|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-18-09 | Bonneville Power Administration  (BPA) | N | **West of McNary Reinforcement Project** | 2/2013 |
|  |  | N | 08-18-09 By e-mail this date, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) initiated Phase I of the WECC 3-Phase Project Rating Review Process for the West of McNary Reinforcement Project. This project was previously known as the West of McNary Generation Integration Project (WOMGIP) and includes construction of a new 79 mile, 500 kV line from BPA’s McNary Substation to BPA’s John Day Substation and a new 28 mile, 500 kV line from BPA’s Big Eddy Substation to a new 500 kV substation to be named Knight (formerly known as Station Z). A CPR was distributed with comments and indication of interest in participation in the Phase II PRG due by October 16, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 02-06-13 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating the completion of Phase I requirements for the BPA West of McNary (WOM) Reinforcement Project. This project achieved Phase 2A status in the WECC Project Rating Review Process a Planned Rating of 4,500 MW (east-to-west). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 7-29-13 By email this date a draft study plan was distributed to the PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-1-2013 – By email this date the presentation was sent out for the PRG kick-off meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 8-6-13 By email this date a proposal on how to stress the study cases was distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 8-9-13 By an email chain between the project sponsor and BPA a discussion of the proper study plan and what it should include for cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 9-16-13 By email this date a draft Study Plan and 3 preliminary foundational base cases are posted. Feedback is requested by 10/31/2013. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-19-13 By email this date reminder about an upcoming meeting was distributed. The meeting is scheduled to be held 11-21-13. The meeting information was also distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-27-2013 By email this date a draft study plan was distributed to the PRG. The base cases and associated dynamic data are posted on the ColumbiaGrid website. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-28-10 | Southline Transmiss-ion, L.L.C. | N | **Southline Transmission Project** | Q4/2014 |
|  |  | N | 12-28-10 By e-mail this date, Southline Transmission Project, L.L.C. initiated Phase I in the Project Rating Review Process for the Southline Transmission Project. The project is a proposed interstate EHV transmission project designed to create a bi-directional connection between New Mexico (El Paso region) and Arizona (Palo Verde hub outside Phoenix). Studies for the project are expected to demonstrate a non-simultaneous rating of 750-1500 MW of bi-directional transfer capability. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-05-12 – Comments were submitted by email from Mark Etherton on this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-08/2012 – By email Doug Patterson addressed comments and provided a updated CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 03-20-12 – A letter distributed by the TSS Chair granted completion of Phase I requirements for the Southline Transmission Project. This project has achieved Phase II status with planned ratings outlined in the table below.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Represented Season Conditions*** | ***Southline Project Transmission Rating Interface*** | ***Interface Description*** | ***Non-simultaneous Planned Rating*** | | 2015 Heavy Summer | East-to-West Rating Interface A | Afton-Midpoint 345 kV #1 and #2 Lines | 1038 MW | | 2015 Heavy Summer | East-to-West Rating Interface B | Apache-Adams Tap and Apache-Pantano 230 kV Lines | 1001 MW | | 2014-15 Heavy Winter | West-to-East Rating Interface C | Saguaro-Marana and Tortolita-Tucson/DMP 230 kV Lines | 418 MW | | 2014-15 Heavy Winter | West-to-East Rating Interface D | Apache-Hidalgo 345 kV Lines | 957 MW | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-16-11 | Southern California Edison (SCE) | N | **Path 42 1500 MW Upgrade Project** | 12/2013 |
|  |  | N | 08-16-11 By e-mail this date, Southern California Edison (SCE) initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Path 42 1500 MW Upgrade Project. Path 42 currently has an Existing Rating of 600 MW E-W and recently SCE initiated the Project Rating Review Process for an interim path rating increase on this path from 600 MW to 800 MW. However, due to upgraded transmission facilities in both SCE’s and IID’s systems and the addition of a new SPS, the Path 42 rating is expected to increase by 700 MW to an Accepted Rating of 1500 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 04-03-12 By e-mail a letter from the TSS Vice-Chair indicated completion of Phase I requirements for the Path 42 1500 MW Project. This project has achieved Phase II status in the WECC Project Rating Review Process with a planned rating of 1,500 MW east-to-west. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 8-16-13 By email this date SCE and IID are actively moving forward with securing this rating. The email also laid out the scope of the studies and development of a base case. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-15-11 | Southern California Edison (SCE) | N | **Path 42 800 MW Upgrade Project** | 12/2012 |
|  |  | N | 08-15-11 By e-mail this date, Southern California Edison (SCE) initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Path 42 800 MW Upgrade Project. Path 42 currently has an Existing Rating of 600 MW E-W. Due to upgraded transmission facilities and the addition of a new SPS, the Path 42 rating is expected to increase by 200 MW to an Accepted Rating of 800 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-14-11 By e-mail this date notice was distributed to the council that the Path 42 800 MW Upgrade Project has achieved Phase II status with a Planned Rating of 800 MW E-W. The notice was sent from the TSS Vice-Chair since the TSS Chair works for SCE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 8-16-13 By email this date the indication is that SCE and IID are no longer pursuing the interim 800 MW rating. The following reasons were provided:   * Delays in the queued generation projects * Delays in the path 42 RAS development   With the reasons provided in the email the indication is that the 800 MW rating is no longer a viable option |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-18-08 | Portland General Electric Co. | N | **Cascade Crossing Transmission Project (previously known as Southern Crossing Transmission Project)** | 4/2015 |
|  |  | N | 01-18-08 By e-mail this date Portland General Electric Company (PGE) requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Southern Crossing Transmission Project. The project consists of a 500 kV line approximately 225 miles in length, with the first 75 miles, starting at Bethel Substation in Salem, Oregon and terminating in the new substation Olallie, utilizing a portion of PGE’s existing Bethel-Round Butte 230 kV line rebuilt for 500 kV operation. From Olallie, a 500 kV line would be built to the vicinity of PGE’s Boardman Plant. The project is planned to have an estimated bidirectional rating of up to 2000 MW. PGE also proposed formation of a Phase I Rating Study Team with a response deadline of 02/15/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-08-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting Phase II status to the Cascade Crossing Transmission Project. The project has a planned rating of 1500 MW E-W for the Juniper Flat – Bethel section of the project, measured at the Bethel 500 kV Substation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-03-10 | Pacific Power | N | **Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project** | 12/2012 |
|  |  | N | 10-09-08 By e-mail this date Pacific Power (division of PacifiCorp) requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project. The project consists of a 230 kV transmission line, approximately 56 miles in length between PacifiCorp’s existing Walla Walla, Washington substation and is proposed to terminate at BPA’s McNary substation near Umatilla, OR. The project will also have a midpoint connection to PacifiCorp’s existing Wallula substation. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-03-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting Phase II status to the Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project with a Planned Rating of 800 MW east to west, measured at BPA’s McNary 230 kV substation. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-19-10 By e-mail this date Pacific Power provided notice of a kick-off project review group meeting for the Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project to be held 11/2/10 in Portland, OR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-22-10 By e-mail this date Pacific Power distributed a list of individuals participating on the Project Review Group. A draft Phase II study report was also posted for review as well as base cases with and without the subject project included. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-10-10 By e-mail this date Pacific Power distributed final meeting notes for the 11/2/10 project review group meeting and requested comments on the draft study report and base cases that were posted for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-10-10 By e-mail this date BPA provided a list of changes to be made to the base cases that were posted for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-23-10 By e-mail this date Pacific Power asked for any additional changes to the base cases posted for review and noted that the next PRG meeting teleconference is scheduled for 1-26-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-11 By e-mail this date Pacific Power distributed a copy of the 01-26-11 meeting minutes and requested that PRG members review the draft study report and base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-14-11 By e-mail this date the finalized meeting minutes from the 01-26-11 meeting were distributed and Pacific Power posted three additional pre-project base cases for study use. It was also noted that the next PRG teleconference is scheduled for 04-13-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-18-11 By e-mail this date Pacific Power distributed a final version of the meeting notes from the 04-13-11 PRG meeting. The next PRG teleconference is scheduled for 05-11-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-17-11 By e-mail this date Pacific Power provided meeting notes from the PRG meeting of 05-11-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-17-11 By e-mail this date BPA provided comments to the pre-project base case to be used for study work and requested that N-0 overloads be remedied and the case re-posted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 1/13/2012 By e-mail discussion of some simulation issues that they have run into an indication that they have been resolved. Planning the next face to face meeting on a date to be determined. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-29-12 By email this date study results were posted to the projects FTP site for informal comments. A PRG meeting is scheduled for May 1-2, 2012. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-1-13 By email this date a meeting invitation was sent for a meeting to be held on April 24, 2014 for this project. They are looking to restart this process for this project |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-03-10 | TransWest Express LLC | N | **TransWest Express Project** | 12/2014 |
