

134 FERC ¶ 61,119
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;
Marc Spitzer, Philip D. Moeller,
John R. Norris, and Cheryl A. LaFleur.

Midwest Independent Transmission
System Operator, Inc.

Docket No. ER10-2869-000

ORDER CONDITIONALLY ACCEPTING TARIFF REVISION

(Issued February 17, 2011)

1. In this order, we conditionally accept Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc.'s (Midwest ISO) proposed revision to its Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (Tariff) designed to facilitate exports of generation from Midwest ISO to an external border to serve load outside of Midwest ISO. We direct Midwest ISO to make a compliance filing to provide more detail in the Tariff about the deliverability study process used by Midwest ISO to pre-certify transmission paths for export transactions.

I. Background and Description of the Filing

2. On September 22, 2010, Midwest ISO filed a proposed revision to section 19.1 (Notice of Need for System Impact Study) of the Tariff. Midwest ISO states that the proposed revision provides an additional firm point-to-point transmission service study option to facilitate the export of generation from Midwest ISO to an external border.

The proposed revised section 19.1 states:

After receiving a request for service, the Transmission Provider or ITC [independent transmission company], as applicable, shall determine on a non-discriminatory basis whether a System Impact Study is needed. Such review, to the extent reasonably feasible, shall rely upon existing planning studies and System Impact Studies. A description of the Transmission Provider's and, as applicable, ITC's methodology for completing a System Impact Study is provided in Attachment D.

3. According to Midwest ISO, the proposal is a response to stakeholder comments about enhancing the ability to export excess generation from within Midwest ISO's footprint

for transactions that cross Midwest ISO's borders.¹ Midwest ISO states that stakeholders expressed concerns about the difficulties encountered when they tried to use excess generation for profitable export transactions. Midwest ISO states that the proposal was developed in accordance with its governance process to expedite the processing of export transactions and to enable a more efficient use of resources within Midwest ISO.

4. Midwest ISO states that its current method for studying the transmission system to fulfill transmission service requests for export transactions creates uncertainty and delay. Midwest ISO points out that, absent a joint and common capacity market or cross-border deliverability agreement with another transmission provider, the exporting customers must procure both a drive-out point-to-point transmission product from Midwest ISO and a drive-in transmission product, usually network service, from the other transmission provider in order to participate in neighboring energy, capacity and ancillary services markets.²

5. Midwest ISO claims the new procedures would be more efficient than the existing process.³ Midwest ISO states that the proposed changes will use a deliverability algorithm like that used for Network Resource Interconnection Service (NRIS) which allows generators to be designated by any Network Load without further study. Similarly, an aggregate, simultaneous deliverability study will be performed to determine whether generators in Midwest ISO could be pre-certified for the transmission path to serve load in other transmission provider footprints for terms of more than one year and less than five years.

6. Midwest ISO states that these studies would be performed annually, as part of the regular Midwest ISO Transmission Expansion Plan (MTEP) studies where Midwest ISO tests the deliverability of network resources on the system. According to Midwest ISO, it would simply run another set of scenarios where the generation sinks at external load rather

¹ Midwest ISO states that there is currently excess generation capacity of approximately 10,000 MW within Midwest ISO beyond the reserve margin needed for reliability purposes. *See* Midwest ISO filing, Mr. Lavery Direct Testimony (Lavery) at 3.

² According to Midwest ISO, even with joint study agreements with neighboring transmission providers that give a coordinated answer to the customer queries concerning the availability of transmission service, there is a time lag, delay, and uncertainty while the customer awaits an answer to its transmission service request. *See* Lavery at 4.

³ Midwest ISO states that the proposal will save time and reduce costs because Midwest ISO will perform and transmission owners will conduct peer review of an annual study rather than multiple system impact studies. Midwest ISO estimates that it will take an additional two weeks per year to perform the proposed study which compares favorably to the 45-60 days for each impact study. *See* Lavery at 10-11.

than internal load. Midwest ISO would post the amount of available transmission capacity and the amount already sold from that source to the other transmission provider.

