

195 FERC ¶ 61,030
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Laura V. Swett, Chairman;
David Rosner, Lindsay S. See,
Judy W. Chang, and David LaCerte.

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Docket No. ER26-1088-000

ORDER ON COMPLIANCE AND DIRECTING FURTHER COMPLIANCE

(Issued April 16, 2026)

1. On December 18, 2025, the Commission issued an order in the show cause proceeding in Docket No. EL25-49-000, et al., pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Power Act (FPA),¹ finding PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.'s (PJM) Tariff unjust and unreasonable because it does not contain provisions addressing with sufficient clarity or consistency the rates, terms, and conditions of service that apply to generators serving Co-Located Load and Eligible Customers taking transmission service on behalf of Co-Located Load.² The Commission directed PJM to make several filings, including a compliance filing, due within 30 days of the issuance of the PJM Co-Location Order, to revise its Tariff to make clear how Interconnection Customers can make use of Provisional Interconnection Service, the ability to request interconnection service below nameplate capacity, the potential to accelerate the interconnection process under certain circumstances, and Surplus Interconnection Service to interconnect new generating facilities seeking to serve Co-Located Load.³
2. On January 20, 2026, PJM submitted proposed revisions to PJM's OATT to comply with the 30-day compliance requirement set forth in the PJM Co-Location Order

¹ 16 U.S.C. § 824e.

² *PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.*, 193 FERC ¶ 61,217, at P 2 (2025) (PJM Co-Location Order). The PJM Co-Location Order defined the Tariff as PJM's Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT), the Amended and Restated Operating Agreement of PJM, and the Reliability Assurance Agreement Among Load Serving Entities in the PJM Region.

³ *Id.* P 161.

(Compliance Filing).⁴ In this order, we accept in part and reject in part the Compliance Filing, effective April 16, 2026, and direct a further compliance filing within 30 days of this order.

I. Background

3. In the PJM Co-Location Order, the Commission found PJM's Tariff unjust and unreasonable because there is a lack of sufficient clarity or consistency as to the rates, terms, and conditions of service that apply to Interconnection Customers serving Co-Located Load.⁵ The Commission therefore directed PJM to file, as part of the replacement rate, revisions to the generation interconnection procedures of the Tariff with respect to Interconnection Customers seeking to use new generating facilities to serve Co-Located Load, including to: (1) clarify that PJM shall consider requests for interconnection service below the full generating capability of the generating facility, so that an Interconnection Customer may request interconnection service at a level below its maximum facility output to serve Co-Located Load; (2) clarify that Interconnection Customers seeking to use new generating facilities to serve Co-Located Load may use existing procedures to accelerate a new service request if they satisfy the criteria of PJM's Tariff, i.e., the request has no cost allocation for Network Upgrades and does not require further studies; (3) clarify that an Interconnection Customer seeking to use a new generating facility to serve Co-Located Load may request Provisional Interconnection Service; and (4) clarify that an Interconnection Customer seeking to use a new generating facility to serve Co-Located Load at an existing point of interconnection may request Surplus Interconnection Service.⁶

4. The Commission additionally adopted the following definition of Co-Located Load: "a configuration that refers to end-use customer load that is physically connected to the facilities of an existing or planned Customer Facility on the Interconnection Customer's side of the Point of Interconnection to the PJM Transmission System."⁷ The Commission directed PJM to incorporate this definition into its Tariff on compliance as part of the replacement rate.

⁴ See Appendix for tariff records accepted in this order. Capitalized terms used but not defined herein are defined in the OATT.

⁵ PJM Co-Location Order, 193 FERC ¶ 61,217 at P 176.

⁶ *Id.* PP 231-235.

⁷ *Id.* P 164.

II. Compliance Filing

5. First, PJM proposes to add to its OATT a definition for Co-Located Load.⁸ PJM explains that it proposes to modify the definition set forth in the PJM Co-Location Order to match defined terms in the OATT. PJM states that this includes changing the term “Point of Interconnection” in the Commission’s adopted definition to “Point of Change in Ownership,” which PJM states is the appropriate demarcation point for Co-Located Load.⁹ PJM adds that the term “Point of Interconnection” means the point where Interconnection Facilities connect to the Transmission System and thus could include connection to Transmission Owner Interconnection Facilities, which it contends would not be appropriate.

