

No.	Comment Submitted	ISO Response	Assigned To:
1	We are wondering. Have you had a chance to discuss and resolve the issue about CAISO providing the modeling capability for evaluating the momentary cessation issue? We are trying to study and evaluate the reactive support needs at Round Mountain and Gates in order to provide a competitive project bid as part of the CAISO competitive solicitation process for this important reliability issue. We would like to achieve similar results to what CAISO has achieved and the current models do not show this for the momentary cessation issue. Our goal is to benchmark the CAISO results and evaluate various reactive support alternatives as identified in the 2018-2019 CAISO transmission plan.	The CAISO has been working with industry and NERC on an initiative to address identified adverse characteristics of inverter-based resource performance during grid faults including an evaluation of momentary cessation impacts. This work is ongoing. Due to the lack of better information at this time, a generic EPCL model was developed to apply agreed upon universal momentary cessation settings on all selected inverter based resources to investigate, directionally, the impacts of momentary cessation. With that said, upon request, the CAISO will provide the EPCL, subject to the NDA as identified on the ISO transmission planning process webpage (link below). http://www.caiso.com/planning/Pages/TransmissionPlanning/Default.aspx	Planning
2	I understand the process requires an "Option to Collaborate" response from all participants within 10 Business Days • What does the "Option to Collaborate" obligate us to? • Are there any financial obligations? • When is the deadline for submitting the "Option to Collaborate" response?	The process does not require collaboration. The ISO provides a public venue in the first 10 days of the solicitation window for parties to announce their interest in collaborating and are open to be contacted by other parties. Prior notice to the CAISO is not a prerequisite for a Project Sponsor to submit an application, including a joint application, to finance, own, construct, operate, and maintain a Regional Transmission Facility under Section 24.5.	Grid Assets
3	What is the refundability of the \$75,000 deposit if a bidder decides to withdraw a bid after the application deadline?	The applicant only pays for costs incurred during the process associated with evaluating their application. If the costs are greater than \$75,000 but less than \$150,000 the applicant will be billed for the difference (see CAISO tariff section 24.5.6)	Grid Assets



4	I have a client that is determining to becoming a PTO, the construction is the question it is all the other things a PTO is required to do on a day to day basis. I had a question after I read through the posted "2018–2019 Transmission Planning Process Phase 3 – Competitive Solicitation" presentation. My question or comment is what are the next steps of becoming a PTO in parallel of constructions. I know some of the answers but there isn't much posted of what needs to happen between being awarded and the asset(s) become operational. I asked for a external checklist from the MPAI group to be posted but will that be enough for a awarded PTO to determine the full scope of what needs to happen while constructing, modeling and operational of the asset?	The successful project sponsor is required to be a PTO. The APSA defines the rights of the approved project sponsor through the construction period up to commercial operation. The pro forma Approved Project Sponsor Agreement can be found on the Transmission Planning page of the CAISO web site. Prior to commercial operation the approved project sponsor will be required to sign the Transmission Control Agreement (TCA) and meet the identified requirement for a PTO. PTOs have many requirements as defined in the CAISO tariff and TCA. CAISO staff will work with the successful candidate to ensure that all requirements are met for the APSA and TCA to ensure a timely transition.	Grid Assets
5	I have a question about the 2018-2019 Transmission Plan. Specifically, I am seeking clarification with regard to the Round Mountain 500 kV Dynamic Reactive Support project and how it relates to PG&E's proposed Round Mountain 500 kV Voltage Support Project. I am wondering if there is anyone at CAISO who I should be contacting to have my questions answered.	These are the same project.	Planning
6	The CAISO posted slide deck (slide 4), indicates that a comparative analysis of the bids are done several months after the bid window closes. Out client is wondering if that means they are allowed to improve/refine the capital costs prior to the comparative analysis stage is reached, or does the submitted capital cost is firm and not updatable? If our client is selected is there an opportunity to refine capital cost afterwards as well? Tariff Section 24 doesn't mention the possibility that improving or refining the bid is permissible.	The competitive solicitation process does not allow applicants to improve or refine capital costs once the proposal window has closed. Once selected to construct the project, the Approved Sponsor will execute the APSA which will include the cost provisions from their proposal.	Grid Assets



