

On-Line Survey Respondent Organizations (Alphabetically)

- Air Liquide Large Industries U.S. LP
- Air Products and Chemicals, Inc
- Allegheny Electric Cooperative, Inc
- Allegheny Energy Supply Company, LLC
- Altair Energy Trading
- American Municipal Power, Inc.
- Appalachian Power
- ArcelorMittal USA
- Atlantic City Electric Company
- Baltimore Gas and Electric
- Blue Ridge Power Agency
- Borough of Chambersburg
- Borough of Ephrata
- Borough of Lavallette New Jersey
- Borough of Mont Alto
- BP Energy Company
- Buckeye Power, Inc.
- Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc.
- CMS Energy Resource Management Company
- Conectiv Bethlehem
- Conectiv Energy Supply Inc.
- Constellation Energy Commodities & Trading
- Constellation Energy Control and Dispatch, LLC
- Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.
- Constellation Power Source Generation, Inc.
- CPower
- DC Energy
- Delaware Municipal Electric Corporation
- Delmarva Power
- Direct Energy Business
- District of Columbia Public Service Commission
- Downes Associates, Inc.
- DPL Energy
- DPL Energy Resources Inc.
- DTE Energy Trading
- Duke Energy Business Services
- Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC
- Duquesne Light Company
- Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.
- Easton Utilities Commission
- Edison Mission Marketing & Trading, Inc.
- EnergyConnect, Inc
- Enerwise Global Technologies, Inc.
- FirstEnergy Solutions Company
- Gerdau Ameristeel Energy Inc.
- Granger Energy of Honey Brook, LLC
- Hess Corp.
- Highlands Energy Group LLC
- Iberdrola Renewables Inc
- Illinois Commerce Commission
- Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
- Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
- Industrial Energy Users - Ohio
- IPA Trading
- Jersey Atlantic Wind
- JP Morgan Ventures Energy Corp
- Jump Power, LLC
- Kentucky Public Service Commission
- Kimberly-Clark Corporation
- Lehigh Portland Cement Company
- Letterkenny Industrial Development Authority
- Linde, inc.
- Long Island Lighting Company dba LIPA
- Lower Mount Bethel Energy, LLC
- Madison Gas & Electric Company
- Maryland Public Service Commission
- MeadWestvaco Corp.
- Miami Valley Lighting, LLC
- Michigan Public Service Commission
- Mirant, Potomac River LLC
- NextEra Energy Power Marketing LLC
- Nordic Energy Services, LLC
- North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

- Northern Indiana Public Service Company
- NRG Energy
- NYSEG-RGE
- Office of the People's Counsel for the District of Columbia
- Ohio Consumers' Counsel
- Old Dominion Electric Cooperative
- Orion Power Midwest, LP
- Parma Energy
- PECO Energy Company on behalf of Exelon Corp
- Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate
- Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
- Pepco Energy Services, Inc.
- Pepco Holdings on behalf of Potomac Electric Power Company
- PPL Brunner Island, LLC
- PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
- PPL EnergyPlus, LLC
- PPL Holtwood, L.L.C.
- PPL Martins Creek, L.L.C.
- PPL Montour, L.L.C.
- PPL Susquehanna, L.L.C.
- PPL University Park LLC
- Procter & Gamble Paper Products Company
- PSEG Energy Resources & Trade LLC
- Red Wolf Energy Trading
- Rockland Electric
- RRI Energy Services, Inc.
- RRI Energy Solutions East, LLC
- Sempra Energy Trading, LLC.
- Severstal Sparrows Point LLC
- Shell Energy North America
- South Jersey Energy Co.
- Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc.
- TEC Trading, Inc
- The Dayton Power & Light Company
- The Premcor Refining Group
- Thurmont Municipal Light Company
- UGI Utilities, Inc.
- Vineland Municipal Electric Utility
- Virginia Electric & Power Co.
- Viridity Energy, Inc.
- Wellsboro Electric Company

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

5. Is your organization:		
A voting member of the Members Committee	82	71.9%
An affiliate member (that does not vote directly at the Members Committee)	25	21.9%
A state regulator	7	6.1%

6. To which PJM Sector does your Members Committee voting member belong?		
Transmission Owner	24	21.1%
Generation Owner	15	13.2%
End Use Customer	13	11.4%
Electric Distributor	21	18.4%
Other Supplier	34	29.8%
None - am a state regulator	7	6.1%

