is procedurally sound. MISO contends that it did not commence the present proceeding on its own initiative but responded to Commission directives in Order No. 1000. MISO claims that its compliance filing does not deprive affected parties of their procedural rights, including the ability to file a protest to MISO's filing.[321]

145. MISO asserts that its proposal is not directly related to maintaining a right of first refusal but rather to the inconsistency of the MISO-PJM JOA's interregional cost allocation provisions for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects with Order No. 1000's requirement that a project's eligibility for regional cost allocation is a precondition for its eligibility for interregional cost allocation.[322]

146. MISO Transmission Owners argue that treating the current MISO-PJM JOA provisions as voluntary interregional cost allocation is impermissible under Order No. 1000's participant funding framework. MISO Transmission Owners explain that, under this framework, voluntary methods cannot serve as the regional or interregional cost allocation method. In addition, MISO Transmission Owners assert that Order No. 1000 requires that a voluntary participant funding method provide for voluntary agreement by individual market participants, which the current MISO-PJM JOA does not require.[323]

147. MISO argues that protestors fail to specify any provision of Order No. 1000 that would require a cost-sharing arrangement between transmission owners in different transmission planning regions to satisfy the six interregional cost allocation principles. MISO contends that participant funding of projects is an alternative to regional allocation of the cost of transmission facilities and that its proposal for participant funding of Cross-

---

[320] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 25 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[321] *Id.* at 18-19.

[322] *Id.* at 31-32 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 582).

[323] MISO Transmission Owners Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 5-6 (filed Nov. 7, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 723-726).

Border Baseline Reliability Projects is an adaptation of that alternative to the interregional context.[324]

148. MISO Transmission Owners also argue that MISO's Cross-Border Baseline Reliability proposal does not need to satisfy the six interregional cost allocation principles because the proposal is not a regional or interregional cost allocation method.[325] MISO Transmission Owners claim that MISO Baseline Reliability Projects are primarily local, so applying interregional cost allocation principles to assess MISO's proposal does not make sense.[326]

149. MISO asserts that Order No. 1000 only allows the use of multiple project types for purposes of cost allocation; it does not require it. MISO argues that Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 does not require that an interregional cost allocation method consider every possible benefit that could be created by constructing a transmission facility. MISO adds that Order No. 1000 does not require MISO to use the same project categories for regional and interregional cost allocation, so there will be no inconsistency with Order No. 1000.[327]

iii. Opposing Parties' Comments

150. PJM Transmission Owners assert that MISO's argument that revisions to the MISO Tariff regarding treatment of regional reliability projects create an inconsistency between the MISO-PJM JOA and Order No. 1000 rests on a fundamental misreading of Order No. 1000. Specifically, PJM Transmission Owners claim that MISO ignores the minimum requirement in Order No. 1000 that both regions select a project for interregional cost allocation and neighboring regions may select interregional cost allocation methods that differ from regional cost allocation methods.[328] PJM

---

[324] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 6-8 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[325] MISO Transmission Owners Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 9 (filed Nov. 7, 2013) (quoting MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35).

[326] *Id.*

[327] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 30-31 (filed Nov. 1, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 733).

[328] PJM Transmission Owners Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 5-7 (filed Sept. 24, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 635; Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 578, 733); PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-

(continued ...)

Transmission Owners argue that MISO's decision not to allocate *within* its own region the cost of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects that it includes in its separate regional plan is irrelevant to the eligibility of a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project for interregional cost allocation under the MISO-PJM JOA or Order No. 1000.[329]

151. PJM Transmission Owners and Exelon[330] assert that Order No. 1000 established a minimum set of requirements for interregional transmission coordination and explicitly allowed for "superior" cost allocation arrangements in both new and existing agreements.[331] PJM Transmission Owners state that going further than Order No. 1000 required does not render the MISO-PJM JOA inconsistent with Order No. 1000; it means only that MISO and PJM reached a voluntary agreement to allocate the costs of certain transmission projects between the regions.[332]

152. Moreover, PJM Transmission Owners argue that MISO's approach to allocating the costs of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects within its region is not inconsistent with the MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation method. PJM Transmission Owners add that MISO cannot use its revised regional cost allocation method to unilaterally nullify the MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation provisions and renege on its commitment to interregional cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[333] PJM Transmission Owners state that the fact that the MISO-PJM JOA might go beyond Order

---

000, at 10, 11 & n.25 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 578, 733, *order on reh'g*, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 635; MISO and MISO Transmission Owner Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 34).

[329] PJM Transmission Owners Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 7 (filed Sept. 24, 2013); PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 11.

[330] *See* Exelon Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 2 ("Exelon joins and fully supports the protest of the PJM Transmission Owners . . . Therefore, Exelon will not repeat those arguments.").

[331] *See* PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 8-9 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 372, 583 & n.452)

[332] *Id.* at 10.

[333] PJM Transmission Owners Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 8 (filed Sept. 24, 2013); PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 11-12.

No. 1000's minimum requirements does not provide any basis for MISO to unilaterally rewrite the MISO-PJM JOA. PJM Transmission Owners assert that courts have rejected parties' attempts unilaterally to expand their rights in analogous circumstances and that the Commission should not allow MISO to do so here.[334]

153. PJM asserts that MISO's proposal to allow case-by-case voluntary cost allocation for certain Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects is inconsistent with Order No. 1000.[335] PJM argues that, while Order No. 1000 permits market participants to negotiate alternative cost sharing arrangements, a transmission provider may not propose voluntary cost sharing arrangements as a default regional cost allocation method.[336] PJM argues that MISO's proposal is also counter to the Order No. 1000 requirements to improve coordination between neighboring regions.

154. PJM Transmission Owners assert that, while MISO argues that the portion of its proposed method involving voluntary cost-sharing agreements is consistent with the Commission's determinations in Order No. 1000 regarding participant funding, there is no reasoned distinction that would apply this principle to new voluntary cost allocation agreements and not to existing voluntary cost allocation agreements such as the MISO-PJM JOA.[337]

---

[334] PJM Transmission Owners Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 4 (filed Sept. 24, 2013) (citing *Fischer v. Resolution Trust Corp.*, 59 F.3d 1344, 1350 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *Caribbean Shippers Ass'n v. Surface Transp. Bd.*, 145 F.3d 1362, 1365 n.3 (D.C. Cir. 1998); *Harbor Ins. Co. v. Schnabel Found. Co.*, 946 F. 3d 930, 937 n.5 (D.C. Cir. 1991)).

[335] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 10 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 578, 581).

[336] *Id.* at 10-11 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 10, 561, 562, 581, 715).

[337] PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 12 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 582, 723).

155. Ohio Commission argues that, while MISO has chosen not to regionally allocate the costs of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects, nothing prohibits MISO from continuing to allocate costs for necessary Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects. Ohio Commission asserts that MISO's proposal is an attempt to protect rights of first refusal of the MISO Transmission Owners.[338]

156. In addition, Ohio Commission states that MISO's proposal does not comply with the Commission's directives in Order No. 1000 to streamline and coordinate transmission planning activities on a regional and interregional basis.[339]

157. Exelon requests that the Commission reject MISO's proposal because the proposal allows MISO Transmission Owners to decide unilaterally not to construct reliability upgrades needed by PJM due to a cost allocation disagreement with a PJM Transmission Owner. Exelon asserts that any negotiation on cost allocation for reliability projects should be between MISO and PJM and, if there is no agreement, the Commission should allow PJM to direct MISO, not a MISO Transmission Owner, to file an unexecuted upgrade agreement and cost allocation agreement.[340]

158. PJM, PJM Transmission Owners, and Ohio Commission assert that MISO's unilateral proposal to revise the MISO-PJM JOA is expressly prohibited by section 18.12 of the MISO-PJM JOA.[341] PJM and PJM Transmission Owners further assert that MISO acknowledges that it did not obtain PJM's agreement for the proposed unilateral revisions.[342] PJM states that MISO has not articulated any basis under the FPA or state or federal law that allows it to seek to modify the cost allocation method under the MISO-PJM JOA or provided any legal basis for the Commission to do so.[343] PJM

---

[338] Ohio Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 5.

[339] *Id.* at 6 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 13).

[340] Exelon Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 2-3.

[341] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 14-15; PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 6; Ohio Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 8.

[342] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 14; PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 6.

[343] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 14-15.

Transmission Owners assert that a party seeking to modify a filed agreement or tariff must submit its request as a complaint and may not combine it with another pleading.[344] PJM and PJM Transmission Owners also argue that MISO has not acknowledged or satisfied its obligation under section 206 to demonstrate that the MISO-PJM JOA provisions it seeks to change are unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory or preferential and that its proposed replacement is just and reasonable and not unduly discriminatory or preferential.[345] Ohio Commission argues that, if the Commission accepts MISO's proposal without PJM's consent, the Commission would send the message that contracts between RTOs are not always binding and would make RTOs less willing to work together to create agreements in the future, contrary to the objectives of Order No. 1000. Ohio Commission further asserts that accepting MISO's proposed changes to the MISO-PJM JOA could encourage other RTOs to attempt to make unilateral changes to their existing agreements.[346]

159. PJM states that the obligation to build single region reliability projects that benefit a neighboring RTO comes from the efforts of MISO and PJM to address the intertwined nature of the MISO/PJM seam. PJM notes that Commission precedent regarding the MISO-PJM JOA requires the RTOs to be the final decision makers on planning and expansion regarding transmission facilities that may affect each RTO's region.[347] PJM argues that MISO's proposal violates this precedent by giving individual transmission owners discretion to decide whether a single region project needed for reliability by a transmission owner in a neighboring region will be constructed and how its costs will be

---

[344] PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 7 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 116 FERC ¶ 61,292 at n.55 (2006) (citations omitted) ("[W]e have long required that a complaint not be included as part of another pleading such as a protest."); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 108 FERC ¶ 61,248, at P 5 (2004); s*ee also, e.g., ISO New England Inc.*, 125 FERC ¶ 61,017, at P 19 (2009); *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.*, 97 FERC ¶ 61,241 (2001); *Yankee Atomic Elec. Co.*, 60 FERC ¶ 61,316, at 62,096-97 (1992); *Louisiana Power & Light Co.*, 50 FERC ¶ 61,040, at 61,062-63 (1990); *Entergy Servs., Inc.*, 52 FERC ¶ 61,317, at 62,270 (1990)).