7	In APPENDIX I: Description and Functional Specifications for Transmission Facilities Eligible for Competitive Solicitation the rated MVAR of the reactive devices are described as: For Round Mountain Rated MVAR: +500/-500 MVAR. The entire inductive (absorption) range should be continuously available when the voltage is in the 500 kV – 550 kV range and the entire capacitive (injection) range should be available when the voltage is in the 473 kV – 540 kV range.		Planning
	1. Please confirm that this means that the device must be capable of injecting 500 MVAR capacitive power at an operating voltage of 473 kV and that the device must be capable of absorbing 500 MVAR inductive power at an operating voltage of 500 kV.	It is required that the reactive support device be able to inject 500 Mvar at 473 kV and absorb 500 Mvar at 550 kV.	
	 Please provide required V/I curve(s) for the reactive device at base 500 kV and 500 MVA. Please indicate in the V/I diagram, the defined capacitive operating points at 473 kV (0.946 p.u.) 500 kV (1.0 p.u.) and 540 kV (1.08 p.u.), along with the defined inductive operating points at 500 kV (1.0 p.u.) and 550 kV (1.1 p.u.) respectively. 	 The reactive support device should be able to perform in the voltage range and with the response time specified in the functional specification. All different technologies with different V-I curves will be considered as long as they meet the performance requirements in the functional specification. 	
		3. The device has to inject up to 500 MVAR or absorb up to 500 MVAR in the voltage range of 473-550 kV under	



		steady-state conditions. V/I curve depends on the technology of the device	
8	For Gates Rated MVAR: +800/-800 MVAR at the Gates 500 kV bus. The entire inductive (absorption) range should be continuously available when the voltage is in the 500 kV – 550 kV range and the entire capacitive (injection) range should be available when the voltage is in the 473 kV – 540 kV range.		Planning
	1. Please confirm that this means that the device must be capable of injecting 800 MVAR capacitive power at an operating voltage of 473 kV and that the device must be capable of absorbing 800 MVAR inductive power at an operating voltage of 500 kV.	 It is required that the reactive support device be able to inject 800 Mvar at 473 kV and absorb 800 Mvar at 550 kV. 	
	 Please provide required V/I curve(s) for the reactive device at base 500 kV and 800 MVA. Please indicate in the V/I diagram, the defined capacitive operating points at 473 kV (0.946 p.u.) 500 kV (1.0 p.u.) and 540 kV (1.08 p.u.), along with the defined inductive operating points at 	 The reactive support device should be able to perform in the voltage range and with the response time specified in the functional specification. All different technologies with different V-I curves will be considered as long as they meet the performance requirements in the functional specification. 	
	500 kV (1.0 p.u.) and 550 kV (1.1 p.u.) respectively.	 The device has to inject up to 800 MVAR or absorb up to 800 MVAR in the voltage range of 473-550 kV under steady-state conditions. V/I curve depends on the technology of the device 	



