

Stakeholder Process: 2009 Transmission Plan

Summary of Submitted Comments

Stakeholders submitted [insert “two”, “three”, etc.] rounds of written comments to the ISO on the following dates:

- March 10, 2008
- November 20, 2008
- February 27, 2009

Stakeholder comments are posted at: <http://caiso.com/1ca5/1ca5d8334b920.html>

Other stakeholder efforts include:

- The 2009 ISO stakeholder conference call December 3, 2008
 January 16, 2009

Comments / Proposal	Load Serving Entities, Transmission Owners, End-user Customers	Management Response
<p><u>Local Capacity Requirements (LCR)/ Reliability Must Run (RMR) reduction:</u> The ISO should require that reduction in LCR and RMR should be one of the primary objectives in transmission planning</p>	<p><u>Anaheim Public Utilities Department:</u> Support <u>BAMx:</u> Support and cited potential problems related to the LCR <u>CCSF:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO concurs with this comment and will consider this in future studies.</p>
<p><u>Study request:</u> The ISO should publish the list of Study Requests from non-PTOs it received through the 2008 Request Window</p>	<p><u>SCE:</u> Support and insist that the ISO has the obligation under FERC Order 890 to provide this information</p>	<p>The list of the Study Requests received through the Request Window will be documented in the 2009 ISO Transmission Plan.</p>
<p><u>More details of the ISO studies:</u> Request more detailed explanation regarding the assumptions, models, and results of the ISO technical studies</p>	<p><u>SCE:</u> Support and listed a number of questions <u>Flynn RCI:</u> Support and provide specific questions <u>CCSF:</u> Support and provide specific questions <u>BAMx:</u> Support and provide specific questions <u>Metropolitan Water District of Southern California:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO provided the answers to most of these questions during the stakeholder meetings and conference calls. The ISO will continue to update information on its secure webpage to ensure this information is available to stakeholders.</p>
<p><u>Additional stakeholder meeting:</u> Request to have additional stakeholder meetings</p>	<p><u>SCE:</u> Support and requested the ISO to host the meeting in Southern California <u>CALWEA:</u> Support and request the ISO to conduct a short stakeholder process to discuss the proposed Location Constraint Resource Interconnection Facility (LCRIF) project before the May Board meeting</p>	<p>The ISO realizes that stakeholder access to its process across the ISO Controlled Grid is important. During 2009, opportunities to enhance stakeholder participation will be considered, and if appropriate, implemented.</p> <hr/> <p>The Order 890 stakeholder process is sufficient to address this need. The ISO is willing to discuss specific concerns that CALWEA has related to the proposed LCRIF projects. Please initiate this communication by emailing regionaltransmission@caiso.com.</p>
<p><u>Need clear milestones for seeking ISO board approval:</u> The ISO staff should provide a list of clear milestones that need to be met by both the PTO and the ISO</p>	<p><u>PG&E:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO concurs and will address this comment as part of the 2010 Transmission Plan.</p>
<p><u>Utilization of the planning standards:</u> Request the ISO to clearly state conditions under which transmission projects would be appropriate for Category C violations and justify these projects accordingly</p>	<p><u>BAMx:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO concurs and will address this comment as part of the 2010 Transmission Plan.</p>

Comments / Proposal	Load Serving Entities, Transmission Owners, End-user Customers	Management Response
<p><u>Individual approval letter is needed:</u> The ISO should provide individual letters of approval for each of the project proposals once approved by ISO Management or the Board</p>	<p><u>PG&E:</u> Support</p>	<p>Management will determine an appropriate communication to address this concern.</p>
<p><u>Refinement of the planning process:</u> The ISO should consider refinements to the process to more explicitly acknowledge all of the technical studies that may impact one another.</p>	<p><u>J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO concurs with this comment. A key objective of our process is that the ISO's planning process will provide a comprehensive view of all parallel studies and its impacts on one another.</p>
<p><u>Transmission projects against non-transmission alternatives:</u> The applicable ISO ariff and BPM provisions do not detail how the ISO will evaluate proposed transmission projects against non-transmission alternatives.</p>	<p><u>J.P. Morgan Ventures Energy Corporation:</u> Support</p>	<p>A clarification will be added to the Transmission Planning Process BPM during 2009.</p>
<p><u>Approval of the projects cost less than \$50M:</u> Concerns regarding timing issues of the ISO approval process for projects that cost less than \$50M that officially, occurs once a year</p>	<p><u>SCE:</u> Support: In the event these projects may be delayed or miss the planned operating date, they will be delayed until the following year's Request Window. The project review may also be delayed by the ISO due to insufficient data <u>TTS:</u> Support, similar to SCE concerns</p>	<p>A clarification will be added to the Transmission Planning Process BPM during 2009</p>
<p><u>Discrepancies between the ISO and PTO study results:</u> The ISO should resolve and explain the differences between the ISO and PTO study results</p>	<p><u>Phoenix Consulting:</u> Support and provide more specific questions regarding the areas that need more explanation <u>Flynn RCI:</u> Support and provide more specific questions regarding the study results <u>PG&E:</u> Support and provide detailed comments on the ISO study results <u>SCE:</u> Support</p>	<p>The ISO considers this concern resolved. The ISO hosted additional conference calls on December 3, 2008 and January 16, 2009 to address this issue. The ISO staff also contacted stakeholders directly to answer detailed engineering questions regarding the ISO technical study results. The ISO has also considered PG&E's comments in the final Transmission Plan</p>
<p><u>Processing of competitive projects:</u> The ISO should make a decision now regarding the approval of project proposals before the 2009 Transmission Plan is finalized.</p>	<p><u>PG&E:</u> Support: Without ISO approval in 2009, PG&E cannot complete these projects in time to be compliant under certain outage conditions</p>	<p>The ISO is obligated to evaluate all project proposals, including competitive alternatives, to ensure that the most beneficial project for ISO customers is selected. The ISO will complete its analysis and provide its recommendation in 2009.</p>