|  |  | N | 01-11-08 By e-mail this date National Grid requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the TransWest Express Project. This project consists of a bi-pole +/- 500 kV DC transmission line approximately 900 miles in length originating in the Powder River Basin of northeastern Wyoming and terminating in Market Place substation in southern Nevada. This line will be capable of delivering up to 3000 MW of resources to growing markets in the DSW. National Grid also solicited interest in forming a joint Phase I Rating Study Team by 02/10/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-03-10 By e-mail this date the TSS chair distributed a letter indicating that the TransWest Express Project has achieved Phase II status for a planned rating of 3000 MW delivered to the southern terminal of the project. The planned in-service date is December 2014. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-06-10 By e-mail this date TWE distributed notice of a meeting/webinar to be held on 04-08-10 to initiate activities of the TWE Phase II PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-08-10 The Phase II PRG kick-off webinar was held this date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-09-10 By e-mail this date TWE distributed draft #1 of the Phase II study plan to the PRG members for comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-15-10 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted a list of four comments to the draft Phase II study plan for the TWE Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-25-10 By e-mail this date TWE distributed rev. 2 of the Phase II study plan to the PRG members for comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-10 A Phase II PRG webinar was held this date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-16-10 By e-mail this date TWE distributed a 2015 build-out base case to PRG members for comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-20-10 By e-mail this date TWE distributed a final version of the TWE Commercial Operation base case to PRG members which includes all comments that were received. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-14-11 By e-mail this date TWE distributed the TWE Commercial Operation base case (Rev.1) and the Pre-Project case (Rev.1) to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-27-11 By e-mail this date TWE provided notice of a PRG webinar scheduled for 02-01-11 with the purpose of discussing the Phase II study plan and base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-11-11 By e-mail this date TWE distributed to the PRG Rev.4 of the TWE Phase II study plan that was approved by the PRG during the 02-01-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-22-11 By e-mail this date TWE distributed the final notes from the PRG webinar of 02-01-11. These notes document approval of the TWE Phase II study plan as well as approval of the TWE Commercial Operation base case |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-15-11 By e-mail this date TWE distributed preliminary post-transient power flow results for the TWE Commercial Operation non-simultaneous case to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-16-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp requested additional information regarding the TWE study results provided on 06-15-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-16-11 By e-mail this date TWE responded to PacifiCorp’s questions from the same date and stated that the study results in question are preliminary and further analysis is still required. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-23-2012 By email TWE indicated it is working diligently on revisions to their Phase 2 study plan to address the some identified issues. They expect to distribute a revised TWE Phase 2 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 3-12-12 By email TWE indicated that comments on the study plan were due on March 24. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-27-12 By email TWE distributed the path 27, 81, and 35 simultaneous study cases to the PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-23-12 By email this date BPA provided comments concerning the phase 2 studies being conducted. The email outlines concerns about changes to the plan of service from the phase 1 studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-11-2013 By email this date TWE reminded the Project Review Group that comments are due on the study cases by February 15. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-18-2013 By email this date TWE indicated that they had only received comments from two PRG members and wanted to verify there were no further comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 4-18-2013 By email this date TWE distributed study cases to the PRG for review for interactions with Path 81 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 4-22-13 By email this date TWE distributed study cases to the PRG for review for interactions with Path 27. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-1-2013 By email this date a reminder was sent out that comments are due on the simultaneous study case for paths 35/78/79 along with a zip file containing the case. That request also included a number of adjustments that had been made to the case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 7-24-2013 By email this date TWE distributed a revised study plan and highlighted some of the progress. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-16-09 | Comision Federal de Electricidad  (CFE) | N | **Path 45 Uprate Project** | ? |
|  |  | N | 07-30-09 By e-mail this date, Comision Federal de Electricidad (CFE) initiated Phase I of the WECC 3-Phase Project Rating Review Process for the Path 45 Uprate Project. This project is planned to increase the rating of Path 45 to 600 MW in the N-S direction. Comments to the CPR as well as notification of interest in participating in the PRG are due by September 29, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-21-09 By e-mail this date SDGE provided comments to the CPR for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-21-09 By e-mail this date CFE provided answers to SDGE’s comments of the same date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-16-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 45 Uprate Project has achieved Phase II status for a Planned Rating of 600 MW N-S. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-22-10 By e-mail this date CFE distributed notice of an initial PRG meeting to be held 03-02-10 at IID facilities in El Centro, CA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-12-10 By e-mail this date CFE provided meeting minutes from the Phase II PRG meeting that was held 03-02-10 in El Centro, CA and asked for any comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-26-10 By e-mail this date CFE distributed a Phase II study plan to the PRG for their review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-28-10 A Phase II PRG meeting was held at SDG&E facilities this date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-21-10 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments to the Phase II study report of the Path 45 Uprate Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-18-11 By e-mail this date CFE distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-30-11 By e-mail this date CFE indicated that they had not received any comments to their report that was distributed on 02-18-11 and asked about the next steps that need to be taken. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-11 By e-mail this date SCE submitted comments to CFE concerning the Path 45 Uprate Project. SCE indicated that simultaneous analyses with Path 46 have not been performed correctly and need to be completed. As a result, SCE requests that CFE complete these studies before Phase III status can be granted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-11 By e-mail this date the CAISO requested that CFE perform a simultaneous evaluation of Path 45 (N-S) and Path 46 (E-W) both at their maximum flows. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-02-11 By e-mail this date SCE requested that CFE complete a Path 46 simultaneous analysis. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-11-11 By e-mail this date SCE distributed study results to the PRG with Paths 45 and 46 at their respective maximums and loss of the IV-La Rosita 230 kV line. SCE requested help from SDG&E in verifying its SOL’s in the base case used for the studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-17-11 By e-mail this date SDG&E indicated that none of their SOL’s are violated in the base case that SCE used for their studies from 05-11-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-18-11 By e-mail this date CFE distributed a draft Study Report to the PRG that includes a Path 46 simultaneous analysis. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-22-11 By e-mail this date SCE provided a list of four comments to the draft report of 08-18-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-22-11 By e-mail this date the CAISO provided a list of 3 comments to the draft report of 08-18-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-26-11 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided comments to the draft report of 08-18-11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-26-07 | Avista Corp. | N | **Devils Gap Interconnection to the CNC 500 kV Line (previously identified as Canada – Northern California Transmission Project – Avista Corporation 500 MW 500/230 kV AC Interconnection)** | 2015 |
|  |  | N | 11-26-07 By e-mail this date Avista Corp. announced the initiation of the WECC Regional Planning Process and Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for a potential Avista interconnection to the proposed Canada-Northern California Transmission Project. This project will potentially interconnect with the Canada – Northern California Transmission Project at a 500 kV switchyard in the Devils Gap (Spokane) area with a 500/230 kV transformer. Additional requirements are one or possibly two 230 kV phase shifting transformers and two 230 kV circuits integrating the project into the west Spokane area. The project is planned to have a bi-directional rating of up to 500 MW. Interest in formation of a Regional Planning/Phase I Rating Study Team was requested by December 15, 2007. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-22-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that this project has achieved Phase II status and a planned bi-directional rating of 500 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-18-09 By e-mail this date AVA announced the WECC Phase II Rating Process Kickoff Meeting for the Devils Gap Interconnection to the CNC Project to be held on 01-14-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-29-09 By e-mail this date AVA distributed a draft study plan for this project to the PRG for discussion at the planned 01-14-10 kickoff meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-10-07 | TransCanada Energy Ltd. | N | **NorthernLights Project (previously Northern Lights– Celilo Project)** | 2015 |
|  |  | N | 12-10-07 By e-mail this date TransCanada Energy Ltd. requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for a potential +/- 500 kV DC transmission line from northern Alberta to the Celilo, OR area. TransCanada is striving to reach a path rating of 3000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the NorthernLights project has achieved Phase II status and a bi-directional planned rating of 2000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-05-07 | Pacific Gas and Electric Company | N | **Canada – Northern California Transmission Project (CNC Project)** | 2015 |
|  |  | N | 11-05-07 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric Company announced the initiation of Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Canada – Northern California Transmission Project. The proposed project includes an overhead 500 kV AC line from Selkirk substation in southeast British Columbia to the Round Butte/Grizzly area in central Oregon and a ±500 kV DC line from Round Butte/Grizzly to Tesla/Tracy substations in northern California for a total of approximately 1000 miles. It is planned to have a bidirectional rating of up to 3000 MW and is expected to be operational in late 2015. In addition, interest in participation in a Rating Study Team, consisting of four separate work groups, was requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-10-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Canada-Northern California Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status for a N-S rating of 3000 MW. Interest in formation of a Phase 2 Project Review Group was also requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-14-09 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed an update on the status of the CNC project study process as well as a Project Sponsor contact list. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-18-09 By e-mail this date PG&E announced the initial meeting of the Project Review Group for 10-22-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-18-09 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed an agenda to the PRG members for the 10-22-09 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-21-09 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a link to PRG members for presentation materials. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-18-09 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a link to PRG members for updated/corrected meeting materials that were presented at the 10-22-09 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-11-09 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a draft Phase II study plan for the CNC Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-04-10 By e-mail this date PG&E announced the second PRG meeting date to be held 02-09-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-15-10 By e-mail this date SMUD provided comments to the draft CNC Phase II study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-04-10 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed the agenda for the 02-09-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-09-10 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed the presentation material for the 02-09-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-18-10 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed an updated Draft Study Plan incorporating comments that were received during the 02-09-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-28-10 By e-mail this date, the project sponsors provided notice that they are reviewing the possibility of a reduced rating as their needs for renewable generation have changed. An analysis is being conducted that may indicate a new version of the CNC project be pursued with relatively minor changes to the Plan of Service, or the analysis may indicate that another transmission project be pursued. In either case, the new rating could be 2000 MW or more. The analysis is expected to be completed by the end of 2010 at which point the Path Rating Process will resume. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-11-08 | PacifiCorp | N | **Gateway South Project** | 2011-2016 |