6. Second, PJM proposes revisions to clarify the requirements for Generation Interconnection Requests to state that the Project Developer must indicate the level of Interconnection Service being requested, including whether the Project Developer is requesting service that is less than the full generating capacity of a new Generating Facility or whether the requested increase is to the capacity of an existing Generating Facility in order to serve Co-Located Load.¹⁰ PJM adds that the proposed revisions clarify that, for purposes of determining the necessary Interconnection Facilities and Network Upgrades, PJM will consider the level of Interconnection Service requested, including levels below the full generating capability of the facility.

7. Third, PJM proposes revisions to clarify that service requests for new Generating Facilities to serve Co-Located Load or for an increase in the capacity of an existing Generating Facility to serve Co-Located Load are eligible for acceleration at Decision Point I and Decision Point II to the extent the requests have no cost allocation for Network Upgrades and do not require further studies.¹¹

8. Fourth, PJM proposes revisions to clarify that Surplus Interconnection Service pursuant to Tariff, Part VIII, Subpart E, section 414 is available for Surplus Project Developers seeking to use their new Generating Facilities to serve Co-Located Load.¹²

⁸ Compliance Filing at 3.

⁹ *Id.* at 3 n.14.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 4.

¹¹ *Id.* at 5.

¹² *Id.*

9. Last, PJM proposes to revise the definition of Provisional Interconnection Service in its Tariff to explicitly permit Provisional Interconnection Service for a new Generating Facility to be used to serve Co-Located Load pursuant to the terms of a Generation Interconnection Agreement or the proposed OATT, Part VIII, Subpart L, section 439.¹³ PJM states that the proposed revisions add Subpart L to Tariff, Part VIII to allow PJM to, in its discretion, provide Provisional Interconnection Service to a Generation Project Developer with a three-party interconnection agreement seeking to serve Co-Located Load with new or increased generating capability prior to the completion of the requisite Interconnection Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, Network Upgrades, Stand Alone Network Upgrades, or System Protection Facilities based upon an evaluation of the results of available studies.¹⁴ PJM explains that where applicable studies indicate that facilities necessary for the new or expanded Generating Facility's interconnection are not yet in place, PJM will perform a study at the Generation Project Developer's expense, to identify the facilities that are required for the Provisional Interconnection Service.¹⁵ PJM adds that at the Generation Project Developer's request and expense, PJM annually will re-study and, as applicable, update the level of Provisional Interconnection Service that may be available for the new or expanded Generating Facility. PJM states that the proposed revisions also provide that a Generation Project Developer seeking to serve Co-Located Load with new or additional generating capability may request Provisional Interconnection Service in combination with a request for Interconnection Service below the full generating capability of a new Generating Facility or the requested increase in generating capability of an existing Generating Facility.¹⁶

10. PJM notes that it originally proposed changes to the Behind the Meter Generation application requirements in Tariff, Part VIII, Subpart B, section 403 (A)(2) to incorporate the term Co-Located Load but, based on stakeholder comment, is deferring further changes concerning Behind the Meter Generation and Co-Located Load application requirements until the second compliance filing.¹⁷

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.* at 5-6.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 6-7.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 3 n.11.

11. PJM requests that the Commission accept the proposed revisions effective as of the date the Commission accepts the Compliance Filing.¹⁸

III. Notice of Filing and Responsive Pleadings

12. Notice of the filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 91 Fed. Reg. 3175 (Jan. 26, 2026), with interventions and protests due on or before February 10, 2026. Timely motions to intervene were filed by: Advanced Energy United; American Clean Power Association; American Electric Power Service Corporation; American Municipal Power, Inc.; Buckeye Power, Inc.; Clean Energy Buyers Association; Constellation Energy Generation, LLC (Constellation); Dominion Energy Services, Inc.; Duke Energy Corporation; Duquesne Light Company; Enchanted Rock, LLC; Eolian L.P., Antora Energy, Inc., and Verrus, LLC (together, Joint Parties); Electric Power Supply Association; Monitoring Analytics, LLC, acting in its capacity as the Independent Market Monitor for PJM (IMM); New Jersey Board of Public Utilities; New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel; North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation; Northeastern REMC; PJM Power Providers Group; PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; and Rockland Electric Company. Out of time motions to intervene were filed by Exelon Corporation, Geronimo Power, LLC, East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc., EDF Power Solutions, Inc., Solar Energy Industries Association, and Invenergy Renewables LLC.