[345] PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 7-8 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at PP 372, 583); PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 14.

[346] Ohio Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 8-9.

[347] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 17-19 (quoting *TRANSLink Transmission Company, L.L.C.*, 99 FERC ¶ 61,106, at P 40 (2002)).

allocated. PJM also notes that Order No. 1000 anticipated that an RTO or ISO would develop the interregional cost allocation method on behalf of its public utility transmission owning members.[348]

160. PJM argues that MISO's filing is prohibited by the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine because it failed to make the requisite showing that the current MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation provisions seriously harm the public interest.[349] PJM also argues that MISO's contention that PJM's *Mobile-Sierra* argument is untimely is unfounded. PJM asserts that Order No. 1000 allows transmission providers to present *Mobile-Sierra* arguments in their compliance filings.[350]

161. PJM also contends that MISO's proposal to modify a provision of the MISO-PJM JOA unilaterally as part of its Order No. 1000 interregional compliance filing is not equivalent to the Commission's previous direction to MISO and PJM to propose a cost allocation method for cross-border facilities.[351]

162. In addition, PJM argues that, when the Commission finds that a proposal is just and reasonable, the Commission does not need to address the merits of an alternative proposal, particularly when the proposal is a provision agreed to by the parties and accepted by the Commission in the MISO-PJM JOA.[352]

163. PJM also argues that MISO's legal arguments regarding the impacts of the MISO First Regional Compliance Order are outside the scope of this proceeding. PJM asserts that, although MISO and PJM have not utilized the MISO-PJM JOA Cross-Border Reliability Project provisions to date, the existing Cross-Border Baseline Reliability

---

[348] *Id.* at 19-20 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 584).

[349] *Id.* at 15-17 (citing *Pub. Util. Dist. No. 1 of Snohomish Cty. v. FERC*, 471 F.3d 1053, 1077 (9th Cir. 2006)).

[350] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 11 (filed Nov. 21, 2013) (citing Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 389).

[351] *Id.* at 8 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 122 FERC ¶ 61,084).

[352] *Id.* at 9 (citing *Louisville Gas & Elec. Co.*, 114 FERC ¶ 61,282, at P 29 (2006); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,221, at PP 206, 240; *Sw. Power Pool, Inc.*, 131 FERC ¶ 61,252, at P 124 (2010), *reh'g denied*, 137 FERC ¶ 61,075 (2011); *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator, Corp.*, 128 FERC ¶ 61,282, at P 31 (2009)).

Project provisions will become more important over time and, therefore, MISO's proposal will be more inappropriate going forward.[353]

164. Nine Public Interest Organizations aver that MISO's proposal does not provide for the allocation of benefits from interregional projects addressing reliability needs in either MISO or PJM.[354]

165. Organization of MISO States asserts that some of its members support retaining the existing language in section 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA but these members request that the Commission direct MISO to develop a regional cost allocation method for the costs allocated to MISO for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[355] Organization of MISO States asserts that, in another docket, the Commission could revisit its acceptance of the regional cost allocation method for MISO Baseline Reliability Projects in the MISO First Regional Compliance Order.[356]

166. Indiana Commission asserts that neither MISO's nor PJM's proposals meets Order No. 1000's stated goal of encouraging interregional projects when they are more cost-effective or efficient than regional transmission projects. Indiana Commission asserts that MISO's proposal not only appears to violate Order No. 1000 by relying on negotiated cost sharing instead of a predetermined cost allocation, but also cannot overcome the fact that MISO Baseline Reliability Projects that are not regionally cost allocated cannot qualify as interregional transmission projects.[357]

167. Indiana Commission asserts that it prefers that the Commission recognize the uniqueness of the changes to MISO's Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method and adjust the requirements for MISO and its seams so that interregional transmission

---

[353] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 23-24.

[354] Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 15-16.

[355] Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 3. *But see id.* at 3, 7 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.1 (proposed) (noting some members support MISO's proposal to revise section 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA to allow a voluntary approach to Cross-Border Baseline Reliability cost allocation)).

[356] *Id.* at 6-7.

[357] Indiana Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 7-8.

projects must still be selected in the MISO Regional Planning process but not have to be selected for purposes of cost allocation. However, Indiana Commission contends that the Commission cannot accept MISO's filing without substantial modification because the current proposal would lead to unjust and unreasonable rates by failing to provide for interregional projects that are more efficient and cost-effective than regional projects.[358]

168. PJM, PJM Transmission Owners, and Ohio Commission argue that MISO fails to demonstrate how its proposal meets Order No. 1000's six interregional cost allocation principles or how the existing provisions of the MISO-PJM JOA violate the six cost allocation principles.[359]

169. Wind Parties assert that MISO's proposal contradicts the allocation of benefits in its own regional tariff, which recognizes the multiple benefits of Multi-Value Projects from an economic, reliability and public policy perspective.[360]

170. Wind Parties argue that MISO's claim that it cannot allocate reliability benefits interregionally without a regional cost allocation method does not align with the Commission's requirement that costs be assigned commensurate with benefits. Wind Parties assert that, if MISO's share of reliability and public policy benefits cannot be allocated through existing tariffs, MISO can create a method for assigning the costs of interregional projects independent of any regional methods.[361]

171. ITC Companies argue that the Commission should reject MISO's proposal because (1) MISO (and PJM) could eliminate the requirement under the MISO-PJM JOA that interregional reliability projects must first qualify as MISO Baseline Reliability Projects;[362] (2) other projects with reliability benefits, such as Multi-Value Projects, which may produce reliability benefits, could be selected for regional cost allocation and,

---

[358] *Id.* at 8-9.

[359] PJM Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 13; PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 7-8; Ohio Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 7.

[360] Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 7.

[361] *Id.* at 9.

[362] ITC Companies Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 12.

therefore, should be eligible for interregional cost allocation to the extent they provide benefits to PJM;[363] and (3) MISO's proposal utilizes overly restrictive project categories based on narrow definitions of "benefit" and effectively excludes all but the most basic tie-line projects.[364] ITC Companies also contend that MISO's proposal does not comply with Order No. 1000's requirement for coordination and joint evaluation of projects.[365]

172. PJM Transmission Owners argue that MISO's proposal fails to satisfy Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 because MISO does not show how its proposal to allocate costs of interregional projects based on how much of the project lies on each side of the RTO border results in a cost allocation that is roughly commensurate with benefits.[366]

173. Lastly, PJM asserts that the Organization of MISO States' suggestion that the Commission preserve the existing MISO-PJM JOA provisions related to Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation and direct MISO to develop a regional cost allocation method for the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects costs allocated to MISO is a reasonable resolution to this issue.[367]

iv. Commission Determination

174. We reject MISO's proposal to remove the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method from the MISO-PJM JOA. We agree with MISO that, as currently defined in the MISO-PJM JOA, a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cannot be selected in MISO's regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation. A Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project must be a baseline reliability project under MISO's Tariff, but a MISO Baseline Reliability Project is no longer eligible for regional transmission cost allocation and is thus not considered to be selected in the MISO regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation. However, MISO may not

---

[363] *Id.* at 12-13 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,221 at PP 207-212, 215 (approving criteria for Multi-Value Projects which include reliability as a benefit)).

[364] *Id.* at 13 (citing MISO Attachment FF, Docket No. ER13-1945-000, at 30).

[365] *Id.* at 13-14.

[366] PJM Transmission Owners Limited Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1945-000, at 13.

[367] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 3-4 (filed Nov. 21, 2013).

remove the current cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects because the Commission previously directed MISO and PJM to develop the ex ante cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects set forth in the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA.[368] To the extent that a conflict exists between the existing Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation in the MISO-PJM JOA and the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000, that conflict results from MISO's decision to no longer regionally allocate the costs of MISO Baseline Reliability Projects, not the requirements of Order No. 1000. This decision does not preclude MISO from complying with Order No. 1000's interregional cost allocation requirements,[369] nor does MISO's decision dictate elimination of a cost allocation method previously required by the Commission. For this reason, MISO's argument that it must remove the existing cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects to comply with Order No. 1000, due to MISO's perceived conflict between the two, is mistaken. Accordingly, we find that MISO' proposal to remove the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method from the MISO-PJM JOA is not required for compliance with the interregional cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000. Accordingly, we reject MISO's proposal to remove the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method from section 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA.[370]

175. Because we find MISO's reasoning for removing the current MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation method unconvincing, we do not need to address PJM's and other protesters' arguments that MISO's removal of the existing cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects constitutes a unilateral revision prohibited by the terms of the MISO-PJM JOA.

---

[368] *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 109 FERC ¶ 61,168, at P 60 (2004).

[369] As discussed below, Order No. 1000 requires that public utility transmission providers, through their regional transmission planning process, must have an interregional cost allocation method or methods that apply to interregional transmission projects that address regional reliability and economic needs as well as transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 686.