|  |  | N | 01-11-08 By e-mail this date National Grid requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for a two-segment project called the Gateway South Project. The first segment of this project consists of a 330 mile single-circuit 500 kV AC transmission line from Mona substation in Utah to Crystal substation near Las Vegas, NV. This line is planned to have a bidirectional rating of up to 1500 MW. The second segment of this project is a 400 mile double-circuit 500 kV AC transmission line from a new substation, Aeolus, in southeastern Wyoming to Mona substation in Utah. This line will be capable of delivering up to 3000 MW of resources to growing markets in Utah and the DSW. National Grid also solicited interest in forming a joint Phase I Rating Study Team by 02/10/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-06-09 By e-mail this date the TSS chair distributed a letter indicating that the Gateway South Project has achieved Phase II status for a planned rating of 3000 MW N-S on the South of Aeolus path, 2400 MW N-S and 790 MW S-N on the Mona South path, and would increase the TOT 2C transfer capability from 300 MW to 2100 MW N-S and from 300 MW to 1700 MW S-N. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-11-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed an Energy Gateway Phase 2 study process presentation to the PRG in advance of the planned May 22, 2009 Phase 2 study kick-off meeting for both Gateway West and Gateway South. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-31-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed via two separate distributions a straw man study plan for both the Aeolus South and the Mona South study subgroups to review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-31-09 By e-mail this date WAPA requested the addition of a contingency to the study plan. WAPA submitted updates to the base cases being used in the study work to correct topologies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-31-09 By e-mail this date UAMPS requested clarification on some proposed additions to the base cases being used by the Mona South subgroup. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-10-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided the requested clarification from UAMPS and noted that sensitivities will be performed on the subject base case addition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-31-09 By e-mail this date NVEnergy proposed additional sensitivities to perform and will provide the required data for the study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date UAMPS submitted an additional comment regarding the proposed Phase II study work. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp answered the 09-17-09 question from UAMPS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date UAMPS submitted an additional two comments regarding PacifiCorp’s answer directly above. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-19-09 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments to the proposed Gateway South Phase II Study Plan and requested that short circuit studies be performed and added to the Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-20-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp acknowledged LDWP’s comments from 11-19-09 and stated that they will be addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-22-10 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company provided notice of a joint Gateway West/Gateway South technical study coordinating meeting to be held 03-30-10 in SLC, Utah. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-17-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided meeting notes from the 08-04-10 study group meeting for the Energy Gateway-Aeolus South group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-23-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed for review a draft of the TOT 2B/2C Energy Gateway study report and appendices. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed for review a draft of the TOT 2C study report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-13-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed for review a draft of the Aeolus South report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-16-10 By e-mail this date LADWP submitted two comments to the TOT 2B/2C study report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-22-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed an updated Aeolus South Path Rating Report to the PRG for their review. The report was updated to include additional path interaction studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-26-10 By e-mail this date LADWP submitted a comment to the 10-22-10 Aeolus South Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-26-10 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted a list of 6 comments/questions concerning the 10-22-10 Aeolus South Report |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-27-10 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted comments to the TOT 2C study report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-08-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed an updated final study report for the TOT 2B/2C project to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-16-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for the Aeolus South Project for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. Now that the Gateway South Project as a whole has achieved Phase II status, the individual components of this project will be taken through the rest of the Path Rating Process individually. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-22-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for the Gateway South-Stage 1, TOT 2B/2C Project for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. Now that the Gateway South Project as a whole has achieved Phase II status, the individual components of this project will be taken through the rest of the Path Rating Process individually. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-01-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a list of changes that were made to the TOT 2B/2C final study report during an 11-18-10 meeting of the PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-07-10 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted comments to the PacifiCorp changes of 12-01-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-16-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp indicated that the issues raised by NVEnergy on 12-07-10 concerning the TOT 2B/2C study report are being addressed and will be resolved. Once they are resolved, an updated report will be presented to the PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-16-10 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Gateway South – Aeolus South Project has achieved Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 1700 MW north to south. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-23-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided a list of changes that will be made to the TOT 2B/2C study report due to the requested changes submitted by NVEnergy on 12-07-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-03-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed to the PRG an updated Gateway South – Stage 1 TOT 2B/2C Path Rating Study Report for review. This updated report addresses comments received from NVEnergy and LS Power at a 01-05-11 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-24-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy and LS Power provided a joint list of comments to the updated TOT 2B/2C report distributed on 02-03-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-28-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp acknowledged the comments received from NVEnergy and LS Power on 02-24-11 and indicated they will address them. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-25-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a finalized version of the TOT 2B/2C Phase II Study Report to NVEnergy and LS Power. This version of the report addresses all concerns raised by NVEnergy and LS Power from 02-24-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-25-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp submitted the updated TOT 2B/2C Study Report to LDWP. PacifiCorp also noted that in the process of updating this report, it became evident that there are some misunderstandings between PacifiCorp and LDWP concerning interactions between the TOT 2B/2C path and the recently up-rated IPP DC Line. As a result, pertinent sections in the TOT 2B/2C Study Report were updated to correct some technical oversights discovered in a re-evaluation of the IPP DC Line 2400 MW path rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-30-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a document that outlines current issues involving the TOT 2B/2C project for use in the conference call scheduled for 03-30-11 with NVEnergy and LS Power. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-31-11 By e-mail this date LS Power submitted additional comments to the updated TOT 2B/2C report distributed by PacifiCorp on 03-25-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-31-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp informed the PCC Chair that comments to the Gateway – Stage 1, TOT 2B/2C Study Report had been received from NVEnergy and LS Power during the 30-day review and that all had been addressed. Subsequently, a request for Phase III status was requested. In addition, an updated final version of the Study Report was distributed to PCC, TSS, and OC via separate e-mail. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-01-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp responded to the LS Power email of 03-31-11 by saying that the TOT 2B/2C report had been unanimously approved by the PRG and that LS Power’s comments were well outside of the review period. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-01-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted a letter to the PCC Chair requesting that the TOT 2B/2C Study Report not be approved by PCC due to some outstanding issues that PacifiCorp will need to address. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-07-11 By web-ex this date, a discussion with LS Power and NVEnergy was held in order to determine what issues remain to be addressed by PacifiCorp (see 04-01-11 entry). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-07-11 By e-mail this date LDWP commented that the finalized TOT 2B/2C Study Report has significant changes in it that LDWP needs to review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-12-11 By e-mail this date LDWP requested a process review of the Gateway South Project due to their belief that PACE has substantially changed the previously approved PRG report and that it is no longer valid. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-14-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp sent LDWP the base cases that they used to create the updated Study Report from 03-25-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-22-11 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated that they do not agree with the proposed revisions to the previously approved PRG report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp acknowledged receipt of LDWP’s comments from 04-07-11 and indicated that they will review and update the TOT 2B/2C Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-11 By e-mail this date LDWP sent PacifiCorp some presentation slides that had been presented at the RASRS meeting concerning the IPPDC Remedial Action Scheme that was approved by the RASRS in April 2010. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-28-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided to the PRG an updated version of the TOT 2B/2C Study Report for their review in advance of a planned WEBEX conference call for the week of 05-04-11 to discuss outstanding path rating issues. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-04-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed a commented red-line version of the TOT 2B/2C Study Report for discussion on the 05-04-11 WEBEX conference call. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-06-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp noted that significant progress had been made during the WEBEX conference call that was held on 05-04-11 and provided an updated Phase II TOT 2B/2C Study Report with all requested changes regarding SWIP/ON Line interaction. A final version of this report will be released soon and will include necessary changes pursuant to a successful resolution of issues concerning the IPPDC Upgrade. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-06-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed another updated version of the Phase II TOT 2B/2C Study Report to PCC, OC, TSS and the PRG for an additional 2-week review following the addition of comments received during the PCC 30-day review period. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-20-11 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted a 5-page document detailing a list of comments to the updated Phase II Report distributed by PacifiCorp on 06-06-11. LDWP questioned PacifiCorp’s adherence to the WECC 3-Phase Rating Process because of the 2-week review period of the updated Phase II study report allowed by PacifiCorp on 06-06-11 and did not approve the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-21-11 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp requested Phase III status for the Gateway South – TOT 2B/2C Path. PacifiCorp noted that comments received from NVEnergy and LS Power had been resolved but that comments from LADWP had already been addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 06-21-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status and an Accepted Rating to the Gateway South - TOT 2B/2C Project. It was recognized that issues brought up by LDWP are still outstanding but as these issues are operational in nature, they are to be addressed by LDWP and PacifiCorp during Phase III of this project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-27-08 | Idaho Power Company (IPC) | | N | **Gateway West Transmission Project** | 2012 |