7 (a) An essential goal of the PJM Member stakeholder process is to ensure PJM meets its mission regarding reliability; robust, non-discriminatory, and competitive markets; and efficient operations (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	5.7	0.8
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.6	1.1
Generation owners	12	5.8	0.4
End use customers	12	5.9	0.3
Electric distributors	16	5.6	0.9
Other suppliers	29	5.4	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	5.7	0.8

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

7 (b) An essential goal of the PJM Member stakeholder process is to reach agreement among the members (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	3.3	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.2	1.4
Generation owners	12	3.4	1.3
End use customers	12	3.8	0.7
Electric distributors	15	3.6	0.8
Other suppliers	29	3.7	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	7	3.3	0.8

7 (c) An essential goal of the PJM Member stakeholder process is to inform the Board about members' perspectives (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	5.3	0.9
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.5	0.7
Generation owners	12	5.3	0.8
End use customers	12	5.7	0.5
Electric distributors	15	5.5	0.7
Other suppliers	29	4.8	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)	7	4.9	1.3

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

8 (a) The stakeholder process does a good job allowing members to learn about and gain an understanding of issues (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	4.7	0.9
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.8	0.7
Generation owners	12	5.3	0.6
End use customers	12	4.6	0.8
Electric distributors	16	4.6	1.1
Other suppliers	29	4.6	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	4.1	0.9

8 (b) The stakeholder process does a good job allowing members to express their views and concerns (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	5.0	1.0
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.3	0.9
Generation owners	12	5.4	0.5
End use customers	12	4.7	1.0
Electric distributors	15	4.9	1.1
Other suppliers	29	4.5	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	4.0	1.3

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

8 (c) The stakeholder process does a good job allowing members to understand other members' views and concerns (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	4.4	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.6	1.0
Generation owners	12	5.0	0.9
End use customers	12	4.1	0.9
Electric distributors	15	4.4	1.2
Other suppliers	29	4.2	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)	7	4.1	0.9

8 (d) The stakeholder process does a good job allowing members to develop and vet alternative solutions (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	3.9	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.8	1.4
Generation owners	12	4.8	0.9
End use customers	12	3.9	0.8
Electric distributors	15	4.0	1.2
Other suppliers	29	3.8	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	7	3.4	1.8

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

8 (e) The stakeholder process does a good job allowing members to reach agreement on solutions (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	3.0	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.8	1.1
Generation owners	12	3.9	1.8
End use customers	12	3.0	0.7
Electric distributors	15	3.5	1.1
Other suppliers	29	3.1	1.0
OPSI (state regulators)	7	3.0	0.6

9 (a) The PJM stakeholder process is effective at resolving issues related to the reliable operation of the electric grid (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	4.5	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.2
Generation owners	12	4.9	1.1
End use customers	12	5.3	1.1
Electric distributors	16	4.7	1.4
Other suppliers	29	4.8	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	7	4.7	1.0

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

9 (b) The PJM stakeholder process is effective at resolving issues related to the design of wholesale electricity markets (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	3.0	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.2	1.1
Generation owners	11	3.4	1.5
End use customers	12	2.4	0.9
Electric distributors	16	3.2	1.2
Other suppliers	29	3.2	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	6	2.8	1.2

10. Even when members can't reach agreement on a solution, it is still beneficial for issues to be fully vetted through the PJM stakeholder process (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	5.2	1.0
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.2	1.4
Generation owners	12	5.5	0.5
End use customers	12	5.1	0.7
Electric distributors	16	5.4	0.8
Other suppliers	29	5.2	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)	7	5.4	0.8

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

11. Overall, the PJM stakeholder process reasonably balances competing interests (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	2.8	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.7	1.7
Generation owners	12	3.1	1.8
End use customers	12	2.8	0.6
Electric distributors	16	3.6	1.3
Other suppliers	29	3.3	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	2.8	1.2

12. All things considered, the PJM stakeholder process is superior to the stakeholder processes of other RTOs (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	99	3.9	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	11	3.8	0.9
Generation owners	10	4.3	1.1
End use customers	12	3.0	0.7
Electric distributors	14	4.3	1.4
Other suppliers	27	3.8	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	4	2.0	0.8