13. On February 10, 2026, Joint Parties and Constellation filed protests, and the IMM submitted comments. On February 25, 2026, IMM filed a motion for leave to answer and answer to Constellation's protest. On February 27, 2026, Indicated PJM Transmission Owners¹⁹ filed a motion for leave to answer and answer to Constellation's protest. On April 8, 2026, Constellation filed a motion for leave and supplemental protest.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 7.

¹⁹ Indicated PJM Transmission Owners include: American Electric Power Service Corporation on behalf of its affiliates, Appalachian Power Company, Indiana Michigan Power Company, Kentucky Power Company, Kingsport Power Company, Ohio Power Company, Wheeling Power Company, AEP Appalachian Transmission Company, AEP Indiana Michigan Transmission Company, AEP Kentucky Transmission Company, AEP Ohio Transmission Company, and AEP West Virginia Transmission Company; The Dayton Power and Light Company; Dominion Energy Services, Inc. on behalf of Virginia Electric and Power Company; Duke Energy Business Services, LLC for Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. and Duke Energy Ohio, Inc.; Duquesne Light Company; East Kentucky Power Cooperative; Exelon Corporation on behalf of its affiliates Atlantic City Electric Company, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Commonwealth Edison Company, Commonwealth Edison Company of Indiana, Inc., Delmarva Power & Light Company, PECO Energy Company, and Potomac Electric Power Company; FirstEnergy

A. Joint Parties Protest

14. Joint Parties request that the Commission clarify that PJM's filing will allow interconnection customers serving Co-Located Loads to nominate net withdrawal limitations for purposes of these interconnection study processes.²⁰ Specifically, Joint Parties request that the Commission require PJM to file revisions clarifying that (1) interconnection customers may nominate joint withdrawal limits and include information in their interconnection request to demonstrate the ability to operate within such limits; and (2) the determination of Network Upgrades, Interconnection Facilities, and any other infrastructure that may be required shall account for such limits.²¹ Joint Parties assert that the proposed revisions, as currently drafted, do not specify how storage withdrawals will be modeled when a storage facility is seeking to co-locate with a large load.²²

15. Joint Parties argue that its desired clarification and request for additional Tariff revisions are necessary to realize the PJM Co-Location Order's stated intent of ensuring that Co-Located Loads do not pay for services that they do not use and do not trigger network upgrades that they do not need.²³ Joint Parties assert that this will ensure that PJM does not include assumptions in interconnection studies that the load and storage resource withdrawals to charge create bluntly overlapping grid impacts (e.g., coincident withdrawals at peak), when in fact the storage resources and Co-Located Load could be managed to limit the overall withdrawal of the Co-Located Load and to avoid withdrawal when doing so would create grid impacts necessitating network upgrades.²⁴

Service Company, on behalf of its affiliates American Transmission Systems, Incorporated, Jersey Central Power & Light Company, Mid-Atlantic Interstate Transmission LLC, The Potomac Edison Company, Monongahela Power Company, Keystone Appalachian Transmission Company, and Trans-Allegheny Interstate Line Company; PPL Electric Utilities Corporation; Rockland Electric Company; and the Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative.

²⁰ Joint Parties Protest at 3.

²¹ *Id.* at 8.

²² *Id.* at 9.

²³ *Id.* at 3.

²⁴ *Id.* at 4, 10.