[370] MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, §§ 9.4.3.2.1. (Cost Allocation for CBBRPs) (1.0.0).

c. Cross-Border Market Efficiency and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects

i. Proposal

176. As previously noted, MISO and PJM Transmission Owners propose to use the currently effective interregional cost allocation method for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects under the MISO-PJM JOA as part of their compliance with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[371] MISO agrees with PJM and PJM Transmission Owners that the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method as it exists in the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA should be used to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000.[372] However, MISO disagrees with PJM Transmission Owners' proposal to use the MISO-PJM JOA's existing interregional cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects. Instead, MISO proposes that only Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects be eligible for interregional cost allocation.

177. MISO and PJM and PJM Transmission Owners contend that the MISO-PJM JOA Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method satisfies and exceeds the Order No. 1000 requirements for interregional cost allocation. PJM and PJM Transmission Owners also argue that this is true for the MISO-PJM JOA Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation method as well. MISO, PJM and PJM Transmission Owners note that the Commission has specifically accepted the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method as just and reasonable.[373] PJM and PJM Transmission Owners note that the Commission has accepted the currently effective MISO-PJM JOA Cross-Border Baseline

[371] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 1-2; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 19.

[372] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 19.

[373] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3; PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 5, 7 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,102 at P 27; *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 122 FERC ¶ 61,084 at P 28); MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 23 (quoting *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,102 at P 27).

Reliability Project cost allocation method as just and reasonable.[374] MISO and PJM Transmission Owners state that the MISO-PJM JOA allocates costs for cross-border projects in direct proportion to the benefits received by each region, satisfying Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1.[375] Specifically, the MISO-PJM JOA allocates reliability project costs in proportion to each region's contribution to the transmission constraint that the project resolves and allocates market efficiency project costs in proportion to the production and energy cost savings each region will enjoy.[376] MISO adds that, like regional market efficiency projects, Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects are focused on addressing congestion relief and may also have beneficial reliability impacts. Additionally, MISO argues that the MISO-PJM JOA is consistent with Cost Allocation Principle 1 because costs are allocated in proportion to the net present value of the total benefits calculated for each RTO.[377] PJM Transmission Owners contend that the MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation methods appropriately focus on the benefits that the RTOs consider in determining whether to include a cross-border project in an interregional plan produced in accordance with the MISO-PJM JOA.[378] Finally, MISO asserts that the MISO-PJM JOA defines the benefits and beneficiaries of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects and that the current cost allocation of such projects is, at minimum, roughly commensurate with the estimated benefits provided by these facilities.[379]

---

[374] PJM Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1944-000, at 3; PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 5, 7 (citing *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 129 FERC ¶ 61,102 at P 27); *Midwest Indep. Transmission Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 122 FERC ¶ 61,084 at P 28).

[375] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 6; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 23.

[376] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 6.

[377] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 23.

[378] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 7.

[379] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 23.

178. MISO and PJM Transmission Owners state that, because the MISO-PJM JOA cost allocation methods[380] require approval of an interregional project through a joint interregional planning process and only allocates costs based on a determination of each region's benefits, it does not allocate any costs to a region that does not receive benefits, and therefore meets Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2.[381] MISO adds that the costs of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects cannot be allocated to either PJM or MISO without being selected in both regions' transmission planning processes and that the allocation of such costs is based on the voluntary agreement of both MISO and PJM under the MISO-PJM JOA.[382]

179. MISO and PJM Transmission Owners state that the MISO-PJM JOA cost allocations are consistent with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 because, under the MISO-PJM JOA, a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project requires a ratio of benefits to costs that does not exceed 1.25 to 1.[383]

180. PJM Transmission Owners state that the MISO-PJM JOA cost allocation methods meet Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4 because they apply both to new transmission facilities connecting the transmission planning regions and to new transmission facilities located in either PJM or MISO if the regions determine in their joint planning process that customers in both regions benefit from the new facility.[384] PJM Transmission Owners state that, under the MISO-PJM JOA, an interregional facility located only in one region must be selected by the Joint RTO Planning Committee, which requires that the RTO in which the facility is not located voluntarily agrees to bear a

---

[380] The MISO-PJM JOA cost allocation methods refer to both the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation and the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation.

[381] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 8; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 24.

[382] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 24.

[383] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 8; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 25 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2.1 (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[384] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 5-6, 9.

portion of the costs.[385] PJM Transmission Owners assert that, because the allocation is voluntary, the MISO-PJM JOA is consistent with Cost Allocation Principle 4.[386] MISO adds that in Order No. 1000, the Commission explicitly recognized that MISO and PJM have already implemented a cross-border cost allocation method that permits them to allocate to one RTO the cost of a transmission facility that is physically located entirely within the other RTO.[387] Further, MISO asserts that the Commission in Order No. 1000 stated that "MISO and PJM are not required by [Order No. 1000] to revise their existing cross-border allocation method in response to Cost Allocation Principle 4."[388] As a result, MISO states that it and PJM have retained the current features of the MISO-PJM JOA that allow for interregional cost allocation where a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project is entirely located in only one RTO but benefits the other region.[389]

181. MISO adds that, pursuant to Order No. 1000-A,[390] any MISO Transmission Owner that withdraws from MISO will remain responsible for its share of the cost of any interregional project that is a market efficiency project approved by MISO's Board of Directors before the effective date of such Transmission Owner's withdrawal, even if no portion of the project is located in the transmission planning area to which the Transmission Owner will transfer.[391]

182. MISO and PJM Transmission Owners state that the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation process complies with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 5 because it is transparent. PJM Transmission Owners add that the same is true for the costs of Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[392] Specifically, MISO and

---

[385] *Id.* at 9 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2 (Criteria for Project Designation as a CBMEP) (2.0.0)).

[386] *Id.*

[387] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 26.

[388] *Id.* (quoting Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 662).

[389] *Id.*

[390] *Id.* (citing Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 at P 714).

[391] *Id.* (citing MISO Transmission Owners Agreement, Art. 5, § II and Attachment FF, § III.A.2.f).

[392] *See* PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 9-10.

PJM argue that the MISO-PJM JOA details the cost allocation method and the proposed allocation of costs is reviewed with the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee and the appropriate multi-state entities before being posted on the two RTOs' web sites. In addition, MISO and PJM Transmission Owners note that stakeholders have an opportunity to review the proposed cost allocations throughout the planning process.[393] PJM Transmission Owners conclude, therefore, that the MISO-PJM JOA satisfies and even goes beyond the requirements of Cost Allocation Principle 5.[394]

183. Finally, PJM Transmission Owners state that the MISO-PJM JOA includes different cost allocation methods for Cross-Border Reliability and Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects, thus satisfying Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6.[395] MISO states that it is proposing the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project type as the sole method of interregional cost allocation for the purposes of Order No. 1000 between MISO and PJM.[396]

ii. Comments and Protests

184. Indiana Commission protests the PJM Transmission Owners' proposal because no interregional project between MISO and PJM has been approved under the current MISO-PJM JOA.[397]

iii. Commission Determination

185. We conditionally accept MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals to comply with the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000, subject to our acceptance of a further compliance filing to address

---

[393] *Id.*; MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 27 (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2.1 (Allocation of Costs of Network Upgrades) (2.0.0)).

[394] PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1924-000, at 10.

[395] *Id.* (citing PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4.3.2 (Cross-Border Project Shares) (2.0.0)).

[396] MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 27.

[397] Indiana Commission Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 4.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6, as discussed below. We reiterate our understanding that, since their inception, the cross-border transmission planning process and the related cost allocation methods in the MISO-PJM JOA have applied to transmission facilities located in one RTO *and* transmission facilities that cross the seam and are located in both RTOs. Therefore, our evaluation of MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals here is premised on our understanding that the proposals may apply to interregional transmission facilities as defined by Order No. 1000. As stated above, PJM Transmission Owners propose to use both existing MISO-PJM JOA cost allocation methods as the Order No. 1000 interregional cost allocation method for MISO and PJM, while MISO proposes that only the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation be used to comply with Order No. 1000. We find that PJM Transmission Owners' proposal to use the existing Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects cost allocation methods to comply with Order No. 1000 is consistent with Interregional Cost Allocation Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. We also find that MISO's proposal to use only the existing Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects to comply with Order No. 1000 is consistent with Interregional Cost Allocation Principles 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. However, we find that MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals do not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6. Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, further compliance filings as detailed below.

186. We agree with MISO and PJM Transmission Owners that the existing MISO-PJM JOA method allocates the costs of a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project to MISO and PJM in a manner that is at least roughly commensurate with the estimated benefits of the project, while ensuring that MISO and PJM are not involuntarily allocated the costs of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects from which they do not benefit. PJM Transmission Owners state that, for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, the MISO-PJM JOA allocates costs based on the relative contribution of the combined load of each RTO to the loading on the constrained facility that created the need for the project, as determined by a DFAX analysis. The proposals therefore meet Interregional Cost Allocation Principles 1 and 2.

187. The current MISO-PJM JOA is consistent with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 because a project must meet a benefit to cost threshold of 1.25:1 to be designated as a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project.[398] There is no benefit to cost threshold for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects; thus, Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 is not applicable.

[398] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2.1.b (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

188. With respect to Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4, we find that MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposed criteria and cost allocation for a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project and PJM Transmission Owners' criteria and cost allocation for a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project apply to transmission facilities located in both RTOs and to transmission facilities located in one RTO that provide benefits to the other RTO. Although Order No. 1000 defines an interregional transmission facility as one that is located in two or more transmission planning regions, the Commission recognized in the rule that MISO and PJM developed their existing cross-border cost allocation method in response to Commission directives related to the two RTOs' intertwined configuration, and stated that Order No. 1000 did not require that MISO and PJM revise their existing cross-border allocation method in response to Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4.[399] Because MISO and PJM voluntarily agree to assign the costs of a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project that is located solely in MISO or PJM using the existing interregional cost allocation method, we find that, to the extent that the proposed cost allocation method for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects applies to transmission facilities located in one RTO and that provide benefits to the other RTO, it meets and goes beyond the requirements Order No. 1000's Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4. Similarly, because PJM Transmission Owners' criteria and cost allocation for a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project reflect a voluntary agreement between MISO and PJM to assign the costs of a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project that is located solely in MISO or PJM using the existing interregional cost allocation method, we find that, to the extent that the proposed cost allocation method for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects applies both to new transmission facilities connecting the transmission planning regions and transmission facilities located in one RTO and that provide benefits to the other RTO, it meets and goes beyond the requirements Order No. 1000's Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4.