9	Can the CAISO provide an itemized list of the PV units that comprise the generation totaled in Figure B1.2-21. 2020 Summer Peak case with high renewable output. An outage of the Gates-Midway 500 kV line with a three phase fault, assuming momentary cessation of inverters. Solar PV generation output?	The base cases and dynamic data on MPP could be tuned to run the studies and obtain the same results presented in Figure B1.2-21. Upon request, the CAISO will provide the latest base case, dyd, EPCL and instructions to run studies, subject to the NDA as identified on the ISO transmission planning process webpage (link in response to question 1).	Planning
10	Can the CAISO define the bounds of the non-competitive scope and the competitive scope in detail?	The interconnection PTO will design, engineer, install, own, operate and maintain the necessary equipment additions within the existing substations (Gates and/or Round Mountain). The substation terminations and line drops into the PTO owned substations will be owned, operated and controlled by the PTO. These facilities are not included in the scope of the competitive solicitation projects.	Grid Assets
11	What liabilities does the project sponsor carry if the projects are not completed on schedule?	The liabilities for reliability projects are defined in the Section 24.6 of the CAISO tariff and APSA. Specifically for delay in project, the APSA addresses the steps to be taken in Article 5.7 and 5.8. The projects are reliability projects and must be completed on time to ensure that the CAISO does not violate the NERC reliability standards.	Contracts
12	Will bidders need to commit to an exhaustive list of certain FERC transmission incentives in the bid submitted to CAISO, and commit to foregoing additional FERC transmission incentives, as part of the APSA?	The competitive solicitation process requires applicants to provide any special incentives that the applicant would agree to. Otherwise the CAISO assumes that the applicant will avail themselves of any FERC incentives available to the project. Once selected to construct the project, the Approved Sponsor will execute the APSA which will include the cost provisions from their proposal including any agreement to forego FERC transmission incentives.	Contracts



13	How will the CAISO evaluate the schedules submitted by each bidder for feasibility?	The ISO will utilize external consultants and internal staff to evaluate all portions of submitted applications. Specific evaluation criteria and selection factors are specified in section 24.5 of the CAISO tariff.	Grid Assets
14	If selected, will the project sponsor be required to enter into an interconnection agreement with the local PTO and/or the CAISO? If so what type of interconnection agreement (LGIA, Load Interconnection, etc.)?	The project sponsor will be required to execute a transmission interconnection agreement with the Interconnecting Transmission Owner(s). CAISO is not a party to those agreements.	Contracts
15	Will bidders be required to complete potential sub-synchronous resonance study for each site as a prerequisite to development of protection requirements/project scope?	Subsynchronous Resonance (SSR) studies are required to be completed for both sites and any identified mitigation shall be implemented as part of this project.	Planning
16	Is the CAISO only requiring SSR studies for synchronous condenser solutions, or is the CAISO requiring SSR or sub synchronous type studies on SVC and STATCOM as well?	Subsynchronous Resonance (SSR) studies are required for all technologies other than synchronous condenser.	Planning
17	Per the response to Question 9 and related to the Figures B1.2-21, B1.2-22, B1.2-23, XXX requests the latest base case and dynamic (DYD) files, which were used to run the studies documented	See the CAISO's answer to question #1	Planning
18	 1. Environmental data a. What is the maximum ambient temperature that the California ISO would like the system to withstand? b. What is the minimum ambient temperature) that the California ISO would like the system to withstand? This information is required for specifying the design tolerances of the respective reactive support projects. 	The ambient temperature range for both sites shall be: 0C- 50C.	Planning/Grid Assets



For both sites, please provide the following:		Planning/Grid
 2.1 System voltage a. Normal operating voltage range b. Minimum continuous operating voltage c. Maximum continuous operating voltage d. Temporary over-voltage profile 2.2 System frequency a. Normal continuous system frequency range b. Minimum continuous system frequency c. Maximum continuous system frequency d. Temporary low and high system frequency profiles 	 2.1 The CAISO has supplied the 500kV system operating voltage range in the functional specifications for each respective project. The temporary overvoltage profile is not available. Temporary overvoltage characteristics and design shall be based on equipment limits using the nominal system voltage and voltage range provided by the CAISO as well as applicable industry standards including but not limited to IEEE C57.00 and C62.22. 2.2 At a minimum, the system design shall meet the requirements of identified in PRC-024-2. 	
 2.3 Short circuit levels a. Maximum three-phase fault current (kA) b. Minimum three-phase fault current (kA) c. Maximum single-phase fault current (kA) d. Minimum single-phase fault current (kA) 	The ISO is working to determine these values. They will be provided once the information is received.	
	2.4 The ISO does not have this information.	
2.4 Harmonics a. Harmonic impedance sectors (<u>for performance</u>) up to 50 th harmonic		
 b. Harmonic impedance sectors (<u>for rating of filter components</u>) up to 50th harmonic 		