B. Constellation Protest

16. Constellation protests the replacement of the term “Point of Interconnection” with the term “Point of Change in Ownership” in PJM’s proposed definition of Co-Located Load.²⁵ Constellation states that the term “Point of Change in Ownership” is a term defined in the existing OATT, which requires that the Transmission Owner and the Project Developer mutually agree to the location of the Point of Change in Ownership.²⁶ Constellation explains that this differs from the location of the Point of Interconnection, which PJM has final authority to determine if the parties are unable to agree.²⁷ Constellation argues that PJM’s proposal could enable transmission owners to veto the location of the Point of Change in Ownership indefinitely because there are also no timelines for when a Transmission Owner must come to an agreement with a Project Developer over the location of the Point of Change in Ownership. Constellation states that the Commission must ensure that Transmission Owners are not permitted to exploit the interconnection process to delay interconnection services for large load configurations that they disfavor and should reject PJM’s new definition of Co-Located Load.²⁸

17. Constellation states that, alternatively, if the Commission accepts PJM’s new definition of Co-Located Load, it should: (1) direct PJM to revise its OATT to provide that PJM will determine the Point of Change in Ownership if the parties cannot agree, just as PJM currently does if the parties cannot agree on the Point of Interconnection; (2) establish deadlines for Interconnected Entities to mutually agree to the location for Point of Change in Ownership and for PJM to determine the location when mutual agreement cannot be reached; and (3) not tolerate any discrimination or delay and use its enforcement authority or other mechanisms to ensure non-discriminatory open access.²⁹

C. IMM Comments

18. IMM argues that the Compliance Filing does not directly address the most important issue facing PJM, which is how to add significant data center load without

²⁵ Constellation Protest at 2.

²⁶ *Id.* at 2-3 (citing PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, OATT, pt. VII, subpt. A, § 300 (3.0.0), § VII.A 300; *id.* pt. VIII, subpt. A, § 400 (4.0.0), § 400).

²⁷ *Id.* at 3 (citing PJM, Intra-PJM Tariffs, OATT, attach. O, app. 2, § 2 (0.0.0), § 2.1).

²⁸ *Id.* at 5.

²⁹ *Id.* at 5-6.

imposing the related costs on other PJM customers.³⁰ IMM also asserts that neither the PJM Co-Location Order nor the Compliance Filing addresses the reliability issues raised by the addition of large amounts of data center load and the removal of existing capacity from the PJM markets in order to serve data center load.³¹ IMM adds that PJM's filing fails to address: (1) how it will ensure that the transmission system is not built to serve the entire gross output of a co-located generator or the entire gross load of a co-located load; (2) how it will or could prevent unexpected injections onto the grid from a co-located generator when the load drops suddenly; or (3) how it will plan the transmission system to serve the load when the generator trips or is unavailable as a result of an outage.³²

D. Answers

19. IMM and Indicated PJM Transmission Owners assert that Constellation's opposition to PJM's proposed definition of Co-Located Load is based on unsupported and speculative assertions about the potential allegedly discriminatory behavior of transmission owners related to co-located load issues.³³ IMM and Indicated PJM Transmission Owners support PJM's use of the term "Point of Change in Ownership" rather than "Point of Interconnection" for the reasons stated by PJM. IMM argues that Constellation has not demonstrated any actual issues with PJM's proposed language.³⁴ IMM states that it agrees that discrimination against projects not owned by transmission owners in favor of projects owned by transmission owners is not appropriate, and IMM adds that it will investigate specific allegations of discriminatory behavior in the interconnection process.³⁵

E. Constellation Supplemental Protest

20. Constellation asserts that recent experience has borne out the concern raised in its initial protest that PJM's deviation from the Commission's definition of Co-Located

³⁰ IMM Comments at 1.

³¹ *Id.* at 2.

³² *Id.* at 2-3.

³³ IMM Answer at 2; Indicated PJM Transmission Owners Answer at 2.

³⁴ IMM Answer at 2.

³⁵ *Id.* at 3.

Load will allow transmission owners to effectively block co-location arrangements.³⁶ Constellation states that a transmission owner recently notified Constellation that it would not study Constellation's proposed design for a co-location arrangement unless Constellation agreed to transfer ownership of certain facilities to the transmission owner, which would mean that the load would no longer be on the generator's side of the Point of Change in Ownership.³⁷ Constellation argues that, by conditioning the load's interconnection on the transmission owner's ownership of those facilities, the transmission owner would prohibit Constellation's ability to host Co-Located Load at the site and limit the ability of the Co-Located Load to access the transmission services adopted in the PJM Co-Location Order.

