

Generator Interconnection Queue Survey for Planning Advisory Committee Recommendations

Instructions:

1. Please enter company name, names of those responding to the survey, and survey completion date in the spaces provided below. *Submit only one completed survey per company, please.*
2. Review the questions below. The "Ref" column contains references to recommendation numbers published prior to the November 15, 2007 Stakeholder meeting. Note that recommendations below may have been modified or re-grouped to reflect the discussions of November 15.
3. Please indicate your preference by clicking on the "Yes" or "No" box.
4. Add your comments to the right. For "Yes" answers, comments are optional. If you click "No," it's important that you indicate your reason by filling in the comment section beside the question. There is also a comments section at the end of the document, for general comments.
5. Save the document with a new name.
6. Please e-mail the new document to jcurran@midwestiso.org as soon as possible, but no later than Wednesday, December 5, 2007.
7. If you have questions about how to complete this survey, please send an e-mail to jcurran@midwestiso.org

Note: This document is protected. You can enter information only in the gray boxes.

PART ONE

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Company Name: | |
| Respondents' Names: | |
| Completion Date: | |

PART TWO

| Ref | Recommendation to PAC | Yes/No | Comments (Optional for "Yes," Required for "No") |
|------|---|---|---|
| SR5a | Form a task force to evaluate and design a Customer-Oriented Queue, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A contour map during initial customer discussions - Up-front screening of Interconnection Requests - Milestone-based Queue progression - Provision for holding Queue position without winners/losers (pre-IA) - Modified provisions for holding Queue position while in suspension (post-IA) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| TR1 | Improve Communications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update business practice manuals - Design/implement program to better transfer knowledge from MISO to stakeholders - Increase level of MISO assistance and support - Improve reporting - Improve communication with TOs to help bring engineers into project with planners earlier in Queue cycle (formerly part of SR4) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| TR1 | Develop method of estimating transmission project cost ranges considering projects ahead may not get completed | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

Generator Interconnection Queue Survey for Planning Advisory Committee Recommendations

| Ref | Recommendation to PAC | Yes/No | Comments (Optional for "Yes," Required for "No") |
|--------------|---|---|---|
| TR2 | Increase MISO engineering resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| TR2 | Implement new requisition and purchasing procedures (e.g., master service contracts, contractor pre-qualification) that balance saving Stakeholder costs with reducing study duration | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| TR3 (new) | Implement revised group study procedures focused on electrical interconnection | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR1 | Design and implement a customer-friendly electronic process for Interconnection Request handling, including immediate validation of customer data | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR3 | Assist customers with study models <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State assumptions in study models - Develop a standard format to make models clear (e.g., standard Scope of Work) - Continue to make models available to customers | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR3 | Provide a "technical update" for customer during System Impact Study (thereby "increasing" customer participation) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR4 | Implement stricter standards and accountabilities for all Queue participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Place boundaries on peer review (formalize timelines for completion) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR4 | Implement stricter standards and accountabilities for Queue process activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If possible, develop incentives for affected systems owners to return models and analysis back to transmission owners quicker - Implement more transparency in the modeling process (all can see who owns the next step and when it is due) - Conduct periodic model evaluations of the whole system, instead of just study-by-study - Complete implementation of region-wide model-on-demand application | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR5b | Continue efforts to better integrate Network backbone planning and MISO Transmission Expansion Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With the Generator Interconnection Queue process, and - Through the use of Regionally Planned Generator Interconnection Projects (RPGIPs, formerly "Open Season"), including evaluation of applicability of current cost-sharing methodology to RPGIPs | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| SR5c | Study methods to reduce the "free rider" benefits received by lower queued projects | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

Generator Interconnection Queue Survey for Planning Advisory Committee Recommendations

| Ref | Recommendation to PAC | Yes/No | Comments (Optional for "Yes," Required for "No") |
|------|---|---|---|
| SR5d | Form a task force to enhance differing fuel source modeling and assumptions | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

PART THREE

A "Yes" response to the first question (SR5a) in PART TWO means you can skip ahead to PART FOUR

If you responded "No" to SR5a above, please respond to the following recommendations. If you responded "Yes" to SR5a above, you do not need to fill out this part, as these recommendations would be evaluated further as part of Customer-Oriented Queue design and implementation

| | Ref | Recommendation to PAC | Yes/No | Comments (Required When Responding "No") |
|--|-----|---|---|---|
| Leave blank if "Yes" was checked for item SR5a | SR1 | Clarify language for land control. Better define exactly what is required and what MISO will assume from a land control responsibility | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| | SR1 | Increase deposits. Formulate a team to determine the amount of increase and upon what the increase would be based (e.g., MW). Determine if refundable or not | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| | SR1 | Limit the ability to enter Queue without needed information (i.e., tighten screening) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| | SR1 | Eliminate the ability to progress to the next phase of Queue without needed information. This would likely include reduction, but not elimination, of cure periods. This could also mean removal from the Queue | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| | SR2 | Modify the provisions for suspension <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Certify prolonged suspension with higher deposit to cover financial obligations of Queue position - Form team to determine the amount, define "prolonged," and determine if any portion of the deposit would be refundable. The guiding principle is that customers meet Network Upgrade milestones; therefore deposits would likely be applied to Network Upgrades and not refunded. - Eliminate the "loophole" for partial construction - Implement clear protocols for long suspensions (e.g., customer cannot "languish" when coming out of suspension) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

Generator Interconnection Queue Survey for Planning Advisory Committee Recommendations

| Ref | Recommendation to PAC | Yes/No | Comments (Required When Responding "No") | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Blank if "Yes" on SR5a | SR2 | Reduce suspension time frame from 3 years to a shorter duration (for example, 18 months). Note: this recommendation could become irrelevant if it is approved that suspensions become certified with deposits (see above) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |
| | SR3 | Provide a contour map during initial customer discussions (pre-application or post-application, but before impact study) that will help customers see interconnection capacity (available transfer). Would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Making Feasibility Studies discretionary to MISO (currently discretionary to customers only) - Combining Interconnection Request and Feasibility Study Agreement language | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

PART FOUR

General Observations and Comments (for example, things we should do that are not listed above):

Please remember to save the document with a new name, and e-mail it to jcurran@midwestiso.org as soon as possible, but no later than Wednesday, December 5, 2007.

Thank you for your participation.

Midwest ISO