

**Stakeholder Comments
AESO Wind Stakeholder Session
October 19, 2007**

Written comments were received from:

- **Spirit Pine**
- **TransCanada**

Dear Laura,

Spirit Pine is in support of the proposed Interconnection Queue Business Practices and we are pleased that they solve many of the issues that arose in the past as a result of the tariff change and the 900 MW threshold. We have two related points that we feel require further clarification within the Business Practices document:

1. Timing between Milestones 3 and 4.

It is unclear in the document what triggers the 60 days notice from AESO for final technical data. It was mentioned at the stakeholder session that a lot of time could have passed between the time the customer submits a written confirmation/authorization to proceed (Milestone 3) and when the AESO will give 60 days notification for final technical data (Milestone 4). Is this notification based upon the targeted In Service Date and how long it will take AESO from receiving technical final data to achieve the In Service Date? If that is the case, we feel the required lead time should be specified in the milestones so that the 60 days notification does not appear to be arbitrary. If it is not related to the In Service Date, we feel it should be clarified in the milestones what it is related to.

2. Substantial Revisions to the Preliminary Assessment Application

There was discussion at the Stakeholder Session that changing the Wind Turbine Generator would be considered a substantial revision and the project would be cancelled in accordance with the wording on the Preliminary Assessment Application form. Based on the conversation, it was our understanding that it would be considered a substantial revision after the final technical data was provided in Milestone 4 but not prior. We feel that the items that are considered substantial revisions should be better defined and also it should be stated when in the process they are permitted and when they would be cause for project cancellation.

If you require any further clarification on the above 2 points, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best regards,

Michele Morley, BComm, CA
Spirit Pine Energy Corporation
(403) 226-7191
mmorley@spiritpine.com



November 2, 2007

Laura Letourneau,
Director, Market Services
Alberta Electric System Operator
2500, 330 - 5th Ave SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 0L4

TransCanada Energy Ltd.
450 - 1st Street S.W.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2P 5H1

tel 403.920.2081
fax 403.920.2362
email chris_best@transcanada.com
web www.transcanada.com

Re: Discussion Paper: Interconnection Queue Business Practices

Dear Laura,

This letter is in response to the Discussion Paper on Interconnection Queue Business Practices the AESO issued on September 26, 2007.

TransCanada has reviewed this paper and generally agrees with the practices, milestones and obligations proposed. TransCanada agrees that the AESO has incorporated those aspects of earlier stakeholder submissions with general consensus and adequately explained those alternatives considered but not pursued.

However, TransCanada is concerned with the removal of a project from the queue, forfeit of the application fee and requirement for a new PAA due to failure to complete a milestone. TransCanada agrees that this is reasonable in areas where there are numerous projects and transmission capacity is limited, however this seems heavy-handed for projects which are not holding up other projects. As such, TransCanada feels this should only be applied if there are other projects later or lower in the queue connecting in the same transmission area or region. Projects without transmission capacity issues should not be required to reapply.

If you have any further issues or concerns on this matter please feel free to contact me at (403) 920-2081.

Regards

TransCanada Energy Ltd.

Chris Best
Market Services, Western Power