189. In addition to describing in detail the method for determining the benefits and beneficiaries of[400] and cost allocation for[401] Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, the MISO-PJM JOA states that the proposed cost allocation for a specific cross-border project will be reviewed by the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee and appropriate multi-stakeholder entities and

[399] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 662.

[400] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.2.1 (Determination of Benefits to Each RTO from CBMEP) (31.0.0).

[401] *See, e.g.*, *id.* § 9.4.3.2.2 (Cost Allocation for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects) (31.0.0).

will be posted on both PJM's and MISO's websites,[402] thus ensuring that stakeholders can determine how the cost allocation method was applied. Therefore, the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation methods meet the requirements of Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 5.

190. Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 specifies that the public utility transmission providers located in neighboring transmission planning regions have the flexibility to choose a different cost allocation method for different types of interregional transmission facilities, such as interregional transmission facilities needed for reliability, congestion relief, or to achieve Public Policy Requirements.[403] The Commission noted that public utility transmission providers are permitted, but not required, to designate different types of transmission facilities, such as transmission facilities needed for reliability, congestion relief, or to achieve Public Policy Requirements.[404] This statement means that, unless public utility transmission providers decide to have a different cost allocation method for each different type of interregional transmission facility, then they must have one interregional cost allocation method that applies to all three types of interregional transmission facilities. Therefore, the ability to pick one of these approaches did not remove the requirement that public utility transmission providers, through their regional transmission planning process, must have an interregional cost allocation method or methods that apply to interregional transmission projects that address regional reliability and economic needs as well as transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.[405] We find that the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project category applies to interregional transmission projects that address only economic transmission needs (e.g., production and energy cost savings). However, to comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6, MISO and PJM must also have an interregional cost allocation method(s) for regional reliability and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. For this reason MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' interregional cost allocation proposals for Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects do not fully comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6.

191. PJM Transmission Owners also propose to use the MISO-PJM JOA cost allocation for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects to comply with the cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000. As discussed above in the section on MISO's

---

[402] *See, e.g.*, *id.* § 9.4.3 (Network Upgrades Under Coordinated System Plan) (31.0.0).

[403] Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 685.

[404] *Id.* P 686.

[405] *Id.*

Proposal to Remove Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, we agree with MISO that MISO Baseline Reliability Projects cannot be selected in MISO's regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation. We find that this conflict with MISO's regional transmission planning process and the MISO-PJM JOA makes Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects unsatisfactory as an interregional transmission project category for the purpose of complying with the requirements of Order No. 1000. As a result of this conflict, we find that the existing cost allocation methods in the MISO-PJM JOA do not provide for the allocation of costs for interregional reliability transmission solutions. We further find, for the reasons discussed above, that the proposed modifications to the MISO-PJM JOA submitted here do not provide for an Order No. 1000-compliant allocation of costs for interregional reliability transmission solutions. Moreover, neither PJM nor MISO discusses how either the existing provisions of the MISO-PJM JOA or their interregional cost allocation proposals apply to regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.

192. For these reasons, we conditionally accept MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposed criteria and cost allocation for a Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project in sections 9.4.3.1.2 and 9.4.3.2.2 of the MISO-PJM JOA[406] and PJM Transmission Owners' criteria and cost allocation for a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project in sections 9.4.3.1.1 and 9.4.3.2.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA,[407] subject to our acceptance of a further compliance filing to address Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6.

193. Accordingly, we direct MISO and PJM to submit, within 60 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing to (1) revise their currently existing Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project and/or Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method(s), or propose a new interregional cost allocation method(s), that apply to interregional transmission projects addressing regional reliability transmission needs and are eligible to be selected in both MISO's and PJM's regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation; and (2) revise their currently existing Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project and/or Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation method(s), or propose a new interregional cost allocation method(s), that apply to interregional transmission projects addressing regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements and are eligible to be selected in both MISO's and PJM's regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation or provide a detailed

[406] *See, e.g.*, MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, §§ 9.4.3.1.2 (Criteria for Project Designation as a CBMEP) and 9.4.3.2.2 (Cost Allocation for CBMEPs) (1.0.0).

[407] PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, §§ 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a CBBRP) and 9.4.3.2.1 (Cost Allocation for CBBRPs) (2.0.0).

description of how their revised cost allocation method(s) account for regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.

194. We clarify that, by using the phrase "and/or" in our compliance directives we are suggesting that whether the compliance directives apply to both proposals depends on the cost allocation method(s) that MISO and PJM propose on compliance. For example, if MISO and PJM propose on compliance to revise the Cross-Border Market Efficiency Project cost allocation proposal to apply to interregional transmission projects that address regional reliability needs and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements and assert that this one cost allocation method complies with our directives, MISO and PJM are not required to make a similar showing for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation.

d. Miscellaneous

i. Protests and Comments

195. Organization of MISO States opposes MISO's proposed cost allocation for generator interconnection network upgrades.[408] According to Organization of MISO States, MISO's Tariff allows for 10 percent of network transmission upgrades 345 kV or above to be allocated on a postage stamp basis to MISO load. Organization of MISO States asserts that, without a case-specific demonstration of commensurate benefits to all MISO load-serving entities, it would not be reasonable to allocate to MISO load on a postage stamp basis 10 percent of the cost of network upgrades needed on PJM's system to enable a generator to interconnect to the MISO system, which could create reliability issues on the PJM system.[409] Organization of MISO States propose that the costs of network upgrades on the PJM system needed to enable a generator to interconnect to the MISO system should be allocated to the generator seeking interconnection.[410]

196. Wind Parties, ITC Companies, and Nine Public Interest Organizations argue that the Commission should reject MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals and

[408] Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 18 (citing MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.1 (proposed)).

[409] *Id.* at 18-19 (citing MISO Tariff, Attachment FF, § III.A.2.d.(1) (Allocation of Costs Within the Transmission Provider Region) (31.0.0)).

[410] *Id.* at 19.

require them to develop an interregional cost allocation method that considers a wider range of project types and benefits.[411]

197. Wind Parties assert that neither MISO's nor PJM Transmission Owners' proposals meets Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 because they do not consider the full range of benefits of interregional projects, including public policy benefits, when assigning costs. Wind Parties also are concerned that neither proposal reasonably assigns different benefits to each neighboring region because the cost allocation methods limit interregional projects to those that are either reliability projects or economic projects, but not both.[412] Further, Wind Parties assert that, contrary to the Commission's goals in Order No. 1000, PJM Transmission Owners' proposal, by not considering all potential project benefits, while adding them together, limits the potential to build new transmission additions to meet the region's transmission needs.[413] Wind Parties assert that interregional cost allocation methods that do not consider all the potential benefits of a transmission project are less likely to meet the required benefit to cost ratio and, therefore, are less likely to be built, even though the project's benefits may far outweigh its costs if all benefits are considered.

198. Wind Parties urge the Commission to reject both proposals and use the record before it to develop an appropriate interregional cost allocation method. Wind Parties assert that the lack of a robust cost allocation mechanism across the MISO-PJM seam has made it, and will continue to make it, difficult to construct interregional projects.[414] Wind Parties assert that the existing provisions in the MISO-PJM JOA are not sufficient to address real seams issues, such as operations and settlement issues dating back to when Commonwealth Edison and AEP joined PJM in 2004.[415] Wind Parties also claim that

---

[411] ITC Companies Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 9-11; Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 15-16; Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 9-10.

[412] Wind Parties Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 7-10.

[413] *Id.* at 10-11 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 501).

[414] *Id.* at 11-12.

[415] *Id.* at 12-13 (citing "State of the Market Report for PJM," Monitoring Analytics, LLC, Section 10 (2013), *available at* http://www.monitoringanalytics.com/reports/PJM_State_of_the_Market/2012/2012-som-

(continued ...)

curtailment of wind resources in Northern Illinois requires the construction of interregional seams project with MISO to minimize lost production but asserts that it is unclear how such a project would be selected and fit into either of the cost allocation proposals before the Commission.[416]

199. If the Commission is not willing to determine a cost allocation method for MISO and PJM, Wind Parties request that the Commission facilitate a process for the RTOs to resume discussions and agree upon a single interregional cost allocation proposal and provide additional guidance regarding what is necessary to meet the cost allocation principles of Order No. 1000.[417] If the Commission pursues this suggestion, Wind Parties urge the Commission to require MISO and PJM to consider and evaluate economic, reliability, and public policy benefits in their interregional cost allocation methods. Wind Parties assert that cost allocation methods that consider all types of benefits and evaluate these benefits in an additive manner will make interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation more likely to result in new transmission additions addressing seams issues.[418]

200. ITC Companies also request that the Commission develop a cost allocation method that considers a full range of projects capable of providing benefits associated with reliability, reserve sharing, production cost savings, congestion relief, and public policy requirements.[419] ITC Companies argue there is no special feature of the PJM-MISO seam that eliminates the economic, reliability, and public policy benefits supporting regional projects in MISO and other RTOs and many of these benefits can be realized with interregional projects if such benefits are considered.[420] ITC Companies assert that the interregional cost allocation methods proposed will continue to fail to result in the identification and construction of interregional projects and such failure proves that the MISO-PJM JOA cannot and does not fulfill the goals of Order No. 1000

---

pjm-volume2-sec10.pdf; and "2012 State of the Market Report for The MISO Electricity Markets," Potomac Economics (June 2013), *available at* http://www.potomaceconomics.com/uploads/reports/2012_SOM_Report_final_6-10-13.pdf).