	c. Background harmonic voltage (up to 50 th harmonic)			
20	For both sites, please provide the following:			Planning/Grid Assets
	 3.1 Rating a. Dynamic system rating. Please refer to the appendix 'SVS Rating.pdf' for the typical information required for design. 1. Will the California ISO specify additional information, or should the Proponent state assumptions in the application? 2. If not specified, how will the California ISO evaluate assumptions presented by the Proponent? 	3.1	The ISO does not have this information, please state your assumptions in your proposal.	
	 3.2 Response criteria b. Maximum step response time (time to 90% of step magnitude) c. Maximum overshoot (% of ordered change) d. Settling time (time to settle within ±5% of final value) 	3.2	The ISO does not have this information, please state your assumptions in your proposal.	
	 3.3 Availability and reliability a. Annual equivalent availability (%) for forced outages b. Forced outage rate per year c. Annual availability including forced and planned maintenance outages 	3.3	This information is to be provided by each respective bidder for evaluation during the phase 3 process.	



	 3.4 Harmonic and filter performance 3.4.1 Voltage Distortion Criteria a. D - Individual distortion (%) b. THD – Total Harmonic Distortion (%) 3.4.2 Other requirements applicable for harmonic performance 	3.4 The harmonic and filter performance must comply with all applicable standards including but not limited to IEEE519.	
	3.5 Audible noisea. Would the California ISO specify the Maximum accepted sound level at property boundary, or should just applicable regulations be considered?b. Any other requirements for the sound levels of the dynamic reactive system equipment?	3.5 The audible noise requirements will be determined as part of the CEQA and environmental review process after the successful bidder has been awarded the project.	
	3.6 Loss evaluation criteria a. How are the dynamic reactive system losses weighted within the full MVAr operating range?	3.6 The successful applicant must meet the specified range at the point of interconnection as identified in the specification	
21	For both sites, please provide the following:		Planning/Grid Assets
	4.1 Please clarify the desired operating control modes (or functions) besides voltage control and reactive power control.	4.1 No other control modes are specified	
	4.2 Control system hardware a. Are supplier's standard control panels acceptable or are there specific standards for the panel design(s)?	4.2a The ISO has not specified any specific control panel standards, please provide a design as part of your proposal.	



	 b. Are there any special requirements for panel hardware (e.g. terminal blocks, wiring or test switches)? 4.3 SCADA communication a. Communication protocol(s) b. Any other requirements for SCADA communication 	 4.2b The ISO has not identified any special requirements for panel hardware. 4.3 SCADA communications system design details will be determined during the interconnection study process. General SCADA and communication interconnection requirements can be found in the PG&E Interconnection handbook: https://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/shared/rates/tariffb ook/ferc/tih/combined_version_handbooks.pdf 	
22	5. Standards a. Are there any requirements for standards that need to be followed for system/equipment design or may supplier suggest standards that we typically follow?	5. Please follow all applicable US and IEEE standards, provide details in your project proposal.	Planning/Grid Assets
23	For the 500kV option of the Round Mountain project is the requirement to interconnect the new substation between 40 and 60 percent of the distance between Round Mountain and Table Mountain a firm requirement or will CAISO allow for interconnection outside of this range if it can be shown that locating the project outside of this range brings significant benefits?	Any location from Round Mountain substation all the way up to around 60% of the way to Table Mountain substation would be acceptable as per functional specification.	Planning
24	For the 230kV option of the Round Mountain project what do the cost estimates for the PG&E scope of work of \$91M for Round Mountain and \$43M for Table Mountain consist of? If the additional	The transformer costs are included in the cost estimates.	Planning