7. Midwest ISO asserts that making the proposed additional transmission service study option available to generators will maximize the use of existing generation that might otherwise be mothballed or retired if it is not being dispatched in the Midwest ISO markets. Midwest ISO states that the proposed revision will result in greater access to other markets and more efficient use of existing generation in the region obviating the need for customers of other transmission providers to pay for new generation resources in their own area.

8. Midwest ISO requests an effective date of November 22, 2010 for its proposed revision.

II. Notices and Responsive Filings

9. Notice of Midwest ISO's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 75 Fed. Reg. 61,721 (2010), with comments, interventions, and protests due on or before October 13, 2010. Consumers Energy Company, American Municipal Power, Inc., MidAmerican Energy Company, Wisconsin Electric Power Company, and Exelon Corporation (Exelon) filed motions to intervene. PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. (PJM), Ameren Energy Marketing Company (Ameren), and the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners⁴ filed motions to intervene and protests. Additionally, Midwest ISO filed a motion for leave to answer and answer to protests and Midwest ISO Transmission Owners filed a motion for leave to answer and answer to Midwest ISO's answer.

⁴ The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners for this filing are: American Transmission Company LLC; American Transmission Systems, Incorporated, a subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp.; City Water, Light & Power (Springfield, IL); Dairyland Power Cooperative; Duke Energy Corporation for Duke Energy Ohio, Inc., Duke Energy Indiana, Inc., and Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc.; Great River Energy; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Indiana Municipal Power Agency; Indianapolis Power & Light Company; International Transmission Company; ITC Midwest LLC; Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC; Michigan Public Power Agency; MidAmerican Energy Company; Minnesota Power (and its subsidiary Superior Water, L&P); Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.; Northern Indiana Public Service Company; Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, and Northern States Power Company, a Wisconsin corporation, subsidiaries of Xcel Energy Inc.; Northwestern Wisconsin Electric Company; Otter Tail Power Company; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Company; Southern Minnesota Municipal Power Agency; Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.; and Wolverine Power Supply Cooperative, Inc.

10. On November 20, 2010, Commission staff issued a deficiency letter identifying issues that required additional information. These matters included a description of when the deliverability studies would be performed, when the capacity would be available, an explanation of the reliability criteria to be used in the deliverability study, and whether Midwest ISO will reflect other transmission service requests in the deliverability study when the requests are granted. On December 20, 2010, Midwest ISO filed a response to the deficiency letter.

11. Notice of Midwest ISO's response to the deficiency letter was published in the *Federal Register*, 76 Fed. Reg. 354 (2011), with comments due on or before January 10, 2011. Exelon filed a protest.

A. Comments and Protests

12. PJM states that it does not oppose Midwest ISO's proposal. However, it requests that the Commission condition its acceptance on the continued applicability of the cross border coordinated planning study requirements contained in the Joint Operating Agreement (JOA) between Midwest ISO and PJM.⁵ PJM states that, as a result of discussions with Midwest ISO, it understands that Midwest ISO does not intend by this proposal to modify or bypass the JOA's cross border planning requirements. Thus, PJM asserts that the obligations under the JOA are unchanged by this filing. PJM states that a conditional acceptance would remove ambiguity as to how the proposal will work with the JOA.

13. Ameren argues that the proposal lacks sufficient scope and detail to meet the need for enhanced deliverability of generation into other markets without concurrent reforms to JOAs between Midwest ISO and adjacent regional transmission organizations (RTOs). Ameren notes that while the JOA between Midwest ISO and PJM provides for the joint planning and coordinated analysis of service requests, it does not provide a one-stop solution for obtaining firm transmission service from inside Midwest ISO to markets inside PJM. The proposal, according to Ameren, only allows Midwest ISO to approve "its portion of the transmission service required for such [network resource] designation"⁶ and does not address transmission service beyond Midwest ISO's border.

14. Ameren contends that development of a cross-border deliverability agreement or a joint or common capacity market is necessary to better facilitate cross-border transactions.