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

13. Overall, how satisfied is your organization with PJM’s Member Stakeholder Process? (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	3.4	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.2	1.2
Generation owners	12	4.0	1.2
End use customers	12	3.1	0.9
Electric distributors	16	3.9	1.2
Other suppliers	29	3.6	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	7	2.7	0.8

14. Do you think the current number of PJM stakeholder-related meetings needed to accomplish PJM’s workload is ...				
	# of Respondents	Too Few	Too Many	Just About the Right #
All Members (with affiliates)	104	2.9%	45.2%	51.9%
By Sector (without affiliates)				
Transmission owners	13	7.7%	46.2%	46.2%
Generation owners	11	0.0%	27.3%	72.7%
End use customers	12	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Electric distributors	16	0.0%	62.5%	37.5%
Other suppliers	28	7.1%	28.6%	64.3%
OPSI (state regulators)	6	0.0%	16.7%	83.3%

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

15. The PJM stakeholder process takes on more issues in a year than it can process and resolve (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	3.8	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.7	1.3
Generation owners	11	3.5	1.5
End use customers	12	5.1	1.2
Electric distributors	16	4.1	1.9
Other suppliers	29	3.4	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	3.5	1.9

16. PJM and its members need to do a better job prioritizing the issues they do undertake each year (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	4.2	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.1
Generation owners	12	3.4	1.3
End use customers	12	4.9	1.1
Electric distributors	16	5.0	1.2
Other suppliers	29	4.1	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	4.3	1.6

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

17. PJM and its members should set firm timetables for resolving each issue they undertake (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	4.1	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.4	1.6
Generation owners	12	4.0	1.2
End use customers	12	4.0	1.3
Electric distributors	16	3.9	1.8
Other suppliers	29	3.8	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	3.4	1.5

18. Meeting agendas should designate specific start times and durations for agenda items (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	3.5	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.7	1.7
Generation owners	12	3.0	1.2
End use customers	12	3.6	1.0
Electric distributors	16	3.1	1.4
Other suppliers	29	3.4	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	2.9	1.2

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

19. Working groups and committees should have clearer groundrules about members' roles, responsibilities, and norms of behavior (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	3.9	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.9	1.3
Generation owners	12	3.6	1.3
End use customers	12	2.8	1.1
Electric distributors	16	3.8	1.5
Other suppliers	29	3.9	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.3	1.5

20. Members should consider eliminating the Markets and Reliability Committee (MRC) and distributing its current roles and responsibilities among the Members Committee and Lower Level Standing Committees (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	2.9	1.9
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.5	2.1
Generation owners	12	2.6	1.2
End use customers	12	1.8	1.5
Electric distributors	15	3.1	2.2
Other suppliers	27	3.4	1.9
OPSI (state regulators)	6	2.2	1.3

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

21. Lower Level Standing Committees need to better manage the scope and timing of the Working Groups and Task Forces that serve them (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	3.9	1.0
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.1	1.3
Generation owners	12	3.3	1.0
End use customers	12	3.7	0.7
Electric distributors	16	4.3	0.8
Other suppliers	29	4.0	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.5	0.5

22. At the outset of their work on a particular issue, Working Groups and Task Forces should spend more time identifying and clarifying the problem, determining desirable attributes of solutions, and generating multiple options			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	4.2	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.5	1.1
Generation owners	11	3.9	1.1
End use customers	12	3.3	1.0
Electric distributors	15	4.3	1.4
Other suppliers	29	4.4	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)	6	4.2	1.0

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

23. The stakeholder process would benefit from greater direct participation by senior managers and executives of member organizations (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	2.3	1.5
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.5	1.7
Generation owners	12	2.7	1.2
End use customers	11	2.0	1.4
Electric distributors	16	2.1	1.5
Other suppliers	29	3.1	1.6
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	2.8	1.3

24. Members should be required to directly participate in at least one stakeholder meeting per year (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	2.9	1.7
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.5	2.3
Generation owners	12	3.5	2.1
End use customers	12	2.0	1.3
Electric distributors	16	3.1	1.3
Other suppliers	29	2.7	1.7
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	2.1	1.7

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

25. User groups are necessary for addressing issues that are not resolved in the stakeholder process (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	4.2	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.8	2.0
Generation owners	11	3.6	1.5
End use customers	12	3.7	1.0
Electric distributors	16	3.5	1.4
Other suppliers	29	4.3	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	3.2	0.8

26. PJM should improve the effectiveness of participation in meetings by telephone (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	107	4.5	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.6
Generation owners	12	4.5	1.3
End use customers	12	5.1	1.4
Electric distributors	16	5.2	1.1
Other suppliers	29	4.5	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	5.2	1.0

27. Please provide up to three specific suggestions that would most improve the PJM Stakeholder Structure and Meetings

Individual responses not included here.