|  |  | | N | 02-27-08 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Gateway West Transmission Project. The proposed project, to be constructed jointly with Pacificorp, is a 500 kV and 230 kV transmission project from a new station, Windstar – near the Dave Johnston Generating Plant, to a new substation, Hemingway – in southwest Idaho. Desired ratings are: 3500 MW Windstar to Aeolus, 2000 MW Aeolus to Jim Bridger, and 3000 MW from Jim Bridger to Hemingway. The Gateway West project will cross the following WECC defined bulk power transmission paths (cut planes): TOT 4A, Bridger West, and Borah West. |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | | S | 02-06-09 By e-mail this date the TSS chair distributed a letter indicating that the Gateway West Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status for planned rating increases of the following paths; TOT 4A, Bridger West, and Borah West to 3435 MW, 5200 MW, and 5557 MW, respectively, and two new paths created with this project; West of Aeolus (2050 MW) and Midpoint West (5487 MW). |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 05-11-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed an Energy Gateway Phase 2 study process presentation to the PRG in advance of the planned May 22, 2009 Phase 2 study kick-off meeting for both Gateway West and Gateway South. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 07-31-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed via two separate distributions a straw man study plan for both the Southern Idaho and the Bridger study subgroups to review. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 08-31-09 By e-mail this date BPA submitted comments to the straw man study plan as presented by Idaho Power on 07-31-09. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 09-15-09 By e-mail this date IPC responded to all comments from BPA and indicated they would be addressed. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 11-02-09 By e-mail this date IPC distributed a study plan for review and comment to the Southern Idaho Study Group for the Gateway West Project. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 11-17-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the revised study plan for the Gateway West project based on comments received. This study plan will be used for the Bridger and Windstar Study Groups. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 01-11-10 By e-mail this date IPC distributed the final study plan for the Phase II rating studies for the Southern Idaho Study Group. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 02-03-10 By e-mail this date IPC distributed an updated version of the Phase II study plan for the Southern Idaho Study Group. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 02-04-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the final study plans for the Phase II rating studies for both the Bridger West Study Group and the Windstar Study Group. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 02-09-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp requested from the Windstar Study Group that they review the 19HS1 study case and provide comments by 02-19-10. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 02-19-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp indicated that comments from the Windstar Study Group to the study case included those from Basin Electric, Black Hills Corp., and Idaho Power. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 02-23-10 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted additional comments for the Windstar Study Group study case. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 03-22-10 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company provided notice of a joint Gateway West/Gateway South technical study coordinating meeting to be held 03-30-10 in SLC, Utah. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 03-23-10 By e-mail this date IPC provided notice to the Southern Idaho Study Group of the availability on the IPC ftp site of an updated 19HS1 base case with stage one of the Gateway Energy projects included. Additional cases with the MISTI and SWIP projects included are also available. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 07-19-10 By e-mail this date IPC provided notice to the Southern Idaho Study Group of the availability on the IPC ftp site of an updated 19LW3a case and associated dynamic file with the Gateway West project modeled in it. A request was made for a thorough review of the case to ensure that it accurately models the specific year being evaluated. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 07-19-20 By e-mail this date PACE provided notice to the Bridger West Study Group of the availability on the IPC ftp site of an updated 19LW3a case and associated dynamic file. A request was made for a thorough review of the case to ensure that it accurately models the specific year being evaluated. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 08-04-10 By e-mail this date via two separate emails, PACE and IPC informed the Southern Idaho and Bridger West Study Groups that no comments to the 2019 LW base case have been received so the case will be used in the study work as-is. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 08-31-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed meeting notes from the 08-24-10 Energy Gateway-Bridger West study group meeting. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 10-26-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for the Gateway West-TOT 4A Project for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. Now that the Gateway West Project as a whole has achieved Phase II status, the individual components of this project will be taken through the rest of the Path Rating Process individually. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 11-09-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp submitted four study reports for the Bridger study area for PRG review. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 11-24-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for the Gateway West-Stage 1, Aeolus West, Bridger/Anticline West and Path C project for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. Now that the Gateway West Project as a whole has achieved Phase II status, the individual components of this project will be taken through the rest of the Path Rating Process individually. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 11-24-10 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted a letter outlining system upgrades in the WAPA control area necessary for the Gateway West-TOT 4A project to be completed. WAPA noted that since changes are required in their area, coordination and discussion will be necessary. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 12-03-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided responses to the concerns outlined by WAPA on 11-24-10 and indicated that all of the issues raised will be discussed with WAPA to assure mutual understanding. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 12-13-10 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted a letter indicating that all concerns raised previously by them on 11-24-10 had satisfactorily been addressed by PacifiCorp during a phone call on 12-09-10. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 12-14-10 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Gateway West-TOT 4A Project has achieved Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 2175 MW north to south. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 12-21-10 By e-mail this date IPC distributed the Phase II study report for the Gateway West-Bridger West Project to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 01-05-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Gateway West-Aeolus West (2670 MW east to west), Bridger/Anticline West (4100 MW east to west) and Path C (2250 MW bi-directional north/south) Projects have achieved Phase III status with the indicated Accepted Ratings. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 01-06-11 By e-mail this date IPC distributed to the Southern Idaho Study Group an updated Phase II rating report for the Midpoint West, Borah West and Idaho-Sierra northbound portion of the study work. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 05-10-11 By e-mail this date IPC distributed a revised Phase II PRG report updated to include study results for the Idaho-Sierra (N-S) / Borah West interaction per NVEnergy request. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 05-17-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy provided a list of comments to the study report of 05-10-11 and requested a time extension to adequately review the report and base case that was used for the studies. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 05-18-11 By e-mail this date IPC provided a response to the comments from NVEnergy on 05-17-11. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 06-07-11 By e-mail this date IPC distributed a Phase II Project Rating Report to PCC, OC, and TSS for 30-day review and requested Phase III status at the end of this time. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 06-09-11 By e-mail this date WAPA requested additional information concerning flows in the base cases used for Phase II study work |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 06-09-11 By e-mail this date IPC responded to WAPA’s request from the same date. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 06-10-11 By e-mail this date WAPA provided some topology changes for the Flaming Gorge area and requested that IPC re-run some of the outages used in the Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 06-13-11 By e-mail this date IPC implemented WAPA’s topology changes from 06-10-11 and re-ran a number of Gateway/Bridger West outages and provided a summary of results. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | C | | 06-13-11 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted a follow-up question on IPC’s study results from the same date. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 06-13-11 By e-mail this date IPC ran some additional sensitivity studies for a single Bridger unit trip as requested by WAPA and provided the results. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 07-08-11 By e-mail this date IPC noted that minor comments to the Phase II Study Report had been received and implemented in the final version of the report. As a result, IPC requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 07-21-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status to the Gateway West – Borah West, Midpoint West, and Bridger 2400 MW Upgrade Projects with the following Accepted Ratings: Borah West (4450 MW E-W), Midpoint West (4400 MW E-W) and Bridger West (2400 MW E-W). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-21-07 | LS Power &  Great Basin Transmission LLC | N | **SWIP North Transmission Project (previously known as Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Midpoint-White Pine 500 kV transmission line)** | 2014 |
|  |  | N | 02-22-07 By e-mail this date LS Power, LLC for Great Basin Transmission, LLC requested Phase 1 status for the Project Rating Review of the proposed Midpoint-White Pine 500 kV transmission line project. This project represents the northern portion of the original Southwest Intertie Project (SWIP) and stretches from Midpoint in Idaho to White Pine County in Nevada. The request was distributed to PCC and TSS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-11-08 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter stating that the SWIP North Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status with a proposed rating of 1400 MW southbound and 2000 MW northbound. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-28-09 By e-mail this date the SWIP-North PRG leader distributed for review a draft write-up and summary of the preliminary non-simultaneous studies as well as two base cases and associated dynamics data that were used to run the studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-14-09 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Co. submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 09-28-09 for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-18-09 By e-mail this date NV Energy submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 09-28-09 for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-20-09 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 09-28-09 for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-02-10 By e-mail this date Great Basin Transmission (GBT) provided notice that Utility System Efficiencies (USE) will now be providing technical assistance with the Phase II study effort. An updated Study Plan was distributed for review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-03-10 By e-mail this date seven base cases were distributed by USE for review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-12-10 By e-mail this date SMUD submitted two comments to the study plan provided by USE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-13-10 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that updates to the study cases as well as comments to the study plan are forthcoming. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-16-10 By e-mail this date TransWest Express provided a list of 4 comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-17-10 By e-mail this date IPC provided numerous comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-18-10 By e-mail this date PG&E provided a two-page list of comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan as well as some change files for the power flow cases to be used in the Phase 2 studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-18-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided a response to SMUD’s comments of 08-12-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-10-10 By e-mail this date SMUD acknowledged USE’s response on 08-18-10 and re-iterated one of their concerns from the original comments on 08-12-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-10-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting responded to SMUD’s comment on 09-10-10 and agreed to modify a section of the Phase 2 study plan to address SMUD’s concerns. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-10-10 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that power flow parameters regarding COI flows are acceptable. This was one of PG&E’s concerns in their comments from 08-18-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-10-10 By e-mail this date SMUD indicated that USE Consulting’s response from this same date is acceptable. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-15-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided responses to all comments received from PG&E on 08-18-10 and also noted that an updated study plan is forthcoming. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-07-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided responses to all comments received from TransWest Express on 08-16-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-07-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided the finalized SWIP-North Phase II Study Plan for PRG review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-20-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate e-mails SWIP-North Path 66 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-28-11 By e-mail this date LS Power provided notification of a SWIP South PRG meeting to be held 03-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed the draft study report for the SWIP-North N-S non-simultaneous studies to the PRG for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate e-mails SWIP-North Path 14 W-E & E-W simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-31-11 By e-mail this date PG&E provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 N-S & S-N base cases concerning modification of COI flows.. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of PG&E’s comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 base cases and indicated the requested changes would be implemented. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-01-11 By e-mail this date PACE provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 base case representation of TOT 2B/2C. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-02-11 By e-mail this date SMUD re-iterated PG&E’s 01-31-11 comments to the Path 66 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-04-11 By e-mail this date IPC submitted a list of four comments to the base case used to provide the SWIP-North N-S non-simultaneous studies as distributed by USE Consulting on 01-31-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-14-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed the draft study report for the SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous studies to the PRG for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-23-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided notice of a joint SWIP-North and SWIP-South PRG meeting to be held in Las Vegas, NV on 03-22-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-28-11 By e-mail this date PACE submitted a list of six comments to the draft SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous study report as distributed by USE Consulting on 02-14-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-28-11 By e-mail this date SMUD requested additional detail on some of the information included in the draft SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous study report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-07-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate e-mails SWIP-North Path 65 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-17-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed the SWIP-North N-S and S-N non-simultaneous study reports to the PRG after having added all previously received comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-17-11 By e-mail this date PACE submitted an additional comment to the SWIP-North non-simultaneous study reports. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-17-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy addressed the comment from PACE and stated that the SWIP-South team is working on an answer to it. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-18-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate e-mails SWIP-North Path 26 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-04-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate e-mails SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-05-11 By e-mail this date IPC submitted comments to the SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 information distributed by USE Consulting on 04-04-11 and noted that there is potential for significant interaction between Borah West and SWIP North. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-11-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of IPC’s comments of 04-05-11 and indicated that simultaneous interaction analyses will be performed on both Path 17 and Path 19. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-12-11 By e-mail this date WAPA provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-12-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of WAPA’s comments of the same date and indicated their comments will be added into the study base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-18-2012 Cases for simultaneous studies were distributed for comment. Comments due on February 1, 2012. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-22-2012 PRG report was sent on this date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-25-12 Comments from NV Energy received. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-15-06 | Wyoming Colorado Intertie, LLC | N | **Wyoming - Colorado Intertie Project** | 2014 |
|  |  | N | 06-19-07 By e-mail this date Trans-Elect, Inc. submitted a Comprehensive Progress Report for the Wyoming – Colorado Intertie Project. The project will connect northeastern Wyoming to the Denver area via 345 kV transmission line. Current project configuration supports a planned rating of 900 MW. Comments are due by 08/19/07. In addition, interest in participation in a Project Review Group is due by 08/19/07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-03-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting Phase II status to the Wyoming – Colorado Intertie Project for a TOT3 (Path 36) rating increase of 900 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-28-08 By e-mail this date Trans-Elect, Inc. indicated their formation of a Phase II Project Review Group with the invitation remaining open until November 27, 2008. The first meeting of the PRG is tentatively scheduled for November 21, 2008 in Denver, CO. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-29-10 By e-mail this date Wyoming Colorado Intertie, LLC submitted a supplemental progress report for the Wyoming-Colorado Intertie Project. The projected in-service date was changed from 2012 to 2014. This project is owned by Wyoming Colorado Intertie, LLC, a member of the LS Power Group of companies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-26-04 | Sea Breeze Pacific (SBP) | N | **±550 MW Transmission interconnection between the Olympia Peninsula and Vancouver Island, British Columbia. (Juan de Fuca)** | 2012 |
|  |  | N | 11-05-04 By e-mail this date WECC distributed the October 26, 2004 Sea Breeze Pacific Regional Transmission System, Inc. letter  1) indicating their intention to initiate the regional planning process for a new 2 line DC connection between Vancouver Island and the Olympia Peninsula,  2) proposing a review group meeting November 10 or 11 in Vancouver BC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-27-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Sea Breeze Pacific Juan de Fuca Project has achieved Phase II status for a rating of +/- 550 MW. All comments submitted during the review period for the CPR were addressed and a revised and clarified CPR was distributed by Sea Breeze Pacific. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-29-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a modified letter indicating that the Sea Breeze Pacific Juan de Fuca Project has achieved Phase II status for a rating of +/- 550 MW. A few statements in the letter of 06-27-07 had to be corrected. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-05-07 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific distributed notification of the Sea Breeze Pacific Juan de Fuca Project Review Group meeting to be held on November 7, 2007 in Seattle, WA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-10-09 By letter this date an update to this project was provided by SBP. Major environmental permits have been received from both the U.S. and Canada and project is currently in a pre-construction phase. At this time, SBP is finalizing negotiations for engineering, procurement, and construction. The next meeting of the JDF PRG is proposed to occur August 31st, 2009 in Seattle, WA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-14-11 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific distributed notice of a web conference meeting scheduled for 02-28-11 to discuss the Scope of Work (SOW) for the Phase II studies to be performed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-02-12 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific distributed a letter to notify the PRG that the study design is now optimized accordingly and we have scheduled the modeling runs to start. A revised study scope will be available later this week and will be sent to you. The project is still pursuing Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-05-13 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific distributed a letter inviting participation in the Project Review Group. There is a kick off meeting scheduled for March 29, 2013. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-14-06 | Sithe Global | N | | **Navajo Transmission Project Segment 1** | 2016 |
|  |  | N | | 03-14-06 Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of Dine Power Authority (DPA) requested the initiation of the Project Rating Review process for establishing an accepted rating for the eastern segment (NTP Segment 1) of the Navajo Transmission Project. APS would be performing the studies in support of a 1500 MW non-simultaneous rating for DPA. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | | S | 03-14-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that APS had completed all requirements for Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process and has achieved Phase II for this project. |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | | S | 06-01-10 By e-mail this date Sithe Global provided notice that they are now the owners of this project and that the planned effective date has been changed from 2014 to 2016. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-08-06 | LS Power &  Great Basin Transmission LLC | N | **SWIP-South Project (formerly known as Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line (Great Basin Transmission Project))** | 2012 |
