

# SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP

THE WASHINGTON HARBOUR  
3000 K STREET, NW, SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007-5116  
TELEPHONE (202) 424-7500  
FAX (202) 424-7643  
WWW.SWIDLAW.COM

NEW YORK OFFICE  
THE CHRYSLER BUILDING  
405 LEXINGTON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10174  
(212) 973-0111 FAX (212) 891-9598

January 16, 2004

The Honorable Magalie R. Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

**Re: Creed Energy Center, LLC  
Docket No. ER04-324-000 – ERRATA**

Dear Secretary Salas:

On January 12, 2004, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (“ISO”) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) filed their Joint Provisional Protest in the captioned proceeding. It has come to our attention that a paragraph was inadvertently included in the filing that should not have been included, namely, paragraph 3(i) in Section II of the January 12, 2004 filing. The ISO and PG&E now provide the corrected version of the Joint Provisional Protest, in which that paragraph has been removed. Attachment A to the present filing shows, in red-line format, the deletion of paragraph 3(i), the removal of the portion of the caption for paragraph 3 that referred to paragraph 3(i), and the resulting re-numbering of the subsequent paragraph in Section II of the Joint Provisional Protest from paragraph 3(ii) to paragraph 3. Attachment B to the present filing shows the corrected Joint Provisional Protest in clean format.

Please replace the version of the Joint Provisional Protest submitted on January 12, 2003 with the version provided in Attachment B to the present filing.

We apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. Please contact the undersigned with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bradley R. Miliauskas

J. Phillip Jordan  
Bradley R. Miliauskas  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007

Counsel for  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation

Shiran Kochavi  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Law Department, Mail Code B30A  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120

Attorney for Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company

**ATTACHMENT A**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Creed Energy Center, LLC**

)

**Docket No. ER04-324-000**

**JOINT PROVISIONAL PROTEST  
OF THE  
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

Pursuant to Rule 211 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”), 18 C.F.R. § 385.211 (2003), and the Commission’s December 31, 2003 Notice of Filing, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (“ISO”) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) (collectively the “Parties”)<sup>1</sup> submit this provisional protest in the captioned proceeding (“Provisional Protest”). In support thereof, the Parties state as follows:

**I. Description of the Proceeding**

On December 22, 2003, Creed Energy Center, LLC (“Creed”) filed an unexecuted Must-Run Service Agreement and accompanying schedules (“RMR Agreement”)<sup>2</sup> between Creed and the ISO setting forth the rates, terms, and conditions under which Creed proposes to provide reliability must-run services to the ISO.

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of the Parties has concurrently filed a separate Motion to Intervene in this proceeding. The Parties are authorized to state that the California Public Utilities Commission and the California Electricity Oversight Board, which are intervening by separate filings, support this Provisional Protest.

<sup>2</sup> Because the facilities covered by the Must-Run Service Agreement and accompanying schedules must operate at certain times for the reliability of the transmission grid, they are referred to as “reliability must-run” or “RMR” units and the agreement and accompanying schedules covering them are referred to as “RMR agreements.” Other capitalized terms that are not defined in this filing have the same meaning set forth in the RMR Agreement or in the Master Definitions Supplement, Appendix A to the ISO Tariff.

## II. Provisional Protest

The Parties enter this Provisional Protest in this proceeding to identify terms and conditions included in the filed RMR Agreement but not agreed to between Creed and the Parties. While the Parties have been working with Creed to resolve the outstanding issues, the Parties also wish to preserve their respective rights to protest issues included in the filed RMR Agreement and protest the following issues listed below. The enumerated concerns are those the Parties have been able to identify to date. In addition to these concerns, the Parties reserve the right to address in the future any errors or concerns that are discovered after the filing of the Provisional Protest:

Based on their review of the RMR Agreement filing, the Parties have identified the following issues with the filed RMR Agreement:

1. Schedule A Operational Information – The “Load and Maximum MVAR” values should be lowered to be less than or equal to the Maximum Net Dependable Capability.<sup>3</sup>

2. Schedule B Other Outage Hours – The Average Other Outage Hour calculation for Unit 1 includes values that do appear to be incorrect. As such, the values in Table B-1 through B-5 should be revised to incorporate the AOOH using the correct values for Unit 1.

3. Schedule D Coefficients and Note –  
Schedule D requires the following revisions:

---

<sup>3</sup> The “Load at Maximum MVAR Lagging, MW” and “Load at Maximum MVAR Leading, MW” in Schedule A, Section 2 may not be higher than the level to which the ISO is permitted to dispatch the Unit and this is limited by the Maximum Net Dependable Capacity value.

~~(i) Creed and the Parties agreed to revise the coefficients in Table D-1 for the Creed Energy Center 1&2 Units to reflect the Start-up of a single Unit rather than two Units but it appears these values were not updated as the Start-up Costs in Table D-0 were calculated using the single Unit coefficients. As such, these values need to be revised and a note added below the table to explain the relationship between the individual and combined Unit values; and~~

~~(ii) the filed version of Schedule D includes a note below Table D-1 regarding the Owner's right to charge for additional labor costs related to non-peak Starts-ups; the note is unclear and the Parties' believe it is superfluous. As such, the note regarding labor costs regarding non-peak Start-ups should be removed.~~

4. Schedule I Language – The Parties oppose the language regarding the insurance requirements Creed proposes in Schedule I because it varies from the language in the Pro-forma RMR Agreement adopted by the Commission and accepted by other parties to RMR agreements. The proposed language upsets the careful balance between the parties to the filed RMR Agreement. As such, the Parties request that the language be revised to conform to the language provided in the Pro-forma RMR Agreement.

