

154 FERC ¶ 61,043
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20426

January 27, 2016

In Reply Refer To:
California Independent System
Operator Corporation
Docket Nos. ER03-608-003
ER00-2019-010
ER01-819-005

Alston & Bird LLP
The Atlantic Building
950 F Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

Attention: Michael E. Ward, Esq.

Dear Mr. Ward:

1. On July 7, 2003, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) submitted a filing to comply with the Commission's order, issued on May 30, 2003,¹ in the above-captioned proceedings. As discussed below, we accept CAISO's filing.
2. On March 11, 2003, CAISO filed revisions to its Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT) proposing, among other things, to retain an otherwise temporary procedure (simplified procedure) that allowed Scheduling Coordinators to report transaction data at certain scheduling points where CAISO-certified meters had not yet been installed. CAISO used the transaction data to settle wheeling access charges and payments from scheduled transactions.² CAISO explained that it had anticipated that its transmission customers would install CAISO-certifiable meters based on a California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) restructuring order requiring such installation, which would render

¹ *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 103 FERC ¶ 61,260 (2003) (May 30 Order).

² CAISO March 11, 2003 Tariff Filing at 11 (March 11 Filing).

the simplified procedures unnecessary.³ However, CAISO noted, following the issuance of the CPUC restructuring order, that a number of the scheduling points still lacked compliant-metering equipment. Thus, CAISO asserted, it was necessary to retain the simplified procedures in the CAISO tariff.

3. In the May 30 Order, the Commission accepted in part, suspended in part, and rejected in part, the tariff revisions proposed in CAISO's March 11 filing. The Commission accepted CAISO's proposal to retain the simplified procedures. However, the Commission also found that in order for the CAISO to operate an efficient and reliable transmission grid effectively, it would be essential for parties to comply with metering requirements as described in the CAISO tariff. Accordingly, the Commission directed CAISO "to submit a report identifying the Scheduling Coordinators who are not in compliance, the reasons for non-compliance, and the anticipated date of compliance."⁴

4. On July 7, 2003, CAISO submitted a report to comply with the Commission's directive.⁵ Notice of CAISO's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 68 Fed. Reg. 42,697 (2003), with interventions and protests due on or before July 28, 2003. On July 28, 2003, the California Department of Water Resources State Water Project (SWP) and the Northern California Power Agency (NCPA) filed protests to CAISO's report, and the Cities of Azusa, Banning, and Riverside, California (Cities) filed comments. On July 30, 2003, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) filed comments.

5. In its comments, PG&E argues that CAISO's report identifies its Westley 2 scheduling point in error and that prior to the report, PG&E was unaware that the scheduling point was deficient.⁶ Moreover, PG&E argues, since it was not submitting load or meter data associated with the Westley 2 scheduling point, it was not required to install a CAISO-certifiable meter at that location.⁷ The Cities argue that the report does

³ CAISO July 7, 2003 Compliance Filing at 2 (Compliance Filing) (citing California Public Utilities Commission, 1995 CAL PUC LEXIS 1034 at 154-57 (Dec. 20, 1995)).

⁴ May 30 Order, 103 FERC ¶ 61,260 at P 25.

⁵ CAISO June 7, 2003 Compliance Filing, Attachment.

⁶ PG&E July 30, 2003 Comments at 3.

⁷ *Id.*

not recognize that Southern California Edison Company is responsible for installing non-compliant meters at the scheduling point for which the Cities are listed as scheduling coordinators.⁸

6. In its protest, NCPA argues that CAISO neglected to request information from NCPA regarding the installation of meters for the Port of Oakland scheduling point.⁹ Thus, NCPA requests that the Commission either reject the portion of the report at issue or take no action with regard to NCPA's listing.¹⁰ SWP argues that CAISO did not satisfy the Commission's directive because CAISO does not demonstrate that it undertook a reasonable amount of effort to obtain data for the report.¹¹ Thus, SWP requests that the Commission order CAISO to resubmit the report in a subsequent compliance filing.¹²

7. We find that CAISO's report complies with the May 30 Order. In the May 30 Order, the Commission directed CAISO to disclose certain information pertaining to non-compliant scheduling points because "it is essential for parties to comply with the metering requirement as described in CAISO's tariff."¹³ As directed, CAISO filed a report disclosing the Scheduling Coordinators that were responsible for scheduling points that did not have compliant meters, the reasons for non-compliance, and the anticipated date of compliance. While the protests on the record assert that the report contains errors, we find that it is unnecessary to direct CAISO to file a revised report because given the passage of time and change in circumstances, the requested

⁸ Cities July 28, 2003 Comments at 1-3.

⁹ NCPA July 28, 2003 Protest at 1-3.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 4.

¹¹ SWP July 28, 2003 Protest at 1-3.

¹² *Id.* at 5.

¹³ May 30 Order, 103 FERC ¶ 61,260 at P 25.

data for the report are now outdated. Accordingly, we accept CAISO's filing and note the corrections asserted in NCPA's protest and PG&E's and the Cities' comments.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.