	230kV transformers are included in these cost estimates will the CAISO consider the additional reliability benefits of these transformer additions in their evaluation of the proposal?	The key criteria in evaluating proposals are documented in "key selection criteria" document posted on the ISO website. However, the CAISO considers al of the criteria specified in the tariff.	
25	What General Liability limits will PG&E and CAISO require of the Project Sponsor for the Gates and Round Mountain projects?	The liability requirements can be found in Article 15 of the pro forma Approved Project Sponsor Agreement posted on the CAISO website at: http://www.caiso.com/Documents/AppendixX_ApprovedProjectSponsorAgreement_asof_Mar28_2016.pdf	Contracts
26	In Revision 1 of the description and functional specification for the Round Mountain 500 kV DRS, for Alternative 1, CAISO indicates that PG&E will "build the loop in tie lines to connect the new switching station to the existing round Mountain to Table Mountain 500 kV lines." Figure 2 in the specification provides a high level schematic diagram showing PG&E construction responsibilities. a. Can CAISO define where change of ownership of the loop-in tie-lines occurs? b. Can CAISO please provide the requirements to interconnect to PG&E's line (e.g., dead-end tension requirements, communications, protection and control, etc)?	PG&E will design, engineer, install, own, operate and maintain the loop –in tie lines up to the last dead end structure located outside of the new switching station. This structure will be constructed and owned by PG&E. Dead-end tension, communication and protection and control requirements will be determined during the interconnection study process after award of the project. PG&E interconnection facilities are not included in the scope of the competitive solicitation projects.	Planning/Grid Assets
27	Please clarify why a direct connection into Round Mountain is not feasible?	The CAISO specification notes that proposed solution shall be "installed in a minimum of two equally sized block independently connected to the 500kV busthese blocks are to be completely independent of each other and have their own dedicated connections to the bus." These two independent connections to	Planning/Grid Assets



28	Per the CAISO's answer to Question 9 and related to the figure B1.2-21, X requests the latest base case (SAV) and dynamic (DYD) files to replicate the aforementioned documented studies/results.	the 500kV bus cannot be accommodated at the Round Mountain substation due to physical space constraints. The base case and dynamic data will be provided upon request subject to the execution of an NDA. Details of the NDA requirements can be found under Accessing transmission data at the following link: http://www.caiso.com/planning/Pages/TransmissionPlanning/Default.aspx	Planning
29	For Alternative 1, please clarify who will estimate the costs and schedule associated with PG&E's loop-in tie-lines.	The CAISO, in conjunction with its consultants, will estimate the costs and schedule associated with PG&E's transmission line extensions. The cost of the transmission line extensions will be highly dependent upon the location identified by the applicant project sponsor in its proposal.	Grid Assets
30	For Alternative 1, please clarify how the CAISO will evaluate the overall cost and schedule of each proposal since the developer will not be responsible for the loop-in tie-lines? Are developers responsible for including schedule and cost estimates for the loop-in tie-lines as part of their proposal? If a developer includes those estimates, will CAISO consider those in its evaluation? Or, will CAISO develop its own estimates or obtain estimates from PG&E or follow another approach?	As noted in the Functional Specifications, the transmission line extensions associated with Alternative 1 are not included in the scope of the applicant project sponsor. The CAISO will consider the estimated cost of the transmission line extensions when evaluating the total cost of the proposal, and will also consider possible impacts to the proposed project schedule.	Grid Assets
31	In regards to the new alternatives released on May 14th, we respectfully request that CAISO provide the following: a. Any power system performance studies (steady state and transient) and associated reports analyzing the new alternatives	Please refer to response 28 regarding access to the power flow models. As noted in response 27, it is not feasible to terminate two blocks of dynamic reactive support devices to the 500 kV buses in the existing Round Mountain 500 kV substation. Alternative 1 will address this issue by adding a new switching station along the	Transmission Planning



