

RCSTF Polling

Lisa Morelli

RCSTF

May 1, 2026

- The poll will be issued on Monday, May 4. Responses are due by 5pm on Tuesday, May 12.
- The goal is to solicit feedback on the general level of support for the PJM and IMM packages, as well as individual elements of proposals.
- Respondents will be asked to indicate how strongly they support or do not support each proposal or proposal element using a 5-point scale.
 - Strongly do not support , do not support , neutral, support, strongly support, unknown
- Respondents will be invited to provide written comments explaining any concerns.
- Results will be summarized and presented at the May 21 RCSTF meeting.

- PJM Members and non-members may respond to the poll.
 - Only one poll will be accepted per company. Please coordinate to avoid duplicate submissions.
 - If stakeholders wish to update poll responses that have already been submitted, they will be required to restart the poll from the beginning.
- The poll will be distributed via email to the RCSTF email distribution list.
 - Updates to this list may be made [here](#) or by contacting [Customer Service](#) if necessary.
- Assistance: *Voting_Support@pjm.com*

- Poll results will be posted in aggregate. If there is a high level of non-member participation, the results will be designated by member and non-member responses.
- Text responses will be posted verbatim without company attribution.

Facilitator:
Lisa Morelli, Lisa.Morelli@pjm.com

Secretary:
Amanda Egan, Amanda.Egan@pjm.com

RCSTF Next Steps



Member Hotline

(610) 666 – 8980

(866) 400 – 8980

custsvc@pjm.com

Appendix – Poll Questions

- Please indicate your level of support for the PJM proposal (package A).
 - Please explain any significant concerns you have with the PJM proposal overall.
- Please indicate your level of support for representing the Day-Ahead increased operational uncertainty based on the assessed risk level in the Day-Ahead Market (PJM’s proposal for Day-Ahead Scheduling Reserves).
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.

- Please indicate your level of support for representing the Energy Gap (the gap between the cleared physical supply and PJMs load forecast) in the Day-Ahead Market on high and medium risk days in the winter?
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.
- Please indicate your level of support for representing net load forecast uncertainty in PJM’s reserve requirements and creating new reserve services to represent the ramp and uncertainty needs?
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.

- Please indicate your level of support for the shape and penalty factor levels of the PJM-proposed ORDCs.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.
- Please indicate your level of support for locational reserve clearing prices included in the PJM proposal.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.
- Please share any additional feedback you have on the PJM proposal.

- Please indicate your level of support for the IMM proposal (package B).
 - Please explain any significant concerns you have with the IMM proposal.
- Please indicate your level of support for representing the real-time operational uncertainty in the Day-Ahead Market based on the same method used to calculate the real-time reserve requirements (IMM's proposal for new day-ahead reserve requirements).
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.

- Please indicate your level of support for representing net load forecast uncertainty in PJM's existing Primary Reserve requirement by extending the requirement when 30-minute net load forecast uncertainty exceeds 50 percent of the largest contingency.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.

- The IMM proposes to remove the performance adder to the synchronized and primary reserve requirements. (PJM's current reserve requirement has an adder of 20 percent of the largest contingency for the synchronized requirement, which then translates to an adder of 30 percent for the primary reserve requirement.) Please indicate your level of support for removing the adders.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.

- Please indicate your level of support for adding generator uncertainty, as represented by the largest contingency, and two-hour real-time net load forecast uncertainty into the 30-Minute Reserve requirement, as described in the IMM package.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.
- Please indicate your level of support for maintaining the status quo reserve product nesting structure and ORDC penalty factors.
 - Please explain any significant concerns with this element of the proposal.
- Please share any additional feedback you have on the IMM proposal.

**PROTECT THE
POWER GRID
THINK BEFORE
YOU CLICK!**



Be alert to
malicious
phishing emails.

Report suspicious email activity to PJM.
(610) 666-2244 / it_ops_ctr_shift@pjm.com

