

“maximum capacity” would be more clear.³ PG&E notes that “maximum capacity” is consistent with the CAISO’s proposed policy as described in its transmittal letter and supporting documentation.

The CAISO appreciates PG&E’s attention to this wording and its support of the CAISO’s proposed enhancements. The CAISO agrees that “maximum capacity” is clearer to the reader than “output,” and this mere word change is completely consistent with the CAISO’s intent and does not change the CAISO’s proposal as set forth in its original filing. Although the CAISO’s proposal is just and reasonable as originally proposed, the CAISO is prepared on compliance to make the non-substantive clarifications PG&E proposes.

Dated December 14, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ William H. Weaver

Roger E. Collanton

General Counsel

Sidney L. Mannheim

Assistant General Counsel

William H. Weaver

Senior Counsel

California Independent System

Operator Corporation

250 Outcropping Way

Folsom, CA 95630

Tel: (916) 351-4400

Fax: (916) 608-7222

bweaver@caiso.com

Counsel for the California Independent
System Operator Corporation

³ PG&E Comments at pp. 3-5. Specifically, the CAISO’s proposed tariff revisions stated “This value is the committed generator output at n divided by the sum of the output from all committed frequency response capable generators” PG&E believes that it would be more appropriate to state “This value is the committed generator maximum capacity at n divided by the sum of the maximum capacity from all committed frequency response capable generators”

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing document upon all of the parties listed on the official service list for the above-referenced proceeding, in accordance with the requirements of Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 385.2010).

Dated at Folsom, CA this 14th day of December, 2018.

/s/ Anna Pascuzzo

Anna Pascuzzo