|  |  | N | 12-30-05 By e-mail this date request LS Power, LLC for Great Basin Transmission, LLC requested Phase 1 status for the Project Rating Review of the proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line project. The request was distributed to PCC and TSS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-26-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Great Basin Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status for a rating of 1430 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-26-09 By e-mail this date LS Power submitted study results previously provided to the PRG for entry into the Phase II Rating Log. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-24-09 By e-mail this date results for non-simultaneous studies were distributed to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-27-09 By e-mail this date initial power flow results and base cases for the SWIP-South/EOR Simultaneous Analysis were distributed to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-04-09 By e-mail this date NVEnergy provided a list of 6 questions/comments regarding the initial power flow results provided by LS Power. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-30-09 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed pre- and post-project SWIPS-Centennial simultaneous power flow base cases and dyd files for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-03-09 By e-mail this date the CAISO requested the addition of two items into the SWIP-South Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided notice that in January 2010, Great Basin Transmission (GBT) and NV Energy announced a MOU for joint development of a single Robinson Summit-Harry Allen 500 kV transmission line. SWIP-South Phase II rating studies have been resumed with GBT enlisting the services of USE Consulting to provide technical assistance. The SWIP-South Phase II rating study plan has been updated. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the most recent versions of the SWIP-South non-simultaneous cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-05-10 By e-mail this date the CAISO provided a list of seven comments to the Phase II study plan for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-28-10 By e-mail this date NV Energy provided comments to the Phase II study plan for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-03-10 By e-mail this date TransWest Express submitted a list of three comments to the SWIP-South Phase 2 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-25-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the most recent version of the SWIP-South 2013 LW non-simultaneous pre-project case and associated dynamics file. In a separate e-mail, USE Consulting also distributed two post-project cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-09-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed a sensitivity variation of the SWIP-South 13 HS non-simultaneous cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-30-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided responses to the three comments from TransWest Express on 08-03-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-30-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the finalized SWIP-South Phase 2 study plan after incorporating comments that had been received. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-01-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp noted that no simultaneous analyses between the SWIP-South project and east side transmission paths were evaluated. PacifiCorp requested the addition of the following simultaneous analyses: Path C, TOT 2C/TOT 2B1/TOT 2B2, IPP DC line, Bridger West, and Borah West. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-01-10 By e-mail this date Great Basin Transmission indicated that they will be performing simultaneous analyses for the TOT 2C/TOT 2B!/TOT 2B@ and the IPP DC line, but that the remaining paths requested by PacifiCorp in their 10-01-10 e-mail will be covered in the SWIP-North study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-01-10 By e-mail this date SMUD provided a comment to the SWIP-South study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-04-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp asked for information concerning the added generation in the IPC control area that was included in the case(s) being used for Phase 2 studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-04-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting responded to PacifiCorp’s question from the same date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-04-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp asked about resources necessary to justify the SWIP project N-S rating and how this rating will be affected if these resources aren’t available when the SWIP project is built. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-04-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting indicated that three different scenarios are being studied to load the SWIP project N-S out of Midpoint in Idaho. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-06-10 By e-mail this date TransWest Express asked for additional details on the Idaho resources being used in the SWIP-South Phase 2 studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-06-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting responded to the TransWest Express comments from the same date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-07-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp observed that each of the three configurations being considered to load the SWIP-North project would result in different ratings and asked if it would be a good idea to analyze SWIP-South in a similar manner. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-11-10 By e-mail this date USE Consulting responded to PacifiCorp’s comments from 10-07-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-21-10 Via 3 separate e-mails this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG (1) a draft report presenting initial results of the 2013 Heavy Summer N-S Non-Simultaneous case, (2) the base case used to produce these results, and (3) a sensitivity case including NVEnergy’s Sunrise 500/230 kV substation on the Harry Allen-Mead 500 kV line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-28-11 By e-mail this date LS Power provided notification of a SWIP South PRG meeting to be held 03-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-01-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP South PRG via two separate e-mails draft report material detailing non-simultaneous analyses for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-10-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the SWIP South/Path 26 simultaneous cases for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-18-11 By e-mail this date PACE provided updates to their system as represented in the cases used to produce the non-simultaneous report from 02-01-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-24-11 By e-mail this date LS Power provided notice that a loan guarantee for this project has been finalized. The project is scheduled to be in service before the end of 2012. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-24-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG, via two separate emails, four base cases for simultaneous analysis of SWIP-South and Path 32 (Pavant/Intermountain-Gonder 230 kV). Comments to the cases are due by 03-14-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG draft non-simultaneous analyses to be discussed at the SWIPPRG meeting planned for 03-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-18-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG meeting material for the 03-22-11 PRG meeting in Las Vegas. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-13-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted a letter indicating that the ON Line and SWIP-South projects are still separate projects and are still making progress through the 3-Phase rating process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-10-11 By three separate e-mails this date LSPower submitted to the PRG base cases for the SWIP South - TOT 2B-2C/IPP simultaneous studies. Review and comments were requested by 11-23-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-04-12 By e-mail this date LSPower submitted to the PRG base cases for the SWIP South – EOR/WOR simultaneous studies. Review and comments were requested by 01-18-12. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-14-12 By email this date the PRG report was sent. |  |

# PROJECTS BELOW ARE INACTIVE IN THIS FILE

Projects below have progressed to Phase 3 (at least) or have been cancelled.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-10-06 | Sierra Pacific Resources(SPR) | N | **One Nevada Line (ON Line) - (previously known as Ely Energy Center and its associated Robinson Summit – Harry Allen 500 kV Transmission Project)** | 12/2012 |
|  |  | N | 10-12-06 By letter this date, Sierra Pacific Resources (SPR) requested Phase 1 status for the Ely Energy Center and associated Robinson Summit-Harry Allen 500 kV transmission project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that SPR had completed all requirements for Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process and has achieved Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-30-07 By e-mail this date SPR distributed a revision of the Phase 2 Study Plan accommodating PRG comments received lately, before and during the WATS Conference call on April 17, 2007. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-15-09 By e-mail this date SPR distributed a letter stating that the Ely Energy Center project has been renamed to One Nevada Line and that the projected in-service date has been changed from 2011 to 12/2012. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-12-09 By e-mail this date NVEnergy distributed a letter concerning generation sources in the ON Line Phase II Project studies. The Ely Energy Center planned coal facility has been postponed, constituting a material change to the Phase II studies underway. New planned generation sources on the northern end of the project have been identified and project studies are being modified to implement these new sources. As such, NV Energy is modifying study base cases accordingly and will proceed with project studies with these new assumptions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-26-10 By e-mail this date NVEnergy distributed an updated Study Plan with comments received from TWE and PacifiCorp as well as a presentation for the Phase 2 PRG meeting scheduled for 09-27-10 in Reno, NV. A list of contingencies and a Voltage Stability Report were also distributed to the PRG via separate e-mails. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-14-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy distributed to the PRG members for review a simultaneous analysis for COI with ON Line and an updated Study Plan for the project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-29-11 By e-mail this date PACE submitted a comment relative to the NVEnergy and LS Power Annual Progress Reports and asked if only one 500 kV line is now planned south of Robinson Summit. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-30-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy provided a response to PACE and indicated that an omission had been made in their Annual Progress Report submittal. There are still two 500 kV lines being planned for south of Robinson Summit. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-13-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted a letter indicating that the ON Line and SWIP-South projects are still separate projects and are still making progress through the 3-Phase rating process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-23-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy distributed notification that they wish to remove this project from the Project Rating Review Process due to the fact that they plan to consolidate their northern and southern balancing areas into one balancing area. This would effectively make the ON Line an internal path. A presentation to TSS is planned for January 2012. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-02-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy distributed a letter to PRG members for the ON Line Project, in which they requested any comments or objections to the proposed ON Line rating withdrawal from the WECC Project Rating Review Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-16-11 By e-mail this date TransWest Express LLC (TWE)responded to NVEnergy’s request of 12-02-11 and indicated that they have concerns over how NVEnergy’s request to remove the ON Line Project from the Project Rating Review Process may impact the TransWest Express Project. As such, TWE is not ready to agree that the ON Line Project should be removed from the Project Rating Review Process but is willing to entertain further dialogue on the issue. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-19-11 By e-mail this date NV Energy acknowledged receipt of TWE’s comments from 12-16-11 and requested meeting(s) prior to the January TSS meeting to discuss this issue. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-22-11 By e-mail this date NV Energy notified ON Line Project PRG members that comments to their ON Line withdrawal request and Path 81 redefinition have been received from TWE and PacifiCorp but that a resolution is being sought. Further discussion and conference calls will be held when a potential resolution is developed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 1-23-12 By e-mail this date NV Energy notified ON Line Project PRG members of a meeting to discuss the withdrawal of the ON Line. The presentation provides information about various correspondences with WECC committees and the withdrawal of the project from the three phase process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 1-24-12 At the TSS meeting this project was withdrawn. This action was confirmed via email on 4/23/2012. It was requested that this project remain on the log until end of 2012. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-25-08 | BC Transmission Corp. (BCTC) | N | **Path 3 (Northwest-BC) S-N Rating Increase** |  |
|  |  | N | 04-25-08 By e-mail this date BC Transmission Corp (BCTC) and ColumbiaGrid requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Path 3 (Northwest-BC) South-North rating increase project. The project consists of an increase of the conductor to ground clearance on the BC side of the path. Necessary upgrades to the U.S. side of the path will be identified during Phase I studies. The south to north rating on Path 3 is expected to increase from the current 2000 MW up to 3000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-16-11 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 3 S-N Uprate Project has achieved Phase II status with a Planned Rating of 3000 MW S-N (Northwest-British Columbia). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-19-11 By e-mail this date SMUD provided comments to base case conditions to be studied in the Path 3 Study Plan. |  |