IV. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

21. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2025), the timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.

22. Pursuant to Rule 214(d) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214(d), we grant the late-filed motions to intervene given these entities' interests in the proceeding, the early stage of the proceeding, and the absence of undue prejudice or delay.

23. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2025), prohibits an answer to a protest unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We accept IMM's and Indicated PJM Transmission Owners' answers, as well as Constellation's supplemental protest, because they have provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

B. Substantive Matters

24. We find that PJM's Compliance Filing partially complies with the directives set forth in the PJM Co-Location Order and therefore accept the Compliance Filing in part, effective April 16, 2026, reject it in part, and direct a further compliance filing as discussed below.

25. We find that the Compliance Filing complies with certain directives in the PJM Co-Location Order by clarifying the procedures for new generating facilities serving

³⁶ Constellation Supplemental Protest at 2.

³⁷ *Id.* at 3.

Co-Located Load. Specifically, we find that PJM's proposed revisions comply with the Commission's directives to clarify that, for Interconnection Customers seeking to use new generating facilities to serve Co-Located Load: (1) PJM will consider requests for interconnection service below the full generating capability of the generating facility; (2) such customers may use existing procedures to accelerate a new service request if they satisfy the criteria of PJM's Tariff; (3) such customers may request Provisional Interconnection Service; and (4) such customers may request Surplus Interconnection Service.³⁸ Within 30 days of the date of this order, PJM is required to make a compliance filing in this docket through the Commission's eTariff system with only the accepted tariff record text. The compliance filing must establish the effective date of April 16, 2026 for the Tariff records and designate the records accepted in this order as OBE (overtaken by events).³⁹

26. However, we note that, while PJM submitted revised Tariff sheets to reflect the revised definition of Provisional Interconnection Service in Part VII and Part VIII of the OATT, PJM did not include that revised definition in Part I, section 1 of the OATT, contrary to its statement in the Compliance Filing.⁴⁰ Accordingly, we direct PJM to submit a compliance filing within 30 days of the date of this order to add the definition of Provisional Interconnection Service to Part I, section 1 of its OATT, consistent with PJM's statement in its Compliance Filing.

27. We reject PJM's proposed definition of Co-Located Load in OATT Part VII, Subpart A, section 300 and Part VIII, Subpart A, section 400. In the PJM Co-Location Order, the Commission directed PJM to adopt the definition of Co-Located Load specified in the order: "a configuration that refers to end-use customer load that is physically connected to the facilities of an existing or planned Customer Facility on the Interconnection Customer's side of the Point of Interconnection to the PJM Transmission System."⁴¹ We note that no party, including PJM, sought rehearing or clarification of this directive, let alone the definition. Even here, PJM does not allege that the definition of

³⁸ PJM Co-Location Order, 193 FERC ¶ 61,217 at PP 231-235.

³⁹ PJM must make a compliance filing using Type of Filing Code 80 in this docket by including the associated filing identifier (associated_filing_id) for this filing at the filing level. The filing must include tariff records with the effective date for the previously-accepted tariff records and also include, at the tariff record level, the associated filing identifier (associated_filing_id), associated record id (associated_record_id), and associated option code (associated_option_code) of the original tariff records accepted with a 12/31/9998 date.

⁴⁰ Compliance Filing at 5 n.21.

⁴¹ PJM Co-Location Order, 193 FERC ¶ 61,217 at P 164.

Co-Located Load set out in the PJM Co-Location Order is unjust and unreasonable. Rather, PJM proposes to deviate from this definition by replacing the term “Point of Interconnection” with “Point of Change in Ownership” without sufficient explanation as to how this proposed deviation complies with the Commission’s directive in the PJM Co-Location Order.⁴² Specifically, PJM merely asserts that Point of Interconnection is inappropriate because it could include connection to Transmission Owner Interconnection Facilities. However, PJM fails to demonstrate why Point of Change in Ownership is consistent with the Commission’s directive in the PJM Co-Location Order that PJM adopt the definition of Co-Located Load specified therein, which uses Point of Interconnection, and the record here suggests PJM’s proposed modification to this definition may lead to uncertainty or delays for parties in Co-Located Load configurations.⁴³

28. Accordingly, we direct PJM to file, within 30 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing that revises the Tariff’s definition of Co-Located Load to use “Point of Interconnection” instead of “Point of Change in Ownership,” consistent with the Commission’s directive in the PJM Co-Location Order.