⁵ See PJM Motion to Intervene at 2-4. As explained by PJM, the JOA's coordinated planning procedures require, among other things, the coordination of calculating Available Flowgate Capacity (AFC) values, notification to PJM when Midwest ISO's pre-certification studies show potential impacts on PJM's system, coordination of the study process (e.g., agreement of study scope and timelines).

⁶ See Ameren Protest at 6 (*citing* Laverty at 9:17-19).

Ameren notes that Midwest ISO has, in other contexts, stated that lack of a common market mechanism interferes with the ability for capacity in Midwest ISO to be sold into capacity markets administered by PJM.⁷

15. Ameren also claims that the proposed timing of the underlying deliverability studies could harm exporters. Ameren points out that Midwest ISO proposes to conduct the deliverability studies annually as part of its MTEP process that is based on a January to December calendar year.⁸ However, Ameren notes that both Midwest ISO's and PJM's capacity requirements are evaluated on a planning year basis running from June 1 of one year to May 31 of the following year. Thus, a capacity seller that clears the PJM Reliability Pricing Model (RPM) auction will need to show that it has transmission capacity for the entire planning year, which will encompass parts of two calendar years. In other words, a deliverability study based on a single calendar year will not provide assurance that transmission capacity will be available for the full planning year. Thus, Ameren concludes that Midwest ISO needs to better align the deliverability study periods with the capacity planning years in Midwest ISO and adjoining markets.

16. Ameren recommends that the Commission accept the proposal and direct Midwest ISO to work with adjacent transmission providers to develop more comprehensive and effective cross-border deliverability study procedures and other procedures that will help generation within Midwest ISO access other markets. Ameren suggests that the Commission direct Midwest ISO to file a report every 60-days detailing its efforts to reduce these barriers.

17. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners caution that the proposal could cause a conflict between Midwest ISO's deliverability study process and the contingency analyses included in the transmission planning analyses of many transmission owners.⁹ According to the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners, Midwest ISO uses their contingency analyses when it completes system impact studies for long-term firm transmission service requests. Thus, the use of different contingency analyses could raise comparability issues as customers that are studied in the normal transmission service request process could be subject to different

⁷ *Id.* at 6-7 (citing Midwest ISO Answer at 6, 11-12 filed on August 25, 2010 in Docket No. ER10-1562-000 and Midwest ISO Motion to Intervene at 36-37 filed on July 26, 2010 in Docket No. ER10-1562-000).

⁸ *Id.* at 8 (citing Laverty at 7:3-4).

⁹ The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners state that while the Midwest ISO generally includes N-1 contingencies, many transmission owners' planning analyses evaluate a range of Category C contingencies as described in North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) transmission planning standards, such as N-1-1 and/or N-2. *See* Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' Motion to Intervene at 5-6.

or stricter contingency analyses than customers requesting service to the border across the same facilities being evaluated under the aggregate drive-out study process. Additionally, they assert that using the proposal's less strict contingency analyses will likely cause an increase in congestion on the systems of transmission owners on Midwest ISO's border, creating the need for the transmission owners to upgrade their systems to meet NERC's stricter Category C contingencies.¹⁰ The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners recommend that the Commission require Midwest ISO to take a pre-defined contingency list from the local transmission owners into account when performing the drive-out deliverability study.

18. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners also dispute Midwest ISO's contention that the proposal is similar to the deliverability study used to approve NRIS for resources to serve internal Midwest ISO load. They assert that, under Midwest ISO's generation interconnection procedures, being approved for NRIS does not constitute an approval of transmission service, and that additional studies may be required to gain transmission service approval. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners argue that Midwest ISO should be obliged to resolve the disparate treatment between exporting generators obtaining transmission service to the border through the deliverability study process without additional studies and generators serving internal load that would need to have additional studies to obtain transmission service.¹¹

19. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners also request that the Commission require Midwest ISO to clarify the impact of its proposal on subsequent long-term firm transmission service requests. For example, they are concerned that if a customer (Customer A) can transmit to Midwest ISO's border for four years with no rights to continue beyond the initial term of the service request under this proposal, then a subsequent customer (Customer B) that wants service from year three for 10 years may be obliged to pay for upgrades even though after year four ample capacity is available.