[416] *Id.* at 13.

[417] *Id.* at 13-14.

[418] *Id.* at 14.

[419] ITC Companies Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000 at 9.

[420] *Id.* at 14-15.

unless the Commission believes that no such project exists.[421] ITC Companies argue that these proposals are the type of overly-narrow project scope and benefit definition issues the Commission stated it would resolve in Order No. 1000.[422]

201. ITC Companies add that PJM Transmission Owners go too far in suggesting that, because the Commission has offered a general statement that it is not requiring (or precluding) a host of potential factors, MISO and PJM may exclude all but the most stringent categories of projects, with each generating only a single, narrow type of benefit.[423]

202. ITC Companies suggest that the Commission establish a cost allocation method for MISO and PJM that is similar to SPP's proposal for SPP-MISO projects. ITC Companies assert that SPP's proposal recognizes that compliance with Order No. 1000 requires consideration of interregional projects that may address economic, reliability, and public policy issues more efficiently or cost-effectively than projects identified in each region's regional transmission planning process.[424]

203. Similarly, Nine Public Interest Organizations argue that the fact that the Commission does not require interregional transmission planning for economic and public policy projects does not obviate the need for regions to consider economic and public policy benefits of an interregional project to ensure that costs are allocated roughly commensurate with benefits.[425] Nine Public Interest Organizations state that, to the extent that MISO's and PJM's regional planning processes incorporate transmission needs driven by reliability and public policy, the interregional cost allocation method must apply to potential interregional solutions to those regional needs.[426] Nine Public Interest Organizations assert that, otherwise, under MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals some project benefits cannot be allocated and MISO's and PJM

---

[421] *Id.*

[422] *Id.* at 14-15 (citing Order No. 1000, FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 31,323 at P 625).

[423] *Id.* at 10-11.

[424] *Id.* (citing SPP, Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1937-000, at 32 (filed July 10, 2013)).

[425] Nine Public Interest Organizations Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000, at 17.

[426] *Id.*

Transmission Owners' proposed cost allocation methods will not lead to the allocation of costs in a manner roughly commensurate with all the benefits from a proposed project.[427]

204. Both MISO Transmission Owners and Organization of MISO States contend that a change needs to be made to section 9.4.3.1.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA in MISO's proposal.[428] MISO Transmission Owners explain that, under that section, a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project must be, among other things, a Baseline Reliability Project as defined under the MISO *or* PJM Tariffs.[429] MISO Transmission Owners assert that this provision should be conjunctive; in other words, the project must be selected as a reliability project as defined under the MISO *and* PJM Tariffs in order to qualify for interregional cost allocation, and not just under one tariff or the other.[430] MISO Transmission Owners and Organization of MISO States assert that this change is consistent with the principles of Order No. 1000, which provides that a cross-border project should be included in interregional cost allocation only if it is first selected for regional cost allocation in the planning process for both regions.[431] MISO Transmission Owners argue that use of "and" instead of "or" here is also consistent with the terms that MISO has proposed for cost allocation of interregional reliability projects.[432]

---

[427] *Id.* at 17-18 (illustrating how the limited cost allocation approach violates Order No. 1000's Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1).

[428] MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 4; Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 13.

[429] MISO Transmission Owners Protest, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 4 (citing MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (1.0.0)) (emphasis added).

[430] *Id.* (citing MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (1.0.0)) (emphasis added).

[431] *Id.*; Organization of MISO States Protest, Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, and ER13-1944-000, at 13.

[432] *Id.* (citing MISO, Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4.3.1.1 (Criteria for Project Designation as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project) (1.0.0)).

ii. Answers

205. MISO asserts that Organization of MISO States' objection to the payment obligation for network upgrades associated with generator interconnections is outside the scope of this proceeding. MISO states that neither MISO nor PJM have proposed substantive changes to this provision, other than inserting "Party's [Tariff]" in place of "Parties' Order 2003 compliance filings as accepted by FERC." [433] MISO asserts that the proposed reference is the functional equivalent of the tariff rules the Commission accepted in MISO's and PJM's Order No. 2003 compliance filings. MISO contends that the Commission should disregard Organization of MISO States' opposition because it neither relates to nor is supported by the substitution of the functionally equivalent phrase "Party's [Tariff]."[434]

206. MISO agrees with Organization of MISO States and MISO Transmission Owners that it would be more accurate to use "and" rather than "or" in section 9.4.3.1.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA. MISO states that it is willing to make this change.[435] PJM disagrees. PJM states that the use of "or" in section 9.4.3.1.1 was a deliberate choice by MISO and PJM that obligates the two RTOs to build Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects, even if the need for the project was triggered only by one RTO's tariff. PJM asserts this term is central to the concept of the MISO-PJM JOA created due to the nature of the intertwined seam between MISO and PJM. PJM adds that this term cannot be unilaterally changed by one intervenor or party to the MISO-PJM JOA by claiming it was an "editing error."[436]

207. PJM notes that, during the Order No. 1000 joint stakeholder process and subsequent negotiations between MISO and PJM, there were no objections to the continued use of the term "or." PJM claims that its agreement to revise section 9.4.3.1.1 of the MISO-PJM JOA was premised on leaving this subsection intact. In addition, PJM asserts that providing fewer options to build transmission in the name of Order No. 1000 compliance is inconsistent with the Commission's goal to provide greater options for the development of more efficient or cost-effective cross-border transmission solutions. PJM

---

[433] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35 (filed Nov. 1, 2013). MISO also clarifies that the use of the term "Party's [Tariff]" is intended to refer to the Tariff of the affected system.

[434] *Id.*

[435] *Id.* at 32.

[436] PJM Answer, Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000, at 5-6.

concludes that maintaining the term "or" is critical to giving MISO and PJM the flexibility to continue to plan Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[437]

208. MISO disagrees with Ohio Commission's request that the Commission direct MISO and PJM to use a solution-based DFAX method for cost allocation of Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects. MISO argues that those projects are ineligible for interregional cost allocation under Order No. 1000 regardless of which DFAX method is used. MISO also asserts that, if the Commission accepts its proposal, then DFAX-based cost allocation would not be used for Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Projects.[438]

209. MISO counters Wind Parties' and Nine Public Interest Organizations' arguments that MISO's proposal does not account for different types of transmission drivers and benefits. MISO asserts that these parties mischaracterize MISO's proposal, which does consider public policy needs and reliability in connection with the retention of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects for purposes of interregional cost allocation. MISO states that it considers the economic benefits of meeting public policy requirements through the joint evaluation of Cross-Border Market Efficiency Projects, which uses jointly developed future scenarios that include transmission needs driven by public policy requirements identified through MISO's and PJM's respective regional planning processes. Furthermore, MISO argues that the use of adjusted production cost savings captures the majority of the benefits provided by public policy driven projects, noting that its detailed business case on Multi-Value Projects demonstrates that the largest economic efficiency created by such projects is decreased congestion and fuel savings.[439]

iii. Commission Determination

210. In addition to the reasons stated above in the General Requirements section of this order, we reiterate that the both MISO's and PJM Transmission Owners' proposals for cost allocation methods for Cross-Border Market Efficiency and Cross-Border Baseline Reliability projects only partially comply with the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000 because the cost allocation methods do not explicitly apply to an interregional transmission facility, as defined by Order No. 1000 and must be revised as discussed above.[440]

---

[437] *Id.* at 6-7.

[438] MISO Answer, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, at 35-36 (filed Nov. 1, 2013).

[439] *Id.* at 27-29 (citing MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing, Docket No. ER13-1943-000, Curran Test., at 11-12).

[440] As discussed above in the General Requirements section of this order, we have *(continued ...)*

211. Regarding Ohio Commission's comment, we note that the Commission has not found that solution-based DFAX is needed to comply with Order No. 1000 or that it is the only DFAX analysis that allocates costs roughly commensurate with benefits. The Commission has previously found that solution-based DFAX cost allocation is an improvement over the violation-based DFAX cost allocation and acknowledged the potential benefits that it could provide.[441] However, the Commission found that the PJM Transmission Owners only need to show that their proposal is just and reasonable and complies with the requirements of Order No. 1000; the Commission did not require the PJM Transmission Owners to demonstrate that their proposal is superior to the previous cost allocation method.[442] We find that PJM Transmission Owners' proposal to use the violation-based DFAX to allocate the cost between the RTOs complies with Cost Allocation Principle 1. We note, however, that to the extent that stakeholders find that it is appropriate to change to the DFAX method used here, stakeholders could propose in MISO's and PJM's respective stakeholder processes to revise the Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project cost allocation to use solution-based DFAX.

212. We disagree with Wind Parties' and ITC Companies' argument that PJM Transmission Owners' proposal fails to meet Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 because they do not consider the full range of benefits of interregional projects, including public policy benefits, when assigning costs. We note that Order No. 1000 did not require that an interregional cost allocation method consider every possible benefit that could be created by constructing a transmission facility. Rather, Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 requires that entities that pay for a transmission facility receive a commensurate benefit, pursuant to the cost causation principle. We find that, to the extent that a transmission solution is identified as a Cross-Border Baseline Reliability Project providing reliability benefits to both regions, PJM Transmission Owners' proposal allocates costs commensurate with received reliability benefits. We reject as outside the scope of this proceeding Organization of MISO States' protest that the MISO-PJM JOA's cost allocation for generator interconnection network upgrades is unreasonable. We note that neither MISO nor PJM Transmission Owners propose to use this cost allocation method to comply with the interregional cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000. Furthermore, we agree with MISO that the proposed revisions do not functionally alter the provisions at issue that were previously accepted by the Commission.

