Dear Stakeholders,

Following my departure from yesterday’s meeting, a number of requests and action items were requested of Jack and Nick which were provided to me and the Markets and Planning Division Leadership. In response to stakeholder concerns and in consultation with Dave Anders – We will proceed in the following fashion regarding the upcoming PC meeting and future MEPETF meetings:

1. The Planning Committee agenda will indicate a change to an informational update and the MEPETF will continue its consideration of the unresolved item (i.e. RTMEP Concept)

2. The three items within the MEPETF Phase 3 scope that have been completed (i.e. IMM Benefit topic, IMM Cost/Risk Topic and the Phase 2 Carryover to examine decoupling Energy & Capacity in the B/C numerator) will be tabled and out of scope for any continuation of the MEPETF. The completed recommendations will be presented to the PC at the same presentation of a RTMEP proposal, if any, or on a scheduled completion date. Once all proposed recommendations are received by the PC – the chair will determine timing of voting for any/all or the recommendations.

3. Dependencies – Some stakeholders have raised concerns about voting on an RTMEP concept without the benefit of understanding the cost allocation implications and subsequently developed OA/Manual revisions, if any. In order to most efficiently address these dependencies, the MEPETF shall be asked to fully develop and poll on RTMEP concepts. Those concepts achieving a majority poll will be presented to the PC and the PC will request the TOs for cost-allocation information. With understanding of the cost allocation principles, the PC shall take up completion of the development of OA/Manual revisions, if any, and formally vote on the addition of a “quick hit” (e.g. RTMEP) process.

4. Timing – The PC remanded the IMM scope to the MEPETF along with endorsement of the Capacity coupling topic and exploration of interest in a “quick hit” addition to the ME Planning process (i.e. RTMEP) with targeted completion by December 12, 2019. In an ideal state –
Planning process modifications would receive FERC direction in advance of the planning cycle commencing January 1, 2020 to provide developers, transmission owners and stakeholders the transparency and certainty expected of the new planning process rules. Therefore, in addition to providing the PC with an informational update, the PC will be solicited for their guidance as to new expected completion date for MEPETF deliverable.

5. Coupling of packages – We understand that some parties have asserted that the packages were to be polled and considered as a unified portfolio. We advise that the topics were facilitated, discussed, developed and polled as separate items. These work products, matrices and non-binding polls were conducted and documented separately and, accordingly, the recommendations are separate and distinct.

6. Stakeholder CBIR Process – To avoid any confusion on Manual 34 process, any packages put forth to the parent committee shall be developed, vetted and polled by the task force in advance of submission to the parent committee. The process is designed to promote efficiency, consensus-building and best inform the parent committee voting members rather than invite unnecessary work effort by parent committee members.

7. Sunsetting – The timing of the sunset of the task force shall be guided by the PC in accord with the final deliverables. If the PC finds it necessary to revisit any topics – it shall direct the MEPETF to this. In the absence of any further deliverables, the Chair/Facilitator will notify the Chair of the PC of the completion of its scope and advise via the expected email correspondence form for a request to sunset.

No further effort is required on posting materials and Jack Thomas will work with the conference center team to schedule in-person meetings, webinars or short teleconference in accordance with the new meeting rules designed by the Super Forum.