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• Include mapping to be able to relate projects in the same vicinity; Add to GIS maps to include supplemental project locations (similar to queue projects)
  – In progress

• Need to have a better understanding of what models are being used, when they change and if changed, this should be updated and communicated to all
  – Added model to templates (as applicable)

• Interested in seeing some metrics put together around questions asked, responses provided, are they helpful or not, is more interaction/communication needed?
  – Working to develop
• Would there be a way to track how many projects are changed based on stakeholder feedback received?
  – Few changes have occurred, will continue to track
• Need to have a check in place to ensure the OA definition of a supplemental project is being adhered to
  – Working through language changes at Special PC for M14B
• Besides the Planning Community and PC ListServ, are there any other avenues that can be used to notify all stakeholders once a local plan is finalized?
  – No other alternative solutions identified. Current notifications systems work for normal activities
There needs to be more direct conversation/interaction between stakeholders & TO’s to clarify and provide what is needed.

- Offers for additional conversations have been provided when requested

Slides presented at Subregional RTEPs are on PJM slide deck; does this indicate that PJM has reviewed and validates the content?

- PJM performs minimal reviews. Slides no longer to be presented on PJM slide templates
• Develop something equivalent of a PJM Manual format for the M-3 Process. The level of detail and transparency between baseline and supplemental is very different.
  – PJM discussing with Transmission Owners
• Suggestion to retain the original slide and add any updated slide(s) (after questions/comments are addressed, the original slide gets replaced with the updates, and it is hard to track what changed, etc.)
  – PJM believes that corrected slides should be posted as is current practice. Old slides can be made available upon request
• PJM should continue to reach out to the states as well to obtain their feedback
  – PJM continues to work with various states
Other Improvements

- Added table of M-3 process Needs
  - Feedback received on multiple occasions and the table has been modified – Will continue to adapt based on feedback
- Slide templates
  - Improvements beyond model information include addition of ancillary benefits to help stakeholders understand how projects improve system beyond the stated need
- Modeling information being provided by TOs for Solutions Meeting
- Transmission Owners providing maps as required for lower voltage systems representations
• Some stakeholders requesting solution information at Needs meeting
• PJM working on process for how models might be made available in a “repository” for withdrawal when stakeholders granted access
  – Several issues being discussed in order to develop good process (e.g.: How to control notifications if projects change, How to identify sequence of projects to be added for consideration of impacts, etc)
• PJM is seeing improvements in the processes and is continuing to look for additional areas for improvement

• PJM and Transmission Owner’s looking for feedback
  – What is working well for the stakeholders
  – What portions of the process need additional discussion