Agenda for OATT Reform Technical Conference
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Docket Nos. RM05-25-000 and RM05-17-000
October 12, 2006

9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. Opening Comments and Introductions

9:15 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. Issues Relating to Coordinated, Open and Transparent Transmission Planning

- Presentations by Panelists:

  James Yancey Kerr, II, Commissioner, North Carolina Utilities Commission; First Vice President, National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC); Member, NARUC Electricity Committee
  Verne Ingersoll, Director of Regional Planning, System Planning & Operations Department, Progress Energy, Inc.
  Sandra Johnson, Director, Transmission Asset Management, Xcel Energy, Inc.
  Jay Loock, Director, Technical Services, Western Electricity Coordinating Council
  Peter Wybierala, Director, Transmission Planning, NRG Energy, Inc. On behalf of The Electric Power Supply Association (EPSA)
  Michael J. Kormos, Senior Vice President, Reliability Services, PJM Interconnection L.L.C.
  Joel deJesus, Assistant General Counsel, National Grid
  David P. Geschwind, Chief Operating Officer, Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency, on behalf of Transmission Access Policy Study Group (TAPS)
  Will Kaul, Vice President, Transmission, Great River Energy

- Panel discussion topics include related issues raised in the NOPR, as well as the following:

1. What is the appropriate geographic scope for an effective planning region or subregion?
2. Are there specific criteria that can be developed to define the scope and frequency of the congestion studies proposed in the NOPR?

3. Is an independent consultant necessary to facilitate planning?
4. What are some effective mechanisms for safeguarding confidentiality while permitting meaningful access to transmission information?
5. How should the planning obligation be coordinated with state processes?
6. If an open season requirement is added for large new transmission projects, what conditions or limitations should be associated with it?
7. Can the proposed regional planning requirement achieve its goals if the participants in the regional planning process have not achieved agreement among themselves on appropriate cost-allocation issues? If not, what can be done to encourage the development of such cost allocation agreements among regional planning participants?
8. What is the appropriate role for demand response in planning?

11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Lunch

12:30 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. Discussion of ATC-related Reforms

- Presentations by Panelists:

  William (Bill) Lohrman, Managing Director, Prague Power, LLC, on Behalf of North American Electric Reliability Council (NERC)
  Ron Mucci, Williams Power Company, on behalf of North American Energy Standards Board (NAESB)
  Steven Naumann, Vice President, Wholesale Market Development, Exelon Corporation
  Michael Smith, Vice President, Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, Constellation Energy Commodities Group
  Edward N. (Nick) Henery, Director of Reliability, American Public Power Association (APPA)
  Jerry Smith, Alliance Partnership Manager, Arizona Public Service

- Panel discussion topics include related issues raised in the NOPR, as well as the following:

1. What are the challenges that NERC/NAESB and the industry face in the effort to enhance the consistency of certain definitions, data, modeling assumptions and

components of the ATC calculation? Which of these elements are most critical to make consistent? Is a focus on comparability of ATC calculation and transparency more important than consistency of ATC calculation?

2. What is a reasonable timeline to achieve the consistency goal?
3. Are there common standards and modeling assumptions that can be developed to calculate TRM and CBM?
4. What are the most critical data to be exchanged among transmission providers to ensure that all are performing ATC calculations most accurately? How should that data be exchanged, what protocols should be used, and what forum should develop the protocols?
5. What is the most important data to make transparent? Regarding the Commission's proposal to require a narrative explanation for changes in monthly or yearly ATC, are there modifications that would achieve the Commission's transparency goals without imposing an undue burden on transmission providers? What ATC information posted in narrative form will be most beneficial?
6. Regarding the proposal to enhance OASIS postings, what are some industry tools/best practices that can be utilized to assist with this effort?

1:45 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. **Break**

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **The Commission's Proposals Regarding Redispatch and Conditional Firm Service**

- Presentations by Panelists (* Tentative Panelist):

  Donald Furman, Senior Vice President, PPM Energy, Inc., on behalf of American Wind Energy Association (AWEA)
  Patricia Alexander, Consultant/Energy, Dickstein Shapiro LLP, on Behalf of Electric Power Supply Association (EPSA)
  John Lucas, Transmission Services Director, Southern Company Services, Inc.
  Lauren Nichols-Kinas, Public Utilities Specialist, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Anthony Taylor, Director of Transmission, Williams Power Company, Inc.
Natalie McIntire, Senior Policy Associate, Renewable Northwest Project

- Panel discussion topics include related issues raised in the NOPR, as well as the following:

1. Are there improvements to the revised redispatch provision in the pro forma OATT (section 13.5) that are necessary to facilitate redispatch?
2. Would customers be willing to pay for the actual costs of redispatch in addition to the embedded costs of transmission to secure previously unavailable long-term transmission rights? How can the Commission best remove discretion in calculating these costs and create a method for verifying them?
3. What tools are available to allow redispatch to occur using resources other than those owned by the transmission provider?
4. Should curtailments under conditional firm service be specified based on a number of hours per month, when certain transmission constraints or elements bind, when certain load levels are present, or some other factor? How would these different methods be studied and implemented? Which method is preferable from the perspective of the potential conditional firm transmission customers, the network customers and the transmission providers?
5. What curtailment priority should be assigned to conditional firm service? Would this require changes to NERC curtailment protocols? How should changes between firm and non-firm service be handled in real-time systems? Would changes need to be made to e-tags or OASIS?
6. Should conditional firm service be offered indefinitely, or only as a bridge product until transmission upgrades are complete?