20. Finally, the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners assert that Midwest ISO needs to provide additional detail about its proposal. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners point out that Midwest ISO proposes a Tariff revision of just one sentence with the expressed intent to incorporate the rest of the proposal at some future time into the Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners argue that additional detail on the deliverability study process is necessary either as additional Tariff revisions or through clear revisions to the appropriate Business Practice Manuals.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 6.

¹¹ *Id.* at 7-8.

B. Midwest ISO's Answer to Protests

21. Midwest ISO states that it will use local standards to develop its studies, which is already part of the standard operating procedure in Midwest ISO's study process. Midwest ISO points out that section 4.3.6 of the Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual explains which contingencies will be evaluated and that the Generator Interconnection Business Practice Manual provides similar guidance as to how a system impact study will be performed. Further, Midwest ISO asserts that the system impact study will include, among other steps, contingencies for all potentially impacted facilities based on input from an ad hoc group.¹² Thus, Midwest ISO contends, this issue does not need further action because the transmission owners will have the opportunity to provide local standards for use in studies and these standards will be used to identify the paths suggested in the filing.

22. Midwest ISO asserts that the deliverability study will not lead to inconsistent treatment of generators. Midwest ISO contends that it is not inconsistent to use the deliverability study for resources serving external load because these entities receive the same treatment that comparable generators within the Midwest ISO footprint serving internal load receive.¹³ Midwest ISO explains that generators with NRIS, also known as "deliverable generators," can be designated by any Network Integration Transmission Service (NITS) customer within the Midwest ISO footprint without further study. Midwest ISO clarifies that the difference in the instant filing is that the point-to-point customers paying for point-to-point service for delivery to the Midwest ISO border to serve load outside the Midwest ISO footprint do not receive rollover rights, but the NITS customers serving internal load can.¹⁴

23. Further, Midwest ISO states that the impact of the filing on long-term firm transmission service requests will depend on a business decision for each project. Midwest ISO explains that in the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' example, if Customer B deferred its start date by one year, it would not be obligated to pay for any network upgrades. However, Midwest ISO explains that a customer that funds network upgrades would also receive Financial Transmission Rights associated with the upgrades, which may be regarded as an additional benefit.¹⁵

24. Midwest ISO argues that the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' concern about insufficient detail in the proposal has been resolved because updated Transmission Planning

¹² See Midwest ISO Answer at 3-5.

¹³ *Id.* at 6.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.* at 7.

Business Practice Manual language has been drafted and has been reviewed by stakeholders. Midwest ISO states that it is already working with stakeholders to finalize appropriate Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual language.¹⁶

25. Midwest ISO agrees with Ameren that additional coordination with PJM would be helpful. However, Midwest ISO argues that Ameren's proposed 60-day reporting requirement is more frequent than necessary. Midwest ISO states that it intends to pursue discussions with PJM and, if directed, would report to the Commission semi-annually on the progress of these discussions. Regarding the timing of the study to coincide with the MTEP or with the planning year, Midwest ISO asserts that the solution would be for stakeholders to advise it as to when in the MTEP cycle these results would be most useful.¹⁷

C. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' Answer to Midwest ISO's Answer

26. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners state that, although Midwest ISO maintains that its Business Practices Manuals account for local contingencies,¹⁸ Midwest ISO also states that it will remove Category C and D contingencies from the contingency file as part of the deliverability study process.¹⁹ They argue that, absent changes to the deliverability study processes used for pre-certifying drive-out transmission service paths, the removal of Category C and D contingencies from the contingency files will result in Midwest ISO not appropriately taking local reliability criteria into consideration.²⁰

27. The Midwest ISO Transmission Owners also point out that Midwest ISO's clarification in its answer is unclear as to the proposed treatment of prior approved transmission service requests. Therefore, they argue, the Commission should require Midwest ISO to clarify that it will include transmission service requests flowing in the same direction as pre-certified drive-out paths in the deliverability study process.²¹

¹⁶ See Midwest ISO Answer at 8-9.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 10.

