

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

California Independent System Operator  
Corporation  
Docket No. ER09-344-000  
**January 22, 2009**

Alston & Bird LLP  
The Atlantic Building  
950 F Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1404

Attention: Bradley R. Miliauskas, Esquire  
Attorney for the California Independent System  
Operator Corporation

Reference: Amended and Restated Big Creek Physical Scheduling Plant  
Agreement

Dear Mr. Miliauskas:

On November 26, 2008, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) filed an amended and restated Big Creek Physical Scheduling Plant Agreement (PSPA) between the CAISO and Southern California Edison Company. Specifically, the CAISO states that the primary purpose of the PSPA is to: (1) align the currently effective agreement with the new provisions of the Market Redesign and Technology Update (MRTU) Tariff; (2) update the use of the MRTU Tariff defined terms in the agreement; (3) clarify the manner in which the CAISO's metering, telemetry, regulation, outage coordination, and operating requirements will apply to Big Creek; and (4) remove provisions describing the original operation of Big Creek under the agreement as a test case in order to specify the PSPA as an ongoing operating agreement. The CASIO requests an effective date for the PSPA to coincide with the effective date of the CAISO Tariff to implement the CAISO's MRTU market design. Waiver of the Commission's notice requirements pursuant to section 35.11 of the Commission's rules and regulations (18 C.F.R. § 35.11) is granted and the amended and restated PSPA is accepted for filing, effective upon implementation of MRTU, as requested. We also direct the CAISO to make an informational filing specifying the effective date of the PSPA accepted herein prior to MRTU implementation.

This filing was noticed on December 3, 2008, with comments, protests, or motions to intervene due on or before December 17, 2008. No protests or comments were filed. Notices of intervention and unopposed timely filed motions to intervene are granted pursuant to the operation of Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R § 385.214). Any opposed or untimely filed motion to intervene is governed by the provisions of Rule 214.

This acceptance for filing shall not be construed as constituting approval of the referenced filing or of any rate, charge, classification, or any rule, regulation, or practice affecting such rates or services provided for in the filed documents; nor shall such acceptance be deemed as recognition of any claimed contractual right or obligation associated therewith; and such acceptance is without prejudice to any findings or orders which have been or any which may hereafter be made by the Commission in any proceeding now pending or hereafter instituted by or against the California Independent System Operator Corporation.

This action is taken pursuant to authority delegated to the Director, Division of Tariffs and Market Development - West under 18 C.F.R. § 375.307. This order constitutes final agency action. Requests for rehearing by the Commission may be filed within 30 days of the date of issuance of this order, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. § 385.713.

Sincerely,

Steve P. Rodgers, Director  
Division of Tariffs and Market  
Development - West

cc: All Parties

Document Content(s)

19955078.DOC.....1-2