|  |  | S | 06-07-12 By email on this date BC Hydro is initiating the PRG 30-day comment period for its Path 3 re-rating Phase 2 Project Rating Report. The Phase 2 study has demonstrated that the Path 3 S-N transfer increase from 2000 MW to 3000 MW has no negative impact on other WECC paths with the identified mitigation measures. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 6/29/2012 By email this date comments were received from Seattle City Light on the Project Rating Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 7/3/2012 By email this date comments were received from BPA on the Project Rating Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 7/6/2012 By email this date comments were received from Powerex on the Project Rating Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-5-2012 By email this date the Phase II Report was posted for PCC/TSS/OC 30-day review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 12-13-12 By email this date Scott Waples, PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 status with an accepted rating of 3000 MW |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-27-08 | Idaho Power Company (IPC) | N | **Hemingway to Boardman Transmission Project** | 2012 |
|  |  | N | 02-27-08 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Hemingway to Boardman Transmission Project. The proposed project is a single circuit 500 kV transmission line starting at a proposed substation located southwest of Boise named Hemingway and ending at Boardman Substation. The line is approximately 230 miles long and will be rated at 1000 MW bi-directional. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-11-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Hemingway-Boardman 500 kV Project has achieved Phase II status and a planned rating of 1300 MW west to east and 800 MW east to west. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-19-11 By e-mail this date IPC distributed notice of a Phase II kick-off meeting to be held at the Northwest Power Pool (NWPP) offices on 6-22-11. IPC also made another request for participation on their Phase II PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-03-11 By e-mail this date SMUD submitted a list of 5 comments to the Phase II Study Plan for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-22-11 – Phase II Kick-off meeting held at the Northwest Power Pool (NWPP) offices in Portland, Oregon.  11-15-11 – Second Phase II Meeting held at the NWPP offices in Portland, Oregon.  03-8-11 – Announcement for the third Phase II meeting to be held at the NWPP offices in Portland, Oregon. Draft report provided to the review group.  03-22-12 – Third Phase II Meeting held at the NWPP offices in Portland, Oregon.  07-27-12 – Draft Report (proposed Final Report) provided to the review group. Announcement for the final meeting to be held via conference call on 8/10/12.  08-10-12 – Final Phase II meeting held via conference call. Companies with participants on the call: (1) NV Energy, (2) PGE, (3) BC Hydro, (4) Northwestern Energy, (5) PacifiCorp, (6) Avista, (7) SMUD, & (8) BPA. Review group members support the draft report in its current form contingent on two items: (1) Discuss with BPA whether a simultaneous study is required between BPA’s West of McNary path and the Idaho-Northwest path in the east-to-west direction, and (2) Confirm with SWIP project participants that their project was adequately studied.  08-13-12 – E-mail from BPA stating that they do not see a need to study Idaho-Northwest at 3400 MW east-to-west simultaneous with West of McNary at 4500 MW in the Hemingway-Boardman Phase 2 process. BPA plans to begin Phase II studies for West of McNary this fall. If the study needs to be done, it can be done in West of McNary Phase II.  08-20-12 – E-mail from LS Power stating SWIP was adequately studied. Recommend updating the report with the most recent information. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-14-07 | Tri-State G&T, Inc. (TSGT) | N | **TOT3 Archer Interconnection Project (previously known as TOT3 300 MW Upgrade Project)** | 2013 |
|  |  | N | 02-27-07 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Cooperative (BEPC) distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report requesting the initiation of the Project Rating Review Process for the TOT3 300 MW Upgrade Project. The project is expected to be completed in two stages, with the first stage resulting in a 200 MW rating increase and the second stage in a 100 MW rating increase on TOT3. A request was also made for interest in participation in a Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-03-07 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the BEPC TOT3 300 MW Upgrade Project has achieved Phase II status with a proposed TOT 3 rating of 1980 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-29-08 By e-mail this date a letter was distributed indicating that BEPC has relinquished sponsorship of the TOT3 (Path 36) 300 MW Upgrade Project and that Tri-State G&T, Inc. (TSGT) has assumed that role. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-29-08 By e-mail this date an additional letter was distributed by TSGT regarding formation of a Phase II Project Review Group (PRG) for the TOT3 (Path 36) 300 MW Upgrade Project. TSGT requested notification of interest in PRG participation by November 27, 2008. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-27-09 By e-mail this date TSGT indicated that the name of this project is being changed to the TOT3 Archer Interconnection Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-11-10 By e-mail this date TSGT noted that the PRG met on 01-20-10 to discuss the draft report of study results. Report comments were received with minor additional power flow and dynamic study work identified. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-25-11 By e-mail this date PSCo provided a list of comments to a draft PRG study report that was prepared by TSGT. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 5-25-12 By e-mail this date TSGT distributed the Phase II report for 30 day review. The report indicates that the project achieves the rating of 1844 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 6-6-12 By e-mail this date PSCO provided a letter objecting to this project being granted Phase III status. Reason provided are: First, PSCo maintains that the methodology used to stress the Tot 3 path to its non-simultaneous limit is unreasonable. Second, the simultaneous interactions between the Tot 3 and Tot 7 transfer paths have not been adequately addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-4-12 By email PSCo indicated that they have rescinded their objection to the project moving to Phase 3. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-4-12 By email Tri-State supplied study results to some additional studies that were done by Tri-State and PSCo to address PSCo’s objection. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 11-19-12 By email the PCC Chair provided a letter granting Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 1843 MW north to south. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-28-08 | NorthWestern Energy (NWE) | N | **Mountain States 500 kV Transmission Intertie (MSTI)** | 2013 |
|  |  | N | 03-28-08 By e-mail this date NorthWestern Energy Company (NWE) requested entry into Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Mountain States 500 kV Transmission Intertie Project (MSTI). The project consists of a 500 kV line approximately 460 miles long and built between Townsend, MT and Midpoint Substation in Idaho. MSTI is expected to have a north to south rating of 1500 MW and a south to north rating of 950 MW. A phase-shifting transformer located near Mill Creek substation in Montana will control power flow on MSTI. NWE also submitted the Comprehensive Progress Report on this date for 60-day review and requested interest in participating in a Phase II Project Review Group with a response deadline of 05/27/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-18-08 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the MSTI Project sponsored by NWE has achieved Phase II status. The comments submitted by PPL Energy Plus on 5/27/08 will be addressed during the Phase II study process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-28-09 By e-mail this date notice was provided of the next PRG meeting to be held 9/29/09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-21-09 By e-mail this date NWE posted an agenda for the 9-29-09 PRG meeting on OASIS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-01-09 By e-mail this date NWE distributed noticed of the next PRG meeting for the MSTI Project to be held 10-28-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-21-09 By e-mail this date NWE posted an agenda for the 10-28-09 PRG meeting as well as meeting notes from the 9-29-09 PRG meeting on their OASIS site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-29-09 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held on 12-02-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-23-09 By e-mail this date NWE changed the 12-02-09 PRG meeting date to 12-16-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-25-09 By e-mail this date NWE posted meeting minutes from the 10-28-09 PRG meeting on their OASIS site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-15-09 By e-mail this date NWE noted that the planned 12-16-09 Phase II PRG meeting was cancelled and rescheduled to 01-06-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-17-09 By e-mail this date PPL Energy provided two alternate topologies for the MSTI project for consideration. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-30-09 By e-mail this date NWE posted the agenda for the 01-06-10 Phase II meeting on their OASIS site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-08-10 By e-mail this date PPL Energy placed a request to see all study results to date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-12-09 By e-mail this date NWE distributed notice of the next MSTI Phase II PRG meeting, to be held 02-03-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-14-10 By e-mail this date NWE posted meeting minutes from the 01-06-10 PRG meeting on their OASIS site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-04-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of a PRG meeting to be held 02-22-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-10-10 By e-mail this date PPL Energy, BPA, and PSE requested study results for all MSTI simultaneous studies, thermal, voltage stability, and dynamic stability. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-17-10 By e-mail this date NWE rescheduled the 02-22-10 PRG meeting to 03-09-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-11-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of a PRG meeting to be held 04-12-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-13-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 05-13-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-14-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 07-01-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-29-10 By e-mail this date PPL Energy submitted a list of four questions to be discussed at the 07-01-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-06-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 08-18-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-19-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 09-14-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-20-10 By e-mail this date NWE distributed draft reports for Path 18 and Path 14 simultaneous study results that were reviewed at the 09-14-10 Phase 2 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-21-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 10-28-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-26-10 By e-mail this date NWE rescheduled the 10-28-10 meeting to 11-18-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-30-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 12-15-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-17-10 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 1-18-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-18-11 By e-mail this date NWE posted results from five separate studies related to the MSTI Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-24-11 By e-mail this date NWE provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 02-22-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-23-11 By e-mail this date NWE posted two reports on their OASIS site related to the MSTI Project and also provided notice of the next PRG meeting to be held 03-15-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-11 By e-mail this date NWE posted the draft Phase II report on their OASIS site for PRG review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-22-11 By e-mail this date BPA submitted a list of 3 comments to the draft Phase II report of 03-15-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-22-11 By e-mail this date NWE provided a response to BPA’s comments of the same date and also noted that SSR studies for MSTI have not yet been completed. These studies are planned. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-25-11 By e-mail this date PSE provided a number of comments to the MSTI Phase II report of 03-15-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-23-11 By e-mail this date NWE distributed the MSTI Phase II Study Report to PCC, TSS, and OC for 30-day review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-17-11 By e-mail this date PPL Energy submitted comments to NWE on the MSTI Phase II Study Report that was distributed on 05-23-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-24-11 By e-mail this date NWE provided responses to PPL Energy’s comments of 06-17-11 and also requested further clarification on these comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-30-11 By e-mail this date PPL Energy replied to NWE’s e-mail of 06-24-11 and indicated they will not be able to respond fully until the week of 07-11-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-11 By e-mail this date NWE acknowledged receipt of PPL Energy’s response on the same date and stated that comments are due by 07-07-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-07-11 By e-mail this date PPL EnergyPlus and PPL Montana submitted a list of 3 comments to NWE’s responses on 06-24-11 to PPL’s previous comments to the Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-08-11 By e-mail this date NWE provided responses to PPL’s comments from 07-07-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-03-11 By e-mail this date NWE distributed to the MSTI PRG an updated Study Report based on PPL’s comments from 07-07-11 for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-09-11 By e-mail this date NWE distributed to PCC, OC and TSS the MSTI Phase II Study Report for 30-day review. This is a second 30-day review by this group due to the fact that the report was modified with PPL’s comments (see 08-03-11 entry above). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-09-11 By e-mail this date NWE indicated that no additional comments have been received relative to the second review of the Phase II Study Report and requested Phase III status for the MSTI Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 09-27-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed notification that the MSTI Project is granted Phase III status with Accepted Ratings of 1100 MW S-N and 1500 MW N-S. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-12-07 | Southwestern Power Group II, LLC (SWPG) | N | **SunZia Southwest Transmission Project** | 2015 |