¹⁸ See Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' Answer at 4 (*citing* Midwest ISO's Answer at 3-5).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 4.

²⁰ *Id.* at 5.

²¹ *Id.*

28. Finally, the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners take issue with Midwest ISO's position that its treatment of generators selling outside the market is comparable to the treatment of generators selling within the market proposed in Midwest ISO's filing. They point out that while internal customers can use deliverability results to be designated as a network resource throughout Midwest ISO's footprint, an NRIS designation does not entitle an internal generator to use that study result to take long-term firm point-to-point transmission service from its facility to some other Midwest ISO load zone without an additional transmission service request study, which may show the need for transmission upgrades.²² This lack of comparability is something that the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners argue the Commission should require Midwest ISO to address.

D. Midwest ISO's Response to Deficiency Letter

29. Midwest ISO clarifies that it would leverage the base case and reliability work done during the MTEP process to produce the drive-out deliverability values at a minimal cost to stakeholders and publish the results when ready. Midwest ISO states that it can adjust the timing of performing the analysis during the MTEP process, if the stakeholders request, but it points out that the results of the analysis would likely be available in the fourth quarter of a given year. Midwest ISO asserts that because it is studying peak-load scenarios consistent with the study for NRIS, a September 1 to August 31 effective date for the results is appropriate. Midwest ISO states that, if directed by the Commission, it will use the September 1 through August 31 time period or a different time period that has been vetted through the stakeholder process.

30. Midwest ISO also states that during the MTEP process it would produce values for each year through the summer peak period five years out (e.g., during the MTEP 2011 process in the fourth quarter of 2011, Midwest ISO would produce values through the summer of 2016). Midwest ISO states that it would update these values on an annual basis when it performs the next MTEP process. Midwest ISO argues that producing values five years out meets the needs that the stakeholders have communicated to Midwest ISO.

31. Midwest ISO clarifies that it will reflect Category C and D contingencies in the deliverability studies to account for local reliability issues. Midwest ISO also clarifies that it is not proposing to amend the JOA that it has with PJM.

E. Exelon's Protest to Midwest ISO's Response to Deficiency Letter

32. Exelon protests Midwest ISO's response to the deficiency letter. Exelon requests that the Commission reject the filing. It argues that Midwest ISO's proposal of annual study updates is insufficient to ensure accurate assessment of transmission availability and could lead Midwest ISO to oversell transmission service. Exelon contends that Midwest ISO must

²² *Id.* at 5-6.

update the studies for its system whenever it grants service on one path, because that service is likely to impact other paths. Exelon also states that Midwest ISO does not address how it will coordinate its assessment of transmission availability on its system with constraints on neighboring systems in order to avoid causing reliability violations on the other systems.

III. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

33. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2010), the timely, unopposed motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding.

34. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2010), prohibits an answer to a protest unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept Midwest ISO's answer and the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' answer to Midwest ISO's answer because both pleadings have provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

B. Commission Determination

35. We conditionally accept Midwest ISO's proposal subject to the requirement that Midwest ISO submit a compliance filing to reflect more information in its Tariff concerning its proposal to pre-certify transmission paths to the Midwest ISO border.²³ Midwest ISO explains that the proposal is intended to facilitate the sale of excess generation located in the Midwest ISO footprint that might be mothballed unless such generation can access markets outside of Midwest ISO. Midwest ISO also states that uncertainty and delay resulting from its existing procedures for handling transmission service requests to the Midwest ISO border may inhibit export transactions and that Midwest ISO is required to maximize transmission revenues for transmission owners. Additionally, Midwest ISO states that the instant submittal will alleviate any such uncertainty and delay in getting power to the border.