---

directed MISO and PJM to revise the definition of "cross-border allocation project" consistent with the definition of "interregional transmission facility" in Order No. 1000.

[441] *See* PJM First Regional Compliance Order, 142 FERC ¶ 61,214 at P 427.

[442] *See id.* (internal citations omitted).

213. Finally, we disagree with protestors that it is necessary to substitute the term "and" for "or" in section 9.4.3.1.1 to comply with the interregional requirements of Order No. 1000. To the extent that the existing term is the result of an editing error, we encourage protesters use the MISO and PJM stakeholder processes to resolve this error.

The Commission orders:

(A) MISO's compliance filings are hereby rejected in part and conditionally accepted in part, subject to a further compliance filing, as discussed in the body of this order.

(B) PJM's and PJM Transmission Owners' compliance filings are hereby conditionally accepted, subject to a further compliance filing, as discussed in the body of this order.

(C) Entergy's compliance filing is hereby rejected, as discussed in the body of this order.

(D) Cleco's compliance filing is hereby rejected, as discussed in the body of this order.

(E) MISO, PJM, and PJM Transmission Owners are hereby directed to submit further compliance filings, within 60 days of the date of this order, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

V. Appendix A: Abbreviated Names of Intervenors

The following tables contain the abbreviated names of intervenors that are used in this Order on Compliance Filings.

Intervenors

PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1924-000

Abbreviation	Intervenor(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
American Transmission Company	American Transmission Company LLC
Dayton Power and Light	Dayton Power and Light Company (The)
Dominion Resources Services*	Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Duke	Duke Energy Corporation
Duke-American Transmission	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
E.ON Climate & Renewables North America	E.ON Climate & Renewables North America, LLC
Exelon	Exelon Corporation
FirstEnergy Transmission Owners	Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Monongahela Power Company, The Potomac Edison Company, West Penn Power Company, American Transmission Systems, Incorporated and Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company

Indiana Commission	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
Maryland PSC	Maryland Public Service Commission
Midwest TDUs	Madison Gas and Electric Company, Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, Missouri River Energy Services, and WPPI Energy
MISO	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
MISO Transmission Owners*	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.
Nine Public Interest Organizations	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate

	Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation	North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation
NIPSCO	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
Organization of MISO States[443]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board; Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission; Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
Pennsylvania Commission	Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PHI Companies	Pepco Holdings, Inc.; Potomac Electric Power Company; Delmarva Power & Light Company; and Atlantic City Electric Company

[443] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the Organization of MISO States, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

PJM	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PPL PJM Companies*	PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; PPL EnergyPlus, LLC; PPL Brunner Island, LLC; PPL Holtwood, LLC; PPL Ironwood, LLC; PPL Martins Creek, LLC; PPL Montour, LLC; PPL Susquehanna, LLC; Lower Mount Bethel Energy, LLC; PPL New Jersey Solar, LLC; PPL New Jersey Biogas, LLC; and PPL Renewable Energy, LLC
PSEG Companies	Public Service Electric and Gas Company, PSEG Power LLC, and PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company

* late intervention

MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1943-000/001

Abbreviations	Intervenor(s)
Ameren Services Company	Ameren Services Company, on behalf of its affiliated operating companies: Ameren Illinois Company and Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri; and on behalf of its affiliated marketing and generating companies: Ameren Energy Marketing Company, Ameren Energy Generating Company and AmerenEnergy Resources Generating Company
American Transmission Company	American Transmission Company LLC
Consumers Energy Company	Consumers Energy Company
Dominion Resources Services	Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Duke	Duke Energy Corporation; Duke Energy Indiana, Inc.; Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.; Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.; Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC; Duke Energy Progress, Inc.; Duke Energy Florida, Inc.; Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management, Inc.; Duke Energy Business Services, LLC
Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company	Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company, LLC
Duke-American Transmission	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
E.ON Climate & Renewables North America	E.ON Climate & Renewables North America, LLC
Exelon	Exelon Corporation

FirstEnergy Transmission Owners	Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Monongahela Power Company, The Potomac Edison Company, West Penn Power Company, American Transmission Systems, Incorporated and Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company
Indiana Commission	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
Maryland PSC	Maryland Public Service Commission
Midwest TDUs	Madison Gas and Electric Company, Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, Missouri River Energy Services, and WPPI Energy
Nine Public Interest Organizations	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
NRG Companies	Louisiana Generating LLC; NRG Power Marketing LLC; GenOn Energy Management, LLC; Bayou Cove Peaking Power LLC; Big Cajun I Peaking Power LLC; NRG Sterlington

	Power LLC; Cottonwood Energy Company LP; NRG Wholesale Generation LP
Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
Organization of MISO States[444]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board; Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission; Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
PHI Companies	Pepco Holdings, Inc.; Potomac Electric Power Company; Delmarva Power & Light Company; and Atlantic City Electric Company
PJM	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PPL PJM Companies*	PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; PPL EnergyPlus, LLC; PPL Brunner Island, LLC; PPL Holtwood, LLC; PPL Ironwood, LLC; PPL Martins Creek, LLC; PPL Montour, LLC; PPL Susquehanna, LLC; Lower Mount Bethel Energy, LLC; PPL New Jersey Solar, LLC; PPL New Jersey Biogas,

[444] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the Organization of MISO States, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

	LLC; and PPL Renewable Energy, LLC
PSEG Companies	Public Service Electric and Gas Company, PSEG Power LLC, and PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC.
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company
Transource Energy, LLC	Transource Energy, LLC
Wisconsin Electric	Wisconsin Electric Power Company

* late intervention

PJM Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1944-000

Abbreviation	Intervenor(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
American Transmission Company	American Transmission Company LLC
Dominion Resources Services	Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Duke	Duke Energy Corporation; Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.; Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.; Duke Energy Indiana, Inc.; Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC; Duke Energy Progress, Inc.; Duke Energy Florida, Inc.; Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management, Inc.; Duke Energy Retail Sales, LLC; Duke Energy Hanging Rock II, LLC; Duke Energy Washington II, LLC; Duke Energy Lee II, LLC; Duke Energy Fayette II, LLC; Duke Energy Business Services, LLC
Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company	Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company, LLC
Duke-American Transmission	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
E.ON Climate & Renewables North America	E.ON Climate & Renewables North America, LLC
Exelon	Exelon Corporation
FirstEnergy Transmission Owners	Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Monongahela Power Company, The Potomac Edison

	Company, West Penn Power Company, American Transmission Systems, Incorporated and Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company
Indiana Commission	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
Maryland PSC	Maryland Public Service Commission
Midwest TDUs	Madison Gas and Electric Company, Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, Missouri River Energy Services, and WPPI Energy
MISO	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
MISO Transmission Owners*	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.

Nine Public Interest Organizations	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation	North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation
NIPSCO	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
Organization of MISO States[445]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board; Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission; Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
Pennsylvania Commission	Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
PPL PJM Companies*	PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; PPL

[445] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the Organization of MISO States, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

	EnergyPlus, LLC; PPL Brunner Island, LLC; PPL Holtwood, LLC; PPL Ironwood, LLC; PPL Martins Creek, LLC; PPL Montour, LLC; PPL Susquehanna, LLC; Lower Mount Bethel Energy, LLC; PPL New Jersey Solar, LLC; PPL New Jersey Biogas, LLC; and PPL Renewable Energy, LLC
PSEG Companies	Public Service Electric and Gas Company, PSEG Power LLC, and PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company
Transource Energy, LLC	Transource Energy, LLC
Wisconsin Electric	Wisconsin Electric Power Company

* late intervention

MISO Attachment FF Filing
Docket No. ER13-1945-000

Abbreviation	Intervenor(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
Ameren Services Company	Ameren Services Company, on behalf of its affiliated operating companies: Ameren Illinois Company and Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri; and on behalf of its affiliated marketing and generating companies: Ameren Energy Marketing Company, Ameren Energy Generating Company and AmerenEnergy Resources Generating Company
American Transmission Company	American Transmission Company LLC
Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation	Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation
Associated Electric Cooperative	Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc.
Consumers Energy Company	Consumers Energy Company
Dalton Utilities	Dalton Utilities
Duke	Duke Energy Corporation; Duke Energy Indiana, Inc.; Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.; Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.; Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC; Duke Energy Progress, Inc.; Duke Energy Florida, Inc.; Duke Energy Commercial Asset Management, Inc.; Duke Energy Business Services, LLC
Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company	Duke Energy Transmission Holding Company, LLC
Duke-American Transmission	Duke-American Transmission

	Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
E.ON Climate & Renewables North America	E.ON Climate & Renewables North America, LLC
Exelon	Exelon Corporation
Georgia Transmission Corporation	Georgia Transmission Corporation
Indiana Commission	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
Kansas City Power & Light and KCP&L Greater Missouri	Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company
Louisville Gas & Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company	Louisville Gas & Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company
Maryland PSC	Maryland Public Service Commission
MEAG Power	MEAG Power
Midwest TDUs	Madison Gas and Electric Company, Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, Missouri River Energy Services, and WPPI Energy
MISO Transmission Owners	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); American Transmission Company LLC; Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; City Water, Light & Power

	(Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Duke Energy Corporation for Duke Energy Indiana, Inc.; Entergy Arkansas, Inc.; Entergy Louisiana, LLC; Entergy Gulf States Louisiana, L.L.C.; Entergy Mississippi, Inc.; Entergy New Orleans, Inc.; Entergy Texas, Inc.; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; Indianapolis Power & Light Company; MidAmerican Energy Company; Michigan Public Power Agency; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern Indiana Public Service Company; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Northwestern Wisconsin Electric Company; Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power Inc.; South Mississippi Electric Power Association; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.
Nine Public Interest Organizations	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Ohio Valley Electric Corporation	Ohio Valley Electric Corporation