	b. If any, describe additional transmission issues that CAISO is trying to solve with Alternatives 1 and 2.	Round Mountain – Table Mountain 500 kV lines and connecting the dynamic reactive support devices into the new switching station. In Alternative 2, although the dynamic reactive support devices are connected to the 230 kV buses, they provide a similar voltage profile across the 500 kV system as they control the 500 kV buses.	
32	For Alternative 1, will series compensation installations be required for the existing COI lines, which will terminate at the new station?	No new series compensation is required to be installed on the existing COI lines terminating at the new switching station.	Transmission Planning
33	For Alternative 1, has CAISO determined if any adjustments to existing series compensation must occur? If so, please provide details to allow for appropriate modeling.	No adjustments to the existing series capacitors are required.	Transmission Planning
34	In Alternative 1, does CAISO believe this will trigger a Phase 3 rating process?	The CAISO's understanding is that since the Round Mountain – Table Mountain 500 kV lines are not part of a WECC path, connecting a new switching station to them will not require a path rating process.	Transmission Planning
35	For Alternative 2, please provide details on how 230 kV and 500 kV voltages should be controlled and coordinated given a 500 kV measurement point. Please provide specifics as to interactions and control coordination with existing reactive equipment (e.g., significant existing installations of capacitors) at Round Mountain and Table Mountain 230kV.	The dynamic reactive devices will control their 500 kV buses to a set point provided by the CAISO or the PTO. If required, the status of other switched shunts will be adjusted to manage the voltage on the 230 kV side.	Transmission Planning
36	For Alternative 2, are any modifications to existing equipment or existing Remedial Action Schemes (RAS) associated with the operation of the COI or PDCI anticipated? If so, how will CAISO evaluate the costs associated with these modifications?	No modifications to the existing equipment or RAS are anticipated.	Transmission Planning
37	For Alternative 2, please provide the technical data on the proposed 500/230 kV transformers to be added by the PTO at both locations.	The CAISO does not have this information as it does not own nor maintain this equipment. The PTO would be designing and	Grid Assets



		installing the transformer; however it is assumed that the second	
		transformer at each of the locations would be similar to the existing	
		transformers at the substations.	
39	For Alternative 2, will the PTO be installing shunt reactors on the tertiary bus of the new transformers at either or both stations? If so what will be the rating? For Alternative 2, please provide the range of available fault level (minimum with N-2 to maximum normal conditions) at the 230 kV bus at both stations?	No. The CAISO does not have this information. Typically, this information is available during the interconnection studies which are finalized after the approved project sponsor is identified.	Transmission Planning Grid Assets
40	Can a project submitting into the TPP Phase 3 RFP for Gates and Round Mountain sell power and energy into the CAISO ancillaries services market while still meeting CAISO's Reactive Power Requirements?	The "project" the CAISO will evaluate will be the transmission assets placed under CAISO operational control by the project sponsor as a Participating Transmission Owner and receiving cost-of-service based cost recovery. The project will be required to provide the necessary reactive power voltage support on a 24/7/365 basis, subject to forced and maintenance outages consistent with good electric operating practice. The CAISO does not currently have a framework in place for transmission assets to also participate in the CAISO's energy or ancillary services markets. Please refer here for the status of the CAISO's "SATA" initiative that was exploring this possibility, and which is currently on hold: http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/StorageAsATransmissionAsset.aspx Although the TPP will only analyze the transmission facilities designed to meet the reactive power requirements, nothing prevents the developer from separately submitting a generator interconnection request for additional supply facilities at the same	Transmission Planning



