Attachment A

Stakeholder Process: 2010 Transmission Plan

Summary of Submitted Comments

Stakeholders submitted three rounds of written comments to the CAISO on the following dates:

- March 24, 2009
- October 26-27, 2009
- February 16, 2010

Stakeholder comments are posted at: <u>http://www.caiso.com/20a1/20a1dbe417300.html</u>

Other stakeholder efforts include: N/A

Comments / Proposal	Load Serving Entities, Transmission Owners, End-user Customers	Management Response
<u>Study Assumption</u> : Provided recommendations and asked for clarification on the assumptions used in study plan.	<u>SCE</u> : Support <u>PG&E</u> : Support <u>SDG&E</u> : Support <u>CPUC</u> : Support <u>BAMx</u> : Support <u>Bay Area Municipal Transmission</u> : Support	The ISO incorporated recommendations in the 2010 Study Plan and provided the answers to most of these questions during the stakeholder meetings and conference calls
More clarification: Requests more clarification on methodology and study results. More details of the ISO studies: In general, the comments contain request for more detailed explanation regarding the assumptions, models, and results of the ISO technical studies	NextLight Renewable Power LLC: Support PG&E: Support BAMx – Support CPUC: Support SDG&E: Support SFPUC: Support Sempra Generation: Support SCE: Support Recurrent Energy: Support Bay Area Municipal Transmission: Support Terra-Gen Power, LLC: Support CPUC – Division of Ratepayers: Support TANC: Support	The ISO concurs and will include more information regarding the methodology and assumptions in the 2011 Transmission Plan.
Future Study Suggestions: Recommendadditional technical studies to beconducted in the following areas:1. Reliability studies for addressingCategory C contingencies of the230kV facilities in San Francisco;2. Economic and renewable studies forthe Greater Bay Area	<u>SFPUC</u> : Support	The ISO concurs and will take this comment into consideration. Economic or renewable studies for the Greater Bay area may be included in the scope of the studies that are closely related with the ongoing RETPP initiative.
Request to have additional stakeholder meeting or conference call to discuss more details scope of a transmission project recommended approval by the ISO	Recurrent Energy: Support SCE: Support	The ISO agrees with this comment and hosted a conference call to discuss this issue with stakeholders.
Once Through Cooling (OTC): Request to include OTC studies in the transmission planning process and involve the PTOs in the evaluation	<u>SCE</u> : Support <u>PG&E</u> : Support	The ISO concurs and has included OTC studies as part of the ISO 2011 Transmission Plan study scope.
Request more time: For reviewing the ISO Transmission Plan report	<u>CPUC – Division of Ratepayers</u> : Support	The ISO will try to accommodate stakeholders with more time as allowed under the ISO Transmission Planning Business Practice Manual (BPM) in the ISO 2011 Transmission Plan process.

Comments / Proposal	Load Serving Entities, Transmission Owners, End-user Customers	Management Response
Request Window and Project Approval (non-reliability projects): Requests more updates on the projects that were submitted earlier and request the ISO the complete the evaluations of these submissions as soon as possible	LS Power: Support <u>Startrans IO, LLC:</u> Support <u>PG&E</u> : Support <u>CalWEA</u> : Support <u>CPUC</u> : Support <u>Green Energy Express, LLC</u> : Support <u>Pattern Transmission LP</u> : Support <u>Starwood Energy Group</u> : Support	The ISO cannot adequately assess the needs for these non-reliability projects in isolation and therefore is taking additional time to examine these projects after a comprehensive statewide transmission plan for achieving a 33% RPS in 2020. The ISO anticipates having a 33% RPS transmission plan completed by the end of this year.