Old Dominion Electric Cooperative	Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
Organization of MISO States[446]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Kentucky Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board; Michigan Public Service Commission; Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
PJM	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PowerSouth Electric Cooperative	PowerSouth Electric Cooperative
PPL PJM Companies*	PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; PPL EnergyPlus, LLC; PPL Brunner Island, LLC; PPL Holtwood, LLC; PPL Ironwood, LLC; PPL Martins Creek, LLC; PPL Montour, LLC; PPL Susquehanna, LLC; Lower Mount Bethel Energy, LLC; PPL New Jersey Solar, LLC; PPL New Jersey Biogas, LLC; and PPL Renewable Energy, LLC
PSEG Companies	Public Service Electric and Gas Company, PSEG Power LLC, and PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC
Climate & Energy Project and the Sustainable FERC Project	Climate & Energy Project and the Sustainable FERC Project

[446] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the Organization of MISO States, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company
Southern Companies	Southern Company Services, Inc. (on behalf of Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, Mississippi Power Company, and Southern Power Company)
South Mississippi Electric Power Association	South Mississippi Electric Power Association
Transource Energy, LLC	Transource Energy, LLC
Western Farmers Electric Cooperative	Western Farmers Electric Cooperative
Wisconsin Electric	Wisconsin Electric Power Company

* late intervention

Entergy Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1955-000

Abbreviation	Intervenor(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
Lafayette Utilities System	Lafayette Utilities System
Louisiana Energy and Power Authority	Louisiana Energy and Power Authority
MISO	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company

Cleco Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1956-000

Abbreviation	Intervenor(s)
Lafayette Utilities System	Lafayette Utilities System
Louisiana Energy and Power Authority	Louisiana Energy and Power Authority
MISO	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
Rockland Electric Company	Rockland Electric Company

VI. Appendix B: Abbreviated Names of Initial Commenters

The following tables contain the abbreviated names of initial commenters that are used in this Order on Compliance Filings.

Initial Commenters

PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1924-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Indiana Commission +	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
MISO and MISO Transmission Owners +	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.; Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.
Nine Public Interest Organizations +	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate

	Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO +[447]	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Organization of MISO States[448]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board, Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Mississippi Public Service Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; and Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
Wind Parties *	American Wind Energy Association; Wind on the Wires; and Mid-Atlantic Renewable Energy Coalition

* late comments
\+ protest

[447] On September 1, 2013, NIPSCO filed an errata to its protest.

[448] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the Organization of MISO States (OMS), participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000/001

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
Duke-American Transmission +[449]	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
Exelon +	Exelon Corporation
Indiana Commission+	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
MISO Transmission Owners[450]	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Ameren Missouri, Ameren Illinois Company, and Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric; Indianapolis Power & Light Company; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern Indiana Public Service Company; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and

[449] Duke-American Transmission submitted comments and protests in its September 9, 2013 pleading.

[450] On September 11, 2013, MISO Transmission Owners submitted a correction to their September 9, 2013 comments.

	Wisconsin corporations); Northwestern Wisconsin Electric Company; Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; and Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency
Nine Public Interest Organizations +	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO +[451]	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Organization of MISO States[452]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board, Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Mississippi Public Service Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public

[451] On September 1, 2013, NIPSCO filed an errata to its protest.

[452] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the OMS, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

	Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
PJM +	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PJM Transmission Owners +[453]	PJM Transmission Owners
Wind Parties *	American Wind Energy Association; Wind on the Wires; and The Wind Coalition

* late comments
\+ protest

[453] PJM Transmission Owners submitted a limited protest.

PJM Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1944-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation
Duke-American Transmission +[454]	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
Indiana Commission +	Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
MISO and MISO Transmission Owners +	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.; Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Missouri, Ameren Illinois Company, and Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern Indiana Public Service Company; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency;

[454] Duke-American Transmission submitted comments and protests in its September 9, 2013 pleading.

	and Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.
Nine Public Interest Organizations +	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO +[455]	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Ohio Commission	Public Utilities Commission of Ohio
Organization of MISO States[456]	Arkansas Public Service Commission; Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board, Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Mississippi Public Service Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
Wind Parties *	American Wind Energy Association;

[455] On September 11, 2013, NIPSCO filed an errata to its protest.

[456] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the OMS, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

Wind on the Wires; and Mid-Atlantic Renewable Energy Coalition

* late comments
\+ protest

MISO Attachment FF Filing
Docket No. ER13-1945-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation +	Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation
Climate & Energy Project and the Sustainable FERC Project +	Climate & Energy Project and the Sustainable FERC Project
Duke-American Transmission +[457]	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
Exelon +	Exelon Corporation
ITC Companies	International Transmission Company; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; ITC Midwest LLC
Nine Public Interest Organizations +	Earthjustice, Environmental Law and Policy Center, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, Pace Energy and Climate Center, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sustainable FERC Project, and Union of Concerned Scientists
NIPSCO +[458]	Northern Indiana Public Service Company
Organization of MISO States[459]	Arkansas Public Service Commission;

[457] Duke-American Transmission submitted comments and protests in its September 9, 2013 pleading.

[458] On September 11, 2013, NIPSCO filed an errata to its protest.

[459] Louisiana Public Service Commission abstained from these comments. The Manitoba Public Utilities Board did not participate in these comments. The Indiana

(continued ...)

	Illinois Commerce Commission; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission; Iowa Utilities Board, Kentucky Public Service Commission; Michigan Public Service Commission, Minnesota Public Utilities Commission; Mississippi Public Service Commission; Missouri Public Service Commission; Montana Public Service Commission; City of New Orleans; North Dakota Public Service Commission; South Dakota Public Utilities Commission; Public Utility Commission of Texas; Wisconsin Public Service Commission
PJM +	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PJM Transmission Owners +	PJM Transmission Owners
Wind Parties *	American Wind Energy Association; Wind on the Wires; and The Wind Coalition

* late comments
\+ protest

Office of Utility Consumer Counselor, as an associate member of the OMS, participated in these comments and generally supports these comments.

Entergy Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1955-000

No protests or comments were filed in this docket.

Cleco Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1956-000

No protests or comments were filed in this docket.

VII. Appendix C: Abbreviated Names of Reply Commenters

The following tables contain the abbreviated names of reply commenters that are used in this Order on Compliance Filings.

Reply Commenters

PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1924-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Exelon[460]	Exelon Corporation
MISO Transmission Owners[461]	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Agency; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power Inc.; South

[460] Exelon filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

[461] MISO Transmission Owners filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on October 31, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

	Mississippi Electric Power Association; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.
PJM Transmission Owners[462]	PJM Transmission Owners

MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing
Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000/001

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Duke-American Transmission[463]	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
Exelon[464]	Exelon Corporation
MISO[465]	Midcontinent Independent System

[462] PJM Transmission Owners filed an answer to protests and comments on the PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1924-000) and to MISO's protest of the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000) on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-000).

[463] Duke-American Transmission filed a response to the November 1, 2013 joint answer of MISO and PJM (Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000) on November 21, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000).

[464] Exelon filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

[465] MISO filed: jointly with PJM, answer to comments and protests in response to the joint coordination and planning portions of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000) and the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000) on November 1, 2013 (filed in Dockets Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000); and an answer to comments and protests to the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1943-000) on November 1, 2013 (filed in Docket No. ER13-1943-000)

(continued ...)

	Operator, Inc.
MISO Transmission Owners[466]	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Agency; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power Inc.; South Mississippi Electric Power Association; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.
PJM[467]	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

---

[466] MISO Transmission Owners filed: an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on October 31, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000); and an answer to the protests of PJM and the PJM Transmission Owners on November 7, 2013 (filed in Docket No. ER13-1943-000).

[467] PJM filed, jointly with MISO, an answer to protests and comments a response to the joint coordination and planning portions of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1943-000) and the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000), on November 1, 2013 (filed in Dockets Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-00); and a response to the MISO November 1, 2013 answer in Docket No. ER13-1943-000 ; comments of Organization of MISO States, MISO

(continued ...)

Transmission Owners, Ohio Commission and AEP, and protest of NIPSCO to the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000), on November 21, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000).

PJM Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1944-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Duke-American Transmission[468]	Duke-American Transmission Company, LLC and DATC Midwest Holdings, LLC
Exelon[469]	Exelon Corporation
MISO[470]	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.
MISO Transmission Owners[471]	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Agency; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana

[468] Duke-American Transmission filed a response to the November 1, 2013 joint answer of MISO and PJM on November 21, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000).

[469] Exelon filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

[470] MISO filed, jointly with PJM, answer to comments and protests in response to the joint coordination and planning portions of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000) and the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000) on November 1, 2013 (filed in Dockets Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000).

[471] MISO Transmission Owners filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on October 31, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1944-000 and ER13-1945-000).

	Municipal Power Agency; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power Inc.; South Mississippi Electric Power Association; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.
PJM[472]	PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.
PJM Transmission Owners[473]	PJM Transmission Owners

[472] PJM filed: jointly with MISO, an answer to protests and comments in response to the joint coordination and planning portions of the MISO and MISO Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1943-000) and the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000), on November 1, 2013 (filed in Dockets Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-00); and a response to the MISO November 1, 2013 answer in Docket No. ER13-1943-000, comments of Organization of MISO States, MISO Transmission Owners, Ohio Commission and AEP, and protest of NIPSCO to the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1944-000), on November 21, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1943-000 and ER13-1944-000).