		point of interconnection. See Section 25 and Appendix DD of the CAISO tariff.	
41	Who will give operational direction, CAISO or PG&E?	The CAISO.	Transmission Planning
42	Who determines the device set points, CAISO or PG&E?	The approved project sponsor will determine device "set points", however these are defined, as the equipment is owned by the approved project sponsor. The interconnecting PTO (PG&E) will determine appropriate voltage schedules.	Transmission Planning
43	Who is performing engineering analysis for real time operations and doing the outage studies, CAISO or PG&E?	Depending on the scope of the required studies, either the CAISO or PG&E will take the lead in performing the studies.	Transmission Planning
44	Who would the project sponsor submit outage requests to for approval, CAISO, PG&E or the RC?	The approved project sponsor will become a PTO and will submit outage requests to the CAISO. The CAISO will coordinate with PG&E and also the RC.	Transmission Planning
45	For Alternative 1: Since PG&E will be responsible for procuring and constructing the Round Mountain loop-in-lines, will the t-lines maintenance also fall under PG&E's responsibility?	PG&E will own and maintain the transmission lines.	Grid Assets
46	How will station service for the auxiliary loads associated with the reactive support devices be provided? Through CAISO market/backfeed from grid (if so, how would it be billed)?, or separate distribution connection/agreement to local distribution company?	The project sponsor is responsible to provide its own station service. The transmission interconnection study can also include details for local station service. The interconnection study process will normally start after the CAISO selects the approved project sponsor.	Grid Assets



47	What Basic Insulation Level (BIL) should be used for design of the HV equipment for each project?	The CAISO does not specify the BIL. Please include your assumptions in your proposal.	Grid Assets
48	CAISO mentions high availability being a requirement of the design as well as requirements for two separate blocks and electrical and physical separation between the two reactive support blocks all the way up to the POI. Does CAISO have any specific requirements for sparing (for example the step up transformer) for these projects? If not, can you provide any insight into how CAISO plans to evaluate and value availability based on the proposed sparing strategy of each bidder?	The CAISO does not have specific sparing requirements. Potential project sponsors should state in its application a sparing strategy to achieve high availability. Specific evaluation criteria and selection factors are specified in section 24.5 of the CAISO tariff. Applicants can also review prior selection reports available on the CAISO's website.	Transmission Planning / Grid Assets
49	Does CAISO or the interconnecting TO have any specific seismic requirements or specifications for the reactive support devices or the associated substation equipment?	The CAISO does not have specific seismic requirements. Please include your assumptions in your proposal.	Grid Assets
50	Does CAISO or the interconnecting TO have any standard design criteria or other minimum specifications beyond what has already been posted on the 2018-2019 Transmission Planning web page that would apply either to the reactive support devices or the associated substation equipment?	The CAISO has published all of its design criteria. The interconnecting TO may have additional criteria that will be available to the approved project sponsor during the interconnection study.	Transmission Planning



51	Regarding the Gates and Round Mountain competitive solicitations, the CAISO-published workbook that bidders are to complete provides a "presumed inflation rate," that cannot be changed. It appears this rate is not used in any of the visible formulas. The workbook also instructs bidders to provide costs and cost caps in nominal dollars. Does the CAISO want bidders to calculate offers in 2019\$ but then populate the workbook with those costs inflated at the CAISO-mandated inflation rate, or provide offers in nominal dollars based on the sponsors assumptions? Further, what will the CAISO-mandated rate be used for purposes of evaluation?	Applicant project sponsors should provide all values in nominal dollars, as indicated in the headers on each of the cost sheets. The CAISO-identified inflation rate does not have any effect in the workbook's calculations. This inflation rate will later be factored into a discount rate that will be used to calculate the net present value of revenue requirements. The applicant project sponsor should document all assumptions used to develop nominal dollar values, including inflation rate, in its proposal.	Grid Assets
52	For the Gates 500 kV project, will an alternative that is electrically equivalent to a direct connection to and can be demonstrated through powerflow analysis to deliver +/- 800 MVAR of reactive power at the Gates 500 kV bus be considered acceptable?	Projects that meet all of the requirements identified in the ISO's specifications for the Gates Dynamic Reactive Support will be evaluated. Proposals that demonstrate they can provide +/- 800MVAR at the Gates 500kV bus and meet all of the other specification requirements are acceptable.	Grid Assets/ Planning
53	For the Gates 500 kV project, diagram of the Gates bus arrangement appears to show the numbering and alignment of the existing or planned breakers on two bays on the east end of the substation (bays 1 and 2, connecting banks 11 and 12, respectively) in conflict. The numbering of the breakers on Bay 2 implies it should be aligned towards the south bus but is drawn as aligning towards the north bus. Can the CAISO confirm that both Bays 1 and 2 will be aligned towards the south bus, and that the vacant	The ISO does not have this information. The drawing was supplied by the PTO.	Grid Assets/ Planning