28. If you have any additional comments related to the questions above about the PJM Stakeholder Structure and Meetings, please provide here:

Individual responses not included here.

29. The current method of sector weighted voting reasonably balances competing interests (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)

	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	103	3.3	2.0
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.5	1.6
Generation owners	12	3.3	1.8
End use customers	12	5.0	1.3
Electric distributors	16	5.3	1.3
Other suppliers	25	3.5	1.6
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	3.3	2.0

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

30. The current method of sector weighted voting is...					
	# of Respondents	Effective	Imperfect, But Workable	Not Desirable, But Unlikely to Change	Very Undesirable + Must Be Seriously Reconsidered
All Members (with affiliates)	105	27.6%	21.0%	22.9%	28.6%
By Sector (without affiliates)					
Transmission owners	13	7.7%	53.8%	7.7%	30.8%
Generation owners	12	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%	16.7%
End use customers	12	58.3%	25.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Electric distributors	15	80.0%	13.3%	0.0%	6.7%
Other suppliers	28	17.9%	25.0%	46.4%	10.7%
OPSI (state regulators)					
	6	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%

31. The sector-weighted voting threshold, currently requiring more than 2/3 majority, should					
	# of Respondents	Remain at 2/3	Be Higher	Be Lower	Be Different for Different Types of Issues (e.g. market design vs. reliability issues)
All Members (with affiliates)	105	80.0%	1.9%	10.5%	7.6%
By Sector (without affiliates)					
Transmission owners	13	61.5%	0.0%	15.4%	23.1%
Generation owners	12	58.3%	0.0%	25.0%	16.7%
End use customers	12	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Electric distributors	16	68.8%	0.0%	25.0%	6.3%
Other suppliers	27	77.8%	7.4%	7.4%	7.4%
OPSI (state regulators)					
	5	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

32. The number of sectors should remain at the current five sectors (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	4.2	1.5
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.5	1.5
Generation owners	11	4.0	1.5
End use customers	12	4.9	1.4
Electric distributors	16	5.6	0.7
Other suppliers	28	3.5	1.7
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	3.6	1.5

33. The definitions of each of the current five sectors should not be changed (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	3.8	1.9
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.8	2.0
Generation owners	11	3.5	1.9
End use customers	12	4.8	1.5
Electric distributors	15	5.5	0.7
Other suppliers	29	3.1	1.8
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	3.8	1.5

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

34. Members' placement in the appropriate sectors should be more carefully monitored and enforced (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	4.8	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.0	1.4
Generation owners	11	5.4	0.9
End use customers	12	4.5	0.8
Electric distributors	15	4.7	1.4
Other suppliers	29	4.8	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)	6	4.3	1.2

35. The voting reports prepared by PJM provide sufficient information about the members' and sector's interests (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	3.4	1.5
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.1	1.3
Generation owners	11	4.3	0.9
End use customers	12	4.1	0.9
Electric distributors	15	3.6	1.7
Other suppliers	29	3.8	1.5
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.7	1.5

36. PJM and its members should evaluate using a sub-weighting scheme within the "Other Supplier" sector to address the heterogeneity of business types within that sector (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	3.8	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.2	1.4
Generation owners	11	3.7	1.0
End use customers	12	4.8	1.1
Electric distributors	15	3.9	1.6
Other suppliers	28	3.8	1.6
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	2.5	1.5

37. Voting procedures at working groups, task forces and Lower Level Standing Committees are often unclear and confusing (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	4.2	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.9	1.0
Generation owners	10	3.3	1.3
End use customers	12	4.7	0.9
Electric distributors	16	4.9	1.1
Other suppliers	28	4.3	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	4.2	0.8

38. Voting procedures at working groups, task forces and Lower Level Standing Committees are not uniform across working groups, task forces or lower level committees (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	103	4.1	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.5	1.3
Generation owners	10	3.7	1.7
End use customers	12	4.4	1.0
Electric distributors	14	5.1	0.9
Other suppliers	29	4.2	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	5	3.8	1.1

