

Stakeholder Comments Template

Subject: Exceptional Dispatch – Issues Paper Release 1

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
Bonnie Blair, 202-585-6905	On behalf of the Cities of Anaheim, Azusa, Banning, Colton, Pasadena, and Riverside, California	April 4, 2008

This template has been created for submission of stakeholder comments on the topic of Exceptional Dispatch and specifically the issue paper related to this topic as posted on March 21, 2008 (at: <http://www.caiso.com/1f91/1f91cdbc12f0.pdf>) and discussed on the stakeholder conference call on March 28, 2008. Upon completion of this template please submit (in MS Word) to <mailto:jmclain@caiso.com>. Submissions are requested by close of business on April 4, 2008.

Please provide your comments to the areas below related to the proposals and aspects of the proposals that you do or do not support in the space below. There is also a general comments section for any other comments you would like to provide.

1. Option 1 – Daily Capacity Payment

Based on the information available at this time regarding the anticipated purposes for and scope of Exceptional Dispatch, the Cities support the concept of a Daily Capacity Payment for generators that are not subject to Resource Adequacy or RMR contracts based on 1/30th of the monthly capacity charge proposed in the ISO's ICPM amendments filed in FERC Docket No. ER08-556-000.

2. Option 2 – Bid Adder

See discussion of Option 1.

3. Other Supplemental Payment Options

See discussion of Option 1.

4. Eligibility aspects

The Cities agree that resources receiving capacity payments under Resource Adequacy or RMR contracts or pursuant to an ICPM designation should not be eligible to receive additional capacity payments as a result of Exceptional Dispatch and that such capacity payments should be

limited to resources that have submitted a bid in the IFM or RTM and are required to start-up in response to an Exceptional Dispatch.

5. Mitigation aspects

The Cities agree that resources called upon through Exceptional Dispatch should be subject to mitigation and support the mitigation method proposed by the ISO.

6. General comments

The Cities' comments set forth above are based upon the information available at this time, and the Cities may revise their position based upon subsequent developments.