SPP CAWG Meeting

August 3, 2004

Dallas Texas
AGENDA

• Administrative Matters
• Focus of Aug. 3, 17 Meetings– Base Plan
  – Issue 1: Allocations Test Considered
  – Issue 2: Treatment of New Network Resources
• Action Items for Next Meeting
• Additions to AGENDA?
Administrative Matters

• Sign-up Sheets
• Meeting Minutes/Secretary
• Processes for Receiving Stakeholder Input
• Three-Tiered Decision Process
  – Stakeholder Voting
  – Relation to SPP Committee Structure
• Feedback
## Information

**CAWG Participant Funding Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-Aug</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Telephone #</th>
<th>E-mail Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mike Proctor</td>
<td>Missouri PSC</td>
<td>(314) 340-4680</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.proctor@psc.mo.us">mike.proctor@psc.mo.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Larry Holloway</td>
<td>Kansas CC</td>
<td>(785) 271-3222</td>
<td><a href="mailto:l.holloway@kcc.state.ks.us">l.holloway@kcc.state.ks.us</a>'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Richard House</td>
<td>Arkansas PSC</td>
<td>(501) 682-5825</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhouse@psc.state.ar.us">rhouse@psc.state.ar.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Ed Farrar</td>
<td>Oklahoma CC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:e.farrar@occmail.occ.state.ok.us">e.farrar@occmail.occ.state.ok.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Jess Totten</td>
<td>Texas PUC</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jess.totten@puc.state.tx.us">jess.totten@puc.state.tx.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign in at meeting: Those calling should e-mail me this information to be included on sign-up and distribution lists.
CAWG Meeting Minutes

- Include Agenda
- Attach Presentation
- Include Action Items
- Not taking notes of what is said
- Need a “Secretary” to put together.
Stakeholder Deliberation Process

1. Proposals submitted from various stakeholders.
2. Submit written comments on various proposals/issues –
   a. Critical components – in your written comments tell us what are the most critical components for funding and why you consider these to be critical
      ✓ Can be either positives or negatives.
      ✓ Be specific, but keep lists short.
   b. CAWG will compile these comments and include them in its report to the SPP RSC.
3. Compromise proposal – the CAWG will attempt to put together a proposal that addresses what stakeholders consider to be critical components.
Three-Tiered Decision Process

• Tier 1: Stakeholder Support for Proposal
  – Focus on reaching a “compromise” proposal
  – Some view this in terms of taking a vote on a specific proposal. If so, should this voting take place within the existing SPP Committee structure?

• Tier 2: SPP RSC Support for Proposal
  – Obtaining State Commission support for a proposal.
  – State Commissions will vote on the proposal.

• Tier 3: SPP Board Support for Proposal
  – Depends on a recommendation from the SPP RSC

• FERC Approval
FEEDBACK ON PROCESS