39. Voting at the Lower Level Standing Committees should be more transparent, enabling the higher-level committees to know how participating members and sectors vote on any given issue (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	3.9	1.8
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.8
Generation owners	11	4.0	1.6
End use customers	12	5.3	1.0
Electric distributors	15	4.7	1.8
Other suppliers	28	4.3	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	5.0	0.9

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

40. Lower Level Standing Committees should calculate sector-weighted votes similarly to the higher level committees (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	3.3	2.0
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.8	1.9
Generation owners	10	3.2	1.9
End use customers	12	5.2	1.3
Electric distributors	15	4.3	1.8
Other suppliers	29	3.9	1.6
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.7	1.4

41. Working Groups and Task Forces should develop proposals that have a reasonable chance of acceptance at the committees above them (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	3.9	1.6
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.2	1.4
Generation owners	11	3.6	1.7
End use customers	12	5.2	1.0
Electric distributors	16	5.0	1.6
Other suppliers	29	3.9	1.5
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.0	1.1

42. Working Groups and Task Forces should strive for consensus wherever possible; where consensus on a single proposal is not possible, WGs and TFs should elevate multiple proposals to the Lower Level Standing Committees to which they report			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	5.2	0.9
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.3	0.8
Generation owners	11	5.1	0.8
End use customers	12	5.4	0.9
Electric distributors	16	5.6	0.8
Other suppliers	29	5.0	1.0
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	5.0	1.2

43. Working Groups and Task Forces need not vote on proposals, but should indicate to their Lower Level Standing Committees which participating members support each proposal (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	3.3	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.7	1.5
Generation owners	11	2.7	1.1
End use customers	12	3.7	0.8
Electric distributors	16	3.3	1.4
Other suppliers	28	3.4	1.5
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	4.5	0.8

44. A proposal should be required to have the support of a minimum number of Working Group and Task Force members (e.g., 2-3) before it may be elevated to the Lower Level Standing Committee for that Working Group or Task Force			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	102	3.7	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	12	4.3	1.7
Generation owners	10	3.8	1.7
End use customers	12	2.7	0.9
Electric distributors	15	2.8	1.9
Other suppliers	28	4.0	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	2.5	1.6

45. Please provide up to three specific suggestions that would most improve the PJM Decision-making Process

Individual responses not included here.

46. If you have any additional comments related to the questions above about the PJM Decision-making Process, please provide here:

Individual responses not included here.

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

47 (a) Overall, how satisfied are you with how the PJM staff provides technical expertise and analysis to support the stakeholder process (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	5.0	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.2	0.8
Generation owners	12	5.7	0.5
End use customers	12	5.3	0.9
Electric distributors	16	4.3	1.9
Other suppliers	28	4.7	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	4.0	0.8

47 (b) Overall, how satisfied are you with how the PJM staff chairs/facilitates working group, task force, and committee meetings (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	4.0	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.0
Generation owners	11	4.8	1.3
End use customers	12	3.3	1.4
Electric distributors	16	3.4	1.4
Other suppliers	27	4.1	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	3.9	0.4

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

48 (a) PJM staff and management’s role within the stakeholder process should be to advocate for technically-sound reliability solutions (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	5.3	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.8	0.4
Generation owners	12	5.3	0.9
End use customers	12	5.3	1.4
Electric distributors	16	5.4	0.9
Other suppliers	28	4.6	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)	6	5.2	1.2

48 (b) PJM staff and management’s role within the stakeholder process should be to advocate for competitive and robust market solutions (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	106	4.9	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.7	0.5
Generation owners	12	4.8	1.0
End use customers	12	3.8	1.1
Electric distributors	16	4.3	1.3
Other suppliers	28	4.5	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)	6	5.0	0.9

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

48 (c) PJM staff and management’s role within the stakeholder process should be to broker agreements among its members (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	105	3.0	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	2.8	1.3
Generation owners	12	3.2	1.6
End use customers	12	3.8	0.7
Electric distributors	16	3.7	1.6
Other suppliers	27	3.2	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)	6	3.7	1.6

49. The effectiveness of PJM staff in facilitating working group, task force and committee meetings varies significantly by staff member (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	4.7	1.1
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.6	1.1
Generation owners	12	3.8	1.5
End use customers	12	5.3	1.1
Electric distributors	15	5.3	1.0
Other suppliers	27	4.3	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)	6	4.3	0.5