	position on both buses aligned towards the north bus, and if so		
	issue a corrected drawing?		
54	Section 8 of the Project Sponsor Application asks for information about previous transmission line experience of the Sponsor, but says the items "should only be completed if there is a transmission line included in the proposed transmission solution". Does this also apply to other questions that ask for information regarding the Sponsor's transmission line experience, such as: P-1 Transmission Line Projects, E-14, and The transmission line portion of E-16?	As stated, if the proposed solution does not include a tie line or any elements of transmission line engineering, procurement, permitting, or construction the information in Section 8 is not required. The application requirements related to transmission line project development and construction experience included in other sections of the application are used to evaluate individual applicant experience and past project performance. These sections should be completed to demonstrate experience in electric substation and transmission line engineering, procurement, permitting, and/or construction projects.	Grid Assets
55	For Round Mountain Alternative 1, would it be acceptable for Round Mountain #2 and Table Mountain #2 to share a bay in the breaker-and-a-half scheme instead of Round Mountain #1 to Table Mountain #1 sharing a bay as is shown in Figure 2?	The schematic diagram, Figure 2, in the Round Mountain 500kV Dynamic Reactive Support specification provides a high level arrangement of the new switching station and how the dynamic reactive devices will be interconnected. The proposed line terminations locations may be different as long as the two reactive power blocks meet the requirements identified in the specifications including the mandate that the blocks do not share a 500kV breaker or single point of failure.	Grid Assets/ Planning
56	Would it be acceptable by the ISO to deliver the proposal attachments in a flash-drive or an external hard-drive (depending on size) instead of CDs or DVDs?	No, the proposals shall be delivered as noted in the application instructions.	Grid Assets/ Planning
57	Please clarify if a proponent would be able to submit a proposal with two technology alternatives for this project. This proposal would follow the same sections as per CAISO's "Transmission Project Sponsor Proposal – Application" document, and would identify applicable differences per technology/alternative in each section.	As noted in the Round Mountain 500kV Area Dynamic Reactive Support Description and Functional Specifications, the CAISO will not evaluate multiple alternatives as part of a single application. A separate proposal and application fee must be provided for each proposed solution.	Grid Assets



	For the financial information, two excel files "CalifornialSOApplicationWorkbook.xlsx" would be provided, one for each alternative. Furthermore, please confirm if a single \$75,000 payment would suffice for such application.		
58	The new 500 kV switching station shall meet CIP standards, which require 500 kV substations have a physical wall at the perimeter. The requirement for a wall would normally be contained in a Physical Security Plan developed under CIP-014 after the station is built, but the wording in the specification suggests that the CAISO may have already determined a wall is required for this alternative. Has the CAISO determined specifications for this wall? We would like to request the minimum design requirements expected for the wall (e.g. visual restriction).	The CAISO has not determined the specific requirements for a physical wall that may be necessary to meet CIP-014 compliance. It is the applicant's responsibility to provide a design to meet all applicable NERC reliability standards including those identified in CIP-014.	Grid Assets
59	Will sensitive financial information, such as audited financial statements (F - 3), remain confidential throughout the selection process? If not, under what circumstances would such information become public?	Section 20 of the California ISO's tariff describes how the ISO handles confidential information. The information in section F-3 of the application will remain confidential based on this tariff section and confidentiality will be maintained during the competitive solicitation selection process.	Grid Assets
60	We would like to confirm that both PG&E's Round Mountain-Table Mountain 500kV transmission lines are equipped with OPGW.	The ISO cannot confirm this information.	Grid Assets