[473] PJM Transmission Owners filed an answer to protests and comments on the PJM Transmission Owners Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1943-000) and to MISO's protest of the PJM Compliance Filing (Docket No. ER13-1924-000) on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket No. ER13-1924-000 and ER13-1944-00).

MISO Attachment FF Filing
Docket No. ER13-1945-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)
Exelon[474]	Exelon Corporation
MISO Transmission Owners[475]	Ameren Services Company (as agent for Union Electric Company, Ameren Illinois Company, Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois); Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Central Minnesota Municipal Agency; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Missouri River Energy Services; Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern States Power Company (Minnesota and Wisconsin corporations); Otter Tail Power Company; Prairie Power Inc.; South Mississippi Electric Power Association; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.

[474] Exelon filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on September 24, 2013 (filed in Docket No. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1943-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

[475] MISO Transmission Owners filed an answer to the protest of NIPSCO on October 31, 2013 (filed in Docket Nos. ER13-1924-000, ER13-1944-000, and ER13-1945-000).

Entergy Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1955-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)

No answers were filed in this docket.

Cleco Compliance Filing
Docket No. ER13-1956-000

Abbreviation	Commenter(s)

No answers were filed in this docket.

VIII. Appendix D: eTariff Records

The following table contains the eTariff records that are addressed in this Order on Compliance Filings. Shorthand eTariff record citations are only provided for those records that are explicitly addressed in this Order on Compliance Filings.

Filing Party Short Cite	Docket No.	Tariff Record Citation	Shorthand Tariff Record Citation
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5 (Midwest ISO-PJM Joint Operating Agreement) (2.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA (2.0.0)
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. I (Recitals) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. II (Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Definitions) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. II, § 2.1 (Abbreviations and Acronyms) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. II, § 2.2 (Definitions) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. II, § 2.3 (Rules of Construction) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. III (Overview of Coordination and Information Exchange) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV (Exchange of	

		Information and Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.1 (Exchange of Operating Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.1.1 (Real-Time and Projected Operating Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.1.2 (Exchange of SCADA Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.1.3 (Models) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.1.4 (Operations Planning Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.2 (Access to Data to Verify Market Flow Calculations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IV, § 4.3 (Cost of Data and Information Exchange) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V (AFC Calculations)) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1 (AFC Protocols) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.1 (Generation Outage Schedules) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.2 (Generation Dispatch Order) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, 5.1.3 (Transmission Outage Schedules) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.4 (Transmission Interchange Schedules/Net Scheduled Interchange) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.5 (Reservations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.6 (Load Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.7 (Calculated Firm and Non-firm AFC) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.8 (Total Flowgate Capability (Flowgate Rating)) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.9 (Identification of

		Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.10 (Configuration/Facility Changes (for power system model updates)) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.11 (Dynamic Schedule Flows) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. V, § 5.1.12 (Coordination of Transmission Reliability Margin Values) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI (Reciprocal Coordination of Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI, § 6.1 (Reciprocal Coordination of Flowgates Operating Protocols) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI, § 6.2 (Costs Arising From Reciprocal Coordination of Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI, § 6.3 (Transmission Capability for Reserve Sharing) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI, § 6.4 (Maintaining Current Flowgate Models) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VI, § 6.5 (Sharing Contract Path Capacity) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VII (Coordination of Outages) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VII, § 7.1 (Coordinating Outages Operating Protocols) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VII, § 7.1.1 (Exchange of Transmission and Generation Outage Schedule Data) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VII, § 7.1.2 (Evaluation & Coordination of Transmission & Generation Outages) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. VIII (Principles Concerning Joint Operations in Emergencies) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule

		5, art. VIII, § 8.1 (Emergency Operating Principles) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX (Coordinated Regional Transmission Expansion Planning) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.1 (Administration; Committees) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.1 (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.2 (Data and Information Exchange) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.2 (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.3 (Coordinated System Planning) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.3 (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4 (Allocation of Costs of Network Upgrades) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.4 (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.5 (Agreement to Enforce Duties to Construct and Own) (0.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.5 (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. X (Joint Checkout Procedures) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. X, § 10.1 (Scheduling Checkout	

		Protocols) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XI (Additional Coordination Provisions) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XI, § 11.1 (Application of Congestion Management Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XI, § 11.2 (Additional Provisions Concerning Market-to-Market) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XII (Effective Date) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIII (Joint Resolution of Market Monitor Issues) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIV (Cooperation and Dispute Resolution Procedures) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIV, § 14.1 (Administration of Agreement) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIV, § 14.2 (Dispute Resolution Procedures) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XV (Relationship of the Parties) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVI (Accounting and Allocation of Costs of Joint Operations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVII (Retained Rights of the Parties) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII (Additional Provisions) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.1 (Confidentiality) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.2 (Protection of Intellectual Property) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.3 (Indemnity) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.4 (Effective Date and Termination Provision) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.5 (Survival Provisions) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.6 (No Third-Party Beneficiaries) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.7 (Successors and Assigns) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.8 (Force Majeure) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.9 (Governing Law) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.10 (Notice) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.11 (Execution of Counterparts) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XVIII, § 18.12 (Amendment) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIX (Voltage Control and Reactive Power Coordination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIX, § 19.1 (Coordination Objectives) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XIX, § 19.2 (Voltage and Reactive Power Coordination Procedures) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XX (Change Management Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. XXI (Biennial Review of Process Changes) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Signature Page (Signature Page) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 1 (Reserved) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2 (Congestion Management Process (CMP) Master) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, Executive Summary (Executive Summary) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, Change Summary (Change Summary) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, Table of

		Contents (Table of Contents) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 1 (Introduction) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 1.1 (Problem Definition) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 1.2 (Process Scope and Limitations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 1.3 (Goals and Metrics) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 1.4 (Assumptions) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 2 (Process Overview) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 3 (Impacted Flowgate Determination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 3.1 (Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 3.2

		(Coordinated Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 4 (Market-Based Operating Entity Flow Calculations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 4.1 (Market Flow Determination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 4.2 (Firm Flow Determination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 4.3 (Determining the Firm Flow Limit) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 4.4 (Firm Market Flow Calculation Rates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5 (Market-Based Operating Entity Congestion Management) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5.1 (Calculating Market Flows) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5.2 (Quantify and Provide

		Data for Market Flow) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5.3 (Day-Ahead Operations Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5.4 (Real-Time Operations Process - Operating Entity Capabilities) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 5.5 (Market-Based Operating Entity Real-time Actions) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6 (Reciprocal Operations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.1 (Reciprocal Coordinated Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.2 (The Relationship Between Coordinated Flowgates and Reciprocal Coordinated Flowgates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.3 (Coordination Process for Reciprocal Flowgates)

(0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.4 (Calculating Historic Firm Flows) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.5 (Recalculation of Initial Historic Firm Flow Values and Rates) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.6 (Forward Coordination Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.7 (Sharing or Transferring Unused Allocations) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.8 (Market-Based Operating Entities Quantify and Provide Data for Market Flow) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 6.9 (Real-time Operations Process for Market-Based Operating Entities) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7 (Appendices) (0.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix A (Glossary) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix B (Determination of Marginal Zone Participation Factors) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix C (Flowgate Determination Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix D (Training) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix E (Reserved) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix F (FERC RCF Dispute Resolution) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix G (Allocation Adjustment for New Transmission Facilities and/or Designated Network Resources)

		(0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 2, § 7, Appendix H (Application of Market Flow Threshold Field Test Conditions) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3 (Interregional Coordination Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, Table of Contents (Midwest ISO & PJM Market-to-Market Interregional Coordination Process Table of Contents) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, Preface (Preface) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 1 (Overview of the Market-to-Market Coordination Process) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 2 (Interface Bus Price Coordination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 3 (Real-

		Time Energy Market Coordination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 3.1 (Real-Time Energy Market Coordination Procedures) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 3.2 (Real-Time Energy Market Settlements) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 4 (Day-Ahead Energy Market Coordination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 4.1 (Day-Ahead Energy Market Coordination Procedures) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 4.2 (Day-Ahead Energy Market Settlements) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 5 (Annual Revenue Rights (ARR) Allocation/Financial Transmission Rights (FTR) Auction Coordination) (0.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 6

		(Coordination Example) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 7 (When One of the RTOs Does Not Have Sufficient Redispatch) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, § 8 (Appropriate Use of the Market-to-Market Process) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 3, Appendix A (Definitions) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 4 (Cross-Border Grandfathered Projects) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-000	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, Attachment 5 (Emergency Energy Transfers) (0.0.0).	
MISO	ER13-1943-001	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.1 (Administration; Committees) (1.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.1 (1.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-001	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.2 (Data and Information Exchange) (1.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.2 (1.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1943-001	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.3 (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.3 (1.0.0).

MISO	ER13-1943-001	MISO, MISO Rate Schedules, Rate Schedule 5, art. IX, § 9.4 (Allocation of Costs of Network Upgrades) (1.0.0).	MISO, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.4 (1.0.0).
PJM	ER13-1944-000	PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.1 (Administration; Committees) (1.0.0).	PJM, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.1 (1.0.0).
PJM	ER13-1944-000	PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.2 (Data and Information Exchange) (1.0.0).	PJM, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.2 (1.0.0).
PJM	ER13-1944-000	PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.3 (Coordinated System Planning) (1.0.0).	PJM, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.3 (1.0.0).
PJM	ER13-1944-000	PJM, Interregional Agreements, MISO-JOA, art. IX, § 9.4 (Allocation of Costs of Network Upgrades) (2.0.0).	PJM, MISO-PJM JOA, art. IX, § 9.4 (2.0.0).
MISO	ER13-1945-000	MISO, FERC Electric Tariff, Attachment FF (Transmission Expansion Planning Protocol) (14.0.0).	MISO, Tariff, Attachment FF (14.0.0).