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

50. If PJM staff and management have a strong opinion about how an issue should be substantively resolved, should they...					
	# of Respondents	Keep it to Themselves	State it Clearly and Continue to Chair/ Facilitate	State it Clearly But Assign Two PJM Staff (One to represent PJM and another to chair/ facilitate)	State it clearly but bring in a 3rd party to chair/ facilitate
All Members (with affiliates)	104	1.9%	40.4%	37.5%	20.2%
By Sector (without affiliates)					
Transmission owners	13	0.0%	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%
Generation owners	12	8.3%	66.7%	16.7%	8.3%
End use customers	11	0.0%	0.0%	54.5%	45.5%
Electric distributors	16	0.0%	18.8%	75.0%	6.3%
Other suppliers	27	3.7%	29.6%	40.7%	25.9%
OPSI (state regulators)	6	0.0%	16.7%	66.7%	16.7%

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

51. Over the last two to three years, PJM Board has become more responsive to PJM members (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	102	4.3	1.4
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.3	1.3
Generation owners	9	5.0	1.0
End use customers	12	4.0	0.9
Electric distributors	15	4.6	1.6
Other suppliers	28	3.9	1.1
OPSI (state regulators)			
	5	4.0	1.0

52. The addition of the Liaison Committee has significantly improved communications between the PJM members and the Board (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	102	4.5	1.3
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	4.2	1.2
Generation owners	11	5.0	0.9
End use customers	12	4.9	1.4
Electric distributors	14	5.2	1.5
Other suppliers	27	3.9	1.2
OPSI (state regulators)			
	5	3.8	0.8

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

53. Overall, the PJM Board makes sound decisions on issues on which members are not able to reach agreement (exceed the 2/3 weighted vote threshold at the Members Committee) (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	103	3.5	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.7	1.2
Generation owners	11	3.8	1.3
End use customers	12	2.4	0.7
Electric distributors	15	3.1	1.2
Other suppliers	27	3.6	1.0
OPSI (state regulators)			
	6	2.8	1.0

54. Where members do not reach agreement on significant matters (exceed the 2/3 weighted vote threshold at the Members Committee), the PJM Board currently receives sufficiently clear and detailed information on the perspectives of members			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	3.3	1.5
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.3	1.6
Generation owners	11	4.0	1.2
End use customers	12	3.9	1.5
Electric distributors	15	3.6	1.8
Other suppliers	28	3.5	1.3
OPSI (state regulators)			
	5	2.2	1.1

PJM Stakeholder Process and Governance Online Survey – Data (Sept. 2, 2009)

55. The PJM Board's processes and decision-making should be more open and transparent to the members (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	104	4.8	1.2
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	5.1	1.3
Generation owners	11	4.3	0.8
End use customers	12	4.6	0.9
Electric distributors	15	5.2	1.0
Other suppliers	28	4.5	1.4
OPSI (state regulators)	6	5.7	0.5

56. PJM should provide a more detailed description of stakeholder views in its FERC filings (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)			
	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	100	3.8	1.5
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.8	1.5
Generation owners	10	3.2	1.1
End use customers	12	3.3	1.5
Electric distributors	15	3.9	1.8
Other suppliers	26	4.2	1.5
OPSI (state regulators)	7	4.3	1.1

57. Please provide up to three specific suggestions that would most improve PJM Staff, Management, and Board interface with the members.

Individual responses not included here

58. If you have any additional comments about the questions above about the PJM Staff, Management, and Board interface with the members, please provide here:

Individual responses not included here

59. PJM and its members should more actively seek state regulators' views on issues so that PJM and its members can address them during their deliberations (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree)

	# of Respondents	Mean	Standard Dev.
All Members (with affiliates)	103	3.9	1.7
By Sector (without affiliates)			
Transmission owners	13	3.5	1.7
Generation owners	11	3.2	1.7
End use customers	12	5.6	1.0
Electric distributors	15	5.0	1.2
Other suppliers	27	3.9	1.7
OPSI (state regulators)			
	7	5.6	0.8

60. Please provide up to three specific suggestions that would most improve state regulators interface with the members

Individual responses not included here.

61. Would you like to add any other suggestions from your organization for improving PJM's governance and stakeholder process?

Individual responses not included here.