### **III. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, the Parties respectfully request that the Commission rule that

(i) the rate schedules set forth in Creed's filing have not been shown to be just and reasonable;

(ii) suspend the rate schedules subject to hearing and establish a refund date that is the same as the proposed effective date, January 1, 2004; and

(iii) defer action on the RMR Agreement filing until February 12, 2004, to give the Parties and Creed time to attempt to resolve outstanding issues associated with the filing.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ J. Phillip Jordan

J. Phillip Jordan  
Bradley R. Miliauskas  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007

Counsel for  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation

Shiran Kochavi  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Law Department, Mail Code B30A  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120

Attorney for Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company

Dated: January 12, 2004

**ATTACHMENT B**



**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**Creed Energy Center, LLC**

)

**Docket No. ER04-324-000**

**JOINT PROVISIONAL PROTEST  
OF THE  
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION  
AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

Pursuant to Rule 211 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“Commission”), 18 C.F.R. § 385.211 (2003), and the Commission’s December 31, 2003 Notice of Filing, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (“ISO”) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) (collectively the “Parties”)<sup>1</sup> submit this provisional protest in the captioned proceeding (“Provisional Protest”). In support thereof, the Parties state as follows:

**I. Description of the Proceeding**

On December 22, 2003, Creed Energy Center, LLC (“Creed”) filed an unexecuted Must-Run Service Agreement and accompanying schedules (“RMR Agreement”)<sup>2</sup> between Creed and the ISO setting forth the rates, terms, and conditions under which Creed proposes to provide reliability must-run services to the ISO.

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of the Parties has concurrently filed a separate Motion to Intervene in this proceeding. The Parties are authorized to state that the California Public Utilities Commission and the California Electricity Oversight Board, which are intervening by separate filings, support this Provisional Protest.

<sup>2</sup> Because the facilities covered by the Must-Run Service Agreement and accompanying schedules must operate at certain times for the reliability of the transmission grid, they are referred to as “reliability must-run” or “RMR” units and the agreement and accompanying schedules covering them are referred to as “RMR agreements.” Other capitalized terms that are not defined in this filing have the same meaning set forth in the RMR Agreement or in the Master Definitions Supplement, Appendix A to the ISO Tariff.

## II. Provisional Protest

The Parties enter this Provisional Protest in this proceeding to identify terms and conditions included in the filed RMR Agreement but not agreed to between Creed and the Parties. While the Parties have been working with Creed to resolve the outstanding issues, the Parties also wish to preserve their respective rights to protest issues included in the filed RMR Agreement and protest the following issues listed below. The enumerated concerns are those the Parties have been able to identify to date. In addition to these concerns, the Parties reserve the right to address in the future any errors or concerns that are discovered after the filing of the Provisional Protest:

Based on their review of the RMR Agreement filing, the Parties have identified the following issues with the filed RMR Agreement:

1. Schedule A Operational Information – The “Load and Maximum MVA<sub>r</sub>” values should be lowered to be less than or equal to the Maximum Net Dependable Capability.<sup>3</sup>
2. Schedule B Other Outage Hours – The Average Other Outage Hour calculation for Unit 1 includes values that do appear to be incorrect. As such, the values in Table B-1 through B-5 should be revised to incorporate the AOOH using the correct values for Unit 1.

3. Schedule D Note –

Schedule D requires the following revision: the filed version of Schedule D includes a note below Table D-1 regarding the Owner’s right to charge for additional

---

<sup>3</sup> The “Load at Maximum MVA<sub>r</sub> Lagging, MW” and “Load at Maximum MVA<sub>r</sub> Leading, MW” in Schedule A, Section 2 may not be higher than the level to which the ISO is permitted to dispatch the Unit and this is limited by the Maximum Net Dependable Capacity value.

labor costs related to non-peak Starts-ups; the note is unclear and the Parties' believe it is superfluous. As such, the note regarding labor costs regarding non-peak Start-ups should be removed.

4. Schedule I Language – The Parties oppose the language regarding the insurance requirements Creed proposes in Schedule I because it varies from the language in the Pro-forma RMR Agreement adopted by the Commission and accepted by other parties to RMR agreements. The proposed language upsets the careful balance between the parties to the filed RMR Agreement. As such, the Parties request that the language be revised to conform to the language provided in the Pro-forma RMR Agreement.

### **III. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, the Parties respectfully request that the Commission rule that

(i) the rate schedules set forth in Creed's filing have not been shown to be just and reasonable;

(ii) suspend the rate schedules subject to hearing and establish a refund date that is the same as the proposed effective date, January 1, 2004; and

(iii) defer action on the RMR Agreement filing until February 12, 2004, to give the Parties and Creed time to attempt to resolve outstanding issues associated with the filing.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ J. Phillip Jordan  
J. Phillip Jordan  
Bradley R. Miliauskas  
Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP  
3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20007

Counsel for  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation

Shiran Kochavi  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
Law Department, Mail Code B30A  
P.O. Box 7442  
San Francisco, CA 94120

Attorney for Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company

Dated: January 12, 2004

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list for the captioned proceeding, in accordance with Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 385.2010).

Dated at Folsom, CA, on this 16<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2004.

/s/ Sidney L. Mannheim  
Sidney L. Mannheim