

EXHIBIT 2
ANSWER OF CALIFORNIA ISO TO COMPLAINT
DOCKET NO. EL99-30-000

PAGE 1 OF 1

CITATION TO WPTF'S COMPLAINT	ISSUE/ ARGUMENT	CITATION TO DOCUMENT IN EXISTING PROCEEDING
Complaint at 6-8.	The GMC is unduly discriminatory and anticompetitive because it requires Complainants to subsidize the rates of customers with Existing Contracts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“Request of Enron Power Marketing, Inc. For Clarification, Or in the Alternative, Rehearing” (“Enron Rehearing”) at 4. •“Initial Comments of Enron Power Marketing, Inc. Opposing Offer of Settlement” (“Enron Comments”) at 3, 9 n.8.
•Complaint at 8.	•Incumbent customers only pay 50% of what Complainants must pay in GMC charges.	•Enron Comments at 3, 8.
•Complaint at 11-12.	•In order to protect Complainants, FERC should grant Section 206 refund protection to the rates in Docket No. ER99-473-000.	•Enron Rehearing at 1, 3-4. •
Complaint at 13.	FERC should establish a refund effective date at the earliest possible time.	•Enron Rehearing at 1, 4. •
Complaint at 12-13.	FERC should set for expedited hearing the determination of the reasonableness of the GMC rates effective January 1, 1999, and the appropriate amount of refunds.	•Enron Comments at 9 & n.7.
•Complaint at 9-10.	•The GMC is not just and reasonable, and may be excessive based on a study facilitated by the ISO, which compares the administrative costs of 5 ISOs.	•Enron Rehearing at 4 n.3. •Enron Comments at 8 & Attachment A. •
Complaint at 10-11.	The extended GMC violates the April 1998 Settlement in Docket Nos. ER98-211-000, <i>et al.</i> , because the ISO failed to file new GMC rates effective January 1, 1999.	•Enron Rehearing at 4-5, 6. •Enron Comments at 4.
•Complaint at 12.	•The April 1998 Settlement is binding on the parties as well as the Commission.	•Enron Rehearing at 6. •Enron Comments at 10 & n.10.