

Recommendation from RSC and OMS SLC Members

<p>Issue 2: Rate Pancaking</p> <p>a. High Priority: The OMS supports the idea of creating the working group as long as its meetings are open to anyone who is interested in participating. There is particularly high interest in items 1 (inventory different types of rate pancaking) and 5 (discuss potential tariff changes in lieu of pancaked rates).</p> <p>b. Medium priority (3 voted for low priority; 6 voted for medium priority; and 1 voted for high priority): RSC supports the idea of creating the working group as long as its meetings are open to anyone who is interested in participating. There was also concern with the potential for litigation from the issue. However, the issues will be considered in the SCRIPT process, and there should be coordination of the efforts.</p>	<p>OMS Comments: These are the two recommendations where the SLC would have the most influence. Issue 2 is pursuing additional information, which could lead to recommendations down the road. Issue 4 is promoting the kickoff of a stakeholder process to work on developing a TMEP process.</p>
<p>Issue 4: TMEP</p> <p>a. High Priority: Two of the OMS SLC members believe this should be a high priority. There are concerns from LA related to what the TMEP study process would look like. It is our hope that those concerns could be addressed during the stakeholder processes that the SLC is recommending at this time.</p> <p>b. High Priority (1 voted for low priority; 2 voted for medium priority; and 7 voted for high priority): RSC supports this issue being addressed in the proposed joint study process, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive quarterly or semi-annual updates from SPP and MISO on the progress of the issues. LPSC has significant concerns about this issue.</p>	

<p>Issue 3: Interregional Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Medium Priority: The OMS supports the SLC putting focus on the interregional aspects of the ongoing long-range planning efforts at each RTO. b. Low Priority (6 voted for low priority; 2 voted for medium priority; and 2 voted for high priority): RSC supports that SPP and MISO are including this issue in the proposed joint study process, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive quarterly or semi-annual updates from SPP and MISO on the progress of the issues. 	<p>OMS Comments: These items are being covered by various studies by the RTOs, including the joint study. The SLC would act in a monitoring capacity and receive updates as needed.</p>
<p>Issue 5: Generator Interconnection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. High Priority: The OMS supports the SLC serving as a place for regular updates from MISO and SPP joint study. b. High Priority (0 voted for low priority; 2 voted for medium priority; and 8 voted for high priority): RSC supports that SPP and MISO are including this issue in the proposed joint study process, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive quarterly or semi-annual updates from SPP and MISO on the progress of the issues. 	

<p>Issue 1: Market-to-Market</p> <p>a. Medium Priority: OMS states that many of the recommendations made by the market monitor are already underway in the RTO roadmap processes so there may not be a benefit of making further recommendations. The OMS is supportive of individual members participating in the roadmap ranking processes to ensure the M2M improvements are implemented in a timely manner. We also recommend the RTOs coordinate these items within their respective roadmaps to ensure similar timelines.</p> <p>b. Medium Priority (10 votes for medium priority): RSC supports that SPP and MISO are already addressing many of the issues, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive quarterly or semi-annual updates from SPP and MISO on the progress of the issues.</p>	<p>OMS Comments: All of these items are in flight in either the RTO roadmap processes (Issue 1 and 6) or at FERC (Issue 7). The OMS recommendation is to support improvements as individual states within the roadmap ranking processes and to follow their progress generally.</p>
<p>Item 6: Coordinated Transaction Scheduling</p> <p>a. Medium Priority: OMS recommends continued work on the improved price forecasts and additional investigation into the impacts of potential fee removal.</p> <p>b. Low Priority (10 votes for low priority): SPP plans to review this issue in the future, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive updates from SPP and MISO on changes related to the issues.</p>	
<p>Issue 7: Interface Pricing</p> <p>a. Low Priority: The OMS supports the recommendation by the market monitor and the need for the SLC to monitor the ongoing FERC proceedings to ensure recommendations by market monitor are implemented through that process.</p> <p>b. Low Priority (10 votes for low priority): SPP plans to review this issue in the future, and no additional action is necessary. RSC and OMS should receive updates from SPP and MISO on changes related to the issues.</p>	