29. As it relates to the concerns that IMM raises regarding reliability issues posed by the addition of data center load to the PJM markets and Joint Parties’ requests regarding study processes for Co-Located Loads paired with electric storage resources, we note that these issues are outside the scope of this compliance proceeding, which is limited to whether PJM’s proposed Tariff revisions in the instant filing have complied with the directives in the PJM Co-Location Order.⁴⁴

30. We also find that certain of PJM’s proposed Tariff revisions relating to Behind the Meter Generation constitute changes that are outside the scope of this proceeding. The Commission did not direct any changes to the interconnection application rules for Behind the Meter Generation in the PJM Co-Location Order, and PJM does not explain

⁴² See, e.g., *PJM Interconnection LLC*, 119 FERC ¶ 61,179, at P 12 (2007) (“The purpose of a compliance filing is to make the directed changes and the Commission’s focus in reviewing them is whether they comply with the Commission’s previously stated directives.”) (citing *AES Huntington Beach, LLC*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,079, at P 60 & n.25 (2005)).

⁴³ See Constellation Protest at 2-5.

⁴⁴ See, e.g., *Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.*, 121 FERC ¶ 61,275, at P 38 (2007) (“[C]ompliance filings must be limited to the specific directives ordered by the Commission” because “[t]he purpose of a compliance filing is to make the directed changes and the Commission’s focus in reviewing them is whether they comply with the Commission’s previously stated directives.”).

why the changes are necessary to achieve the compliance directives.⁴⁵ Therefore, we reject PJM's proposed revisions to incorporate the term "Co-Located Load" in OATT Part VIII, Subpart B, section 403(A)(2) regarding Behind the Meter Generator Application Requirements. Accordingly, we direct PJM to file, within 30 days of the date of issuance of this order, a further compliance filing that removes its proposed Tariff language in OATT Part VIII, Subpart B, section 403(A)(2).

The Commission orders:

(A) PJM's Compliance Filing is hereby accepted in part and rejected in part, effective April 16, 2026, as discussed in the body of this order.

(B) PJM is hereby directed to make a compliance filing to establish the effective date of the tariff records as discussed in the body of the order.

(C) PJM is hereby directed to submit a compliance filing within 30 days of the date of this order, as discussed in the body of this order.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Debbie-Anne A. Reese,
Secretary.

⁴⁵ See PJM Co-Location Order, 193 FERC ¶ 61,217 at PP 221-224. We also note that PJM proposes to include further changes concerning Behind the Meter Generation in its second compliance filing, which we will address in a subsequent order. *See supra* P 10.

Appendix – Tariff Records

PJM Interconnection, L.L.C.

Intra-PJM Tariffs

- [300 P, OATT 300 Definitions P \(3.0.0\)](#)
- [400 P, OATT 400 Definitions P \(4.0.0\)](#)
- [401, OATT Part VIII.A 401 Applications for Cycle Process Intro \(4.0.0\)](#)
- [403, OATT Part VIII.B 403 Application Rules \(3.0.0\)](#)
- [404, OATT Part VIII.C 404 Introduction \(3.0.0\)](#)
- [406, OATT Part VIII.C 406 Decision Point I \(4.0.0\)](#)
- [408, OATT Part VIII.C 408 Decision Point II \(5.0.0\)](#)
- [413, OATT Part VIII.E 413 Service Below Generating Capability \(1.0.0\)](#)
- [414, OATT Part VIII.E 414 Surplus Interconnection Service \(4.0.0\)](#)
- [VIII Subpart L, OATT VIII Subpart L PROVISIONAL INTERCONNECTION SERVICE \(0.0.0\)](#)
- [439, OATT Part VIII.K 439 Provisional Interconnection Service \(0.0.0\)](#)
- [440 - 499, OATT Part VIII 440 - 499 Reserved \(5.0.0\)](#)