36. We find that the proposal will facilitate export transactions to the Midwest ISO border and provide benefits to market participants. We recognize that this benefit may be limited because the proposal only provides for quicker acceptance of transmission service requests for point-to-point transmission service to the Midwest ISO border and does not provide one-stop shopping that would alleviate any delay in processing requests for transmission service to load within PJM or other neighboring markets. However, we

²³ We find that Midwest ISO has sufficiently addressed protesters' concerns that the proposal does not modify the JOA with PJM and will reflect the necessary reliability criteria and that stakeholders will have input on changing the criteria. Thus, we will not address these issues further.

disagree with Ameren that Midwest ISO and PJM should be directed to form a joint and common market agreement to address these concerns or that we must require changes to the JOA with PJM to address Ameren's concerns. Midwest ISO states in its answer that it agrees that additional coordination with PJM would be helpful and that it intends to pursue discussions with PJM and would report to the Commission semi-annually on the progress of such discussions if so directed by the Commission. We encourage Midwest ISO to pursue market improvements with its neighbors but decline to require Midwest ISO to submit informational reports semi-annually about these efforts. We expect that as enhancements are agreed to parties will submit filings for Commission approval, as necessary.

37. In response to Midwest ISO Transmission Owners concerns regarding the impact of transactions using the pre-certified paths on subsequent transmission service requests, we agree with Midwest ISO that it is a business decision. If Customer B (in the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners' example) wants to use the transmission capacity currently granted to Customer A on a pre-certified path, Customer B may elect to fund the construction of more capacity or may choose to delay their transaction until after Customer A's transaction is finished. Midwest ISO's proposal does not alter that business decision because that is the same business decision Customer B would have to make without the proposal.

38. However, as Exelon notes, Midwest ISO will only update the deliverability study annually and will not adjust the capacity available on the pre-certified paths as new transmission service requests are accepted subsequent to the last annual review. This lack of adjustment to the capacity available on the pre-certified paths for newly accepted transmission service requests could result in overselling transmission service. Accordingly, we direct Midwest ISO to adjust the annual review to account for new uses of the grid as they are accepted to ensure that generators seeking to export to the Midwest ISO border will have an accurate assessment of the amount of capacity available on pre-certified paths.

39. We also agree with the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners that Midwest ISO needs to provide additional detail about the study process in the Tariff regarding this proposal. The proposal merely mentions that Midwest ISO will use existing studies when possible but does not explain how Midwest ISO will conduct the studies,²⁴ when Midwest ISO will make

²⁴ The proposed Tariff revision does not explain that Midwest ISO will conduct deliverability studies for all generation located in Midwest ISO to pre-certify transmission paths for export transactions and identify such pre-certified transmission paths.

the studies available²⁵ and how long the studies are effective.²⁶ Midwest ISO appears to rely on the Business Practice Manuals as the source of all this necessary information about its proposal. However, while some of the details of the proposal may be appropriate for the Business Practice Manuals, as they may be revised, we find that Midwest ISO needs to include more information about this study option in the Tariff. The added detail should be designed to inform transmission customers of the availability of pre-certified paths and a general description of how Midwest ISO will conduct the pre-certification of transmission paths to the Midwest ISO border.

40. Finally, we disagree with Midwest ISO Transmission Owners that the proposed Tariff revision will lead to disparate treatment of exporting generators and those requesting NRIS because the Tariff revision merely provides an additional study option and not a service like NRIS.

The Commission orders:

(A) Midwest ISO's proposal is conditionally accepted for filing effective November 22, 2010, as requested.

(B) Midwest ISO is directed to make a compliance filing within 30 days from the date of this order as discussed in the body of the order.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Kimberly D. Bose,
Secretary.

²⁵ Midwest ISO states in response to the deficiency letter, but not in the Tariff, that it will make the results of the deliverability studies available in the fourth quarter of each year and will adjust its workload as necessary to accommodate stakeholder requests.

²⁶ Midwest ISO states in its filing and pleadings, but not the Tariff revision, that the transactions using these pre-certified paths are limited to five years.