

## **MEPETF Phase 2 Draft Polling Questions (non-binding)**

*Please answer to each question. For “May be able to support” answers, please provide additional comments.*

1. How do you prefer PJM reevaluate Board approved market efficiency projects? (Can support, May be able to support, Cannot support)
  - a. Costs and benefits of **all** new economic-based enhancements or expansions to be evaluated annually to ensure these projects continue to be economical (Status Quo)
  - b. PJM will **only** reevaluate projects with a capital cost of \$20M or higher. For projects with a cost less than \$20M, if project cost increases such that the B/C ratio (given the original benefits) falls below 1.25, then PJM will study the impacts of cancelling the project. PJM will stop reevaluating projects with cost greater than \$20M once the project has completed 20% of its construction within the Engineering and Procurement status as described on PJM transmission construction status page or once the CPCN certificate is received (approved), as applicable.
2. Given the existing provisions in section 15 of attachment DD of the OATT, can you support a separate, structured market efficiency process to mitigate load payments associated with Capacity market congestion drivers? (Can support, May be able to support, Cannot support)
3. How do you prefer PJM conduct its market efficiency process? (Can support, May be able to support, Cannot support)
  - a. 24-month cycle with mid-cycle update annually (Status Quo)
  - b. Annual 18-month (6-month overlapping) cycle
  - c. Other (please provide comments)
4. What is your preferred method for addressing persistent, historical congestion on PJM internal facilities not necessarily seen in future PROMOD simulations? (Can support, May be able to support, Cannot support)
  - a. Address via a new annual process outside of Order No. 1000, prior to the normal MEP process, utilizing the same criteria as the current interregional targeted market efficiency project process
  - b. Address via a new annual process within Order No. 1000, prior to the normal MEP process, utilizing a procurement window in which PJM would first identify solutions then open a window for participants to submit the implementation design, subject to criteria TBD
  - c. Address via a new annual process within Order No. 1000, coincident with the MEP 18-month proposed window, subject to criteria TBD
  - d. No action until significant congestion is seen in future PROMOD simulations, then address through normal MEP process
  - e. Other (please provide comments)