

the following: undue discrimination on the part of transmission providers; inappropriate or unrealistic milestones; inequitable cost assignments; study procedures or other requirements that lead to unnecessary project delays or increased costs; and lack of flexibility in the queuing rules.

B. Identify any problems that are specific to small generators or to large generators within the queue process.

C. Describe the impact of letting the generator choose whether to interconnect as either an energy resource or a network (capacity) resource.

D. Describe any problems associated with the need to manage both interconnection requests and transmission service requests within the context of an overall transmission planning and expansion process.

E. Describe solutions to the problems identified by discussion of the items above.

Lunch, 1:15 pm–2 pm

Panel 3: Further Ideas for Improving Queue Management—2 pm–4:30 pm

Confirmed List of Panelists

John P. Buechler, New York ISO
 Scott M. Helyer, Tenaska
 Sam Jones, ERCOT
 Pete Landrieu, Public Service Electric and Gas Company
 Beth Soholt, Wind on the Wires
 Lou Ann, Westerfield Idaho Public Utilities Commission
 Kim Wissman, Ohio Public Utilities Commission

Discussion Topics

A. Are there particular queuing policies or practices that should change to make queue management more effective? Consider: common study/analytical techniques and tools; different or new analytical tools; procedures for ensuring that the projects of independent generators are treated comparably with those of the transmission provider; treatment of inactive projects; procedures for coordinating the upgrades needed for projects in the queue with the transmission planning process; rules for assigning cost responsibility and property rights to generators in the queue; whether there should be a link between siting requests and transmission service requests; use of milestones to maintain queue position; and a list of actions or events that can trigger a change in queue position.

B. What siting and grid operations information is needed to obtain a position in the queue, where is this information kept, and what are the rules for accessing this information? Would

proposed restrictions on the Critical Energy Infrastructure Information Rulemaking proceeding (Docket Nos. RM02–4–000, PL02–1–000) affect parties' ability to site plants or interconnect cleanly?

C. Should small and large non gas-fired generators receive different treatment within a queue? If so, how should it be different?

D. Should the Commission standardize specific queue management practices or allow regional variations around a set of core principles?

E. Should queue position be treated as a property right which can be transferred?

Audience Comments

[FR Doc. 03–1033 Filed 1–15–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket Nos. ER02–2233–001, EC03–14–000, ER03–242–000, ER03–257–000, ER03–262–000, ER03–263–000, RT01–2–000, RT01–98–000, RT01–87–000 and RT02–2–000]

Ameren Services Company, FirstEnergy Corporation, Northern Indiana Public Service Company, National Grid USA, Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc., American Electric Power Service Corporation Virginia Electric and Power Company, American Electric Power Service Corporation, Commonwealth Edison Company and Commonwealth Edison Company of Indiana, Inc., The Dayton Power and Light Company, Virginia Electric and Power Company, and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Commonwealth Edison Company and Commonwealth Edison Company of Indiana, Inc., PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., PJM Interconnection, L.L.C., Midwest Independent System Operator, Inc., and State-Federal Regional RTO Panels; Notice of State-Federal Regional Panel Discussion

January 10, 2003.

1. At the request of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Indiana Commission), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will hold a discussion with the Commissioners and staff of the Indiana Commission to discuss dockets related to RTO formation that are currently pending before both the Commission and the Indiana Commission. These cases involve the transfer to PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. of functional

control of transmission assets that American Electric Power Service Corporation requested on behalf of Appalachian Power Company, Columbus Southern Power Company, Indiana Michigan Power Company, Kentucky Power Company, Kingsport Power Company, Ohio Power Company and Wheeling Power Company (collectively AEP); and Northern Indiana Public Service Company's request for transfer of functional control of its transmission facilities to GridAmerica and the Midwest ISO. The conference is established pursuant to the Order Announcing the Establishment of State-Federal Regional Panels to Address RTO Issues, Modifying the Application of Rule 2201 in the Captioned Dockets, and Clarifying Order No. 607, 97 FERC 61,182 (2001), reh'g denied 98 FERC 61,309 (2002). The conferences will not involve any discussion of the Indiana Commission's open dockets.

2. The Indiana Commission has indicated that the Commissioners and staff of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, the Michigan Public Service Commission, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, the Tennessee Regulatory Authority, the Virginia State Corporation Commission, and the Public Service Commission of West Virginia, who represent the states served by AEP, may wish to participate in this discussion; other affected state commissions also may have an interest in this matter and may wish to participate. Attendance at the meeting is limited to the Commission, state commissioners, and their respective staffs.

3. The discussion will take place at the offices of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC, at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, January 14, 2003. A transcript of the discussion will be placed in the above-captioned dockets.

Magalie R. Salas,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 03–1028 Filed 1–15–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P