|  |  | N | 07-12-07 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Regional Planning Project Report for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project had been accepted, thus completing the Regional Review for said project. In addition, a request was made for entry of the project into Phase I of the Project Rating Process and this was granted. The proposed project is an addition to the existing Path 47 and is expected to provide at least 1200 MW of transmission capacity between southern New Mexico and southern Arizona on a non-simultaneous rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-27-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status and a planned rating of 3000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-30-09 By e-mail this date Southwestern Power Group distributed notice of the kick-off Phase II PRG Meeting for August 27, 2009 at SRP meeting facilities in Scottsdale, AZ. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-20-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed meeting material for the kick-off PRG meeting for 8/27/09 in Scottsdale. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-03-09 By e-mail this date meeting minutes and presentation material were distributed from the 08-27-09 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-22-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed two updated base cases to the PRG for their review and comment. SWPG also provided, via separate email, an updated version of the Phase II study plan to PRG members for their review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed two updated pre-project base cases to the PRG with all comments incorporated. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed two post-project non-simultaneous transfer base cases to the PRG for their review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-28-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed two post-project base cases to the PRG with all comments incorporated. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-16-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed Phase II Power Flow and Transient Stability study results, via two separate emails, to the PRG for their review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-17-09 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed Phase II Post-Transient study results to the PRG for their review and comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-03-10 By e-mail this date SWPG provided notice of the second Phase II PRG meeting to be held on 02-10-10 at the PDS Consulting offices in Tempe, AZ. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-11-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed presentation material that was discussed at the 02-10-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-25-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed meeting minutes and additional meeting material from the 02-10-10 PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed an Annual Progress Report for the SunZia Project and indicated that the projected in-service date has been changed to early 2014 (previously 2011). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-13-10 By e-mail this date SWPG provided notice of the next Phase II PRG meeting to be held 10-20-10 in Tempe, AZ. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-14-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed simultaneous steady-state, transient, and post-transient study results between SunZia and Paths 22, 47, and 48 to the PRG for their review. By separate e-mail, simultaneous study results between SunZia and Paths 50 and 54 were also distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-15-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed a summary of remedial action scheme analysis for various Category B & C contingencies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-07-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed study results to be discussed at the 10-20-10 PRG meeting, including the following sensitivity cases: new Willow-Tortolita 500 kV line in lieu of 2nd Willow-Pinal\_C 500 kv line, and the new SunZia E-Hidalgo 500 kV lines in lieu of the two SunZia E-SunZia S 500 kV lines. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-15-10 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed to the PRG for their review study results including power flow, transient stability and post-transient voltage analyses for the Sensitivity Case T3 which includes transmission assumptions for the impact of looping the two SunZia S-Willow 500 kV lines into Hidalgo. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-10-11 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed the draft Phase II Study Report to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-12-11 By e-mail this date APS provided some comments to the draft Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-12-11 By e-mail this date SRP provided comments to the draft Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-11 By e-mail this date SWPG distributed the final version of the Phase II Study Report to the PRG for their review and approval. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-11-11 By e-mail this date TEP provided some minor corrections to the final Phase II Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-22-11 By e-mail this date SWPG submitted the Phase II Study Report for 30 day review and requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-30-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project has achieved Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-01-05 | SDGE |  | **Sunrise Powerlink Project** | 6/2012 |
|  |  | N | 11-01-05 By letter this date SDGE initiated the process to include the Sunrise Powerlink Project in Phase 1 of the rating process. The project is to add series compensation to the Imperial Valley – Central 500 kV transmission line and transformers and reactors at Central; and to build 2 Central – Sycamore Canyon 230 kV transmission lines, the Sycamore Canyon – Penasquitos 230 kV line, and SVD at four locations. The rating of the project is expected to be 2364 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By letter this date the WECC staff distributed a letter announcing that Sunrise Powerlink has achieved Phase 2 Status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-27-07 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a draft path rating study plan for the Sunrise Powerlink Project |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-05-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments to the draft path rating study plan distributed by SDGE on 06-27-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-05-07 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed two non-simultaneous base cases: pre-Sunrise and post-Sunrise. Modifications to the cases were requested by 07-10-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-09-07 By e-mail this date PDS Consulting submitted comments concerning conditions in the post-Sunrise base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-09-07 By e-mail this date SRP submitted comments concerning both of the base cases distributed by SDGE on 07-05-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-10-07 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments concerning the base cases distributed by SDGE on 07-05-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-10-07 By e-mail this date PDS Consulting provided an answer to one of the questions posed by LDWP on 07-10-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-10-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided additional comments to the draft path rating study plan distributed by SDGE on 06-27-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-20-07 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a revised Phase II Study Plan that incorporated comments from reviews and a conference call that was held 07-12-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-24-07 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a pre-Sunrise and a post-Sunrise base case to the Sunrise PRG and WATS group. Both base cases are non-simultaneous. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-26-07 By e-mail this date a notice was distributed to the PRG with information on the next PRG meeting on 07-31-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-30-07 By e-mail this date LADWP provided updates/modifications in their area to the non-simultaneous base cases currently being used for studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-30-07 By e-mail this date LADWP provided comments to the Sunrise Powerlink Path Rating Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-07 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a draft version of the Phase II Study Plan to the PRG. In addition, both pre- and post-Sunrise non-simultaneous base cases were included in the email for the PRG review. Since the GPN Project recently achieved Phase III status and an accepted rating, this project was included in the base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-26-07 By e-mail this date SDGE indicated via e-mail that in a November 1, 2007 conference call, both WATS and the Sunrise Powerlink PRG approved SDGE’s study plan and both pre/post project non-simultaneous cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-03-08 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed results from a revised non-simultaneous analysis, which included fine-tuning of cases and reruns of thermal contingency, post-transient and transient analyses. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-08-08 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed results from a Path 46 simultaneous analysis for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-27-08 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed Sunrise Powerlink – Path 49 simultaneous results to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-10-08 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed Sunrise Powerlink – Green Path North simultaneous results to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-18-08 By e-mail this date USE Consulting distributed Sunrise Powerlink – Path 26 simultaneous results to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-11-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E distributed a draft Phase II study report to the PRG for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-31-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E distributed to the PRG additional study results for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-02-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided Path 44 and Path 45 base cases and switching sequence files for Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-09-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided some post-transient study results for a Path 49 simultaneous case as requested by SCE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E submitted the Phase II Project Rating Report for the Sunrise Powerlink Project for 30-day review and requested Phase III status on successful completion of Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-06-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided some additional sensitivity analyses that were requested by SCE subsequent to distribution of the Project Rating Report on 09-17-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-15-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E requested from SCE any comments to the analyses that were provided on 10-06-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-19-09 By e-mail this date SCE indicated they had reviewed the analyses from 10-06-09 and approved of the results. SCE requested that these study results be incorporated into the final Phase II Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-20-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E indicated they would add the study results into the final Phase II Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 11-04-09 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Sunrise Powerlink Project has achieved Phase III status for an Accepted Rating of 1000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 06-15-06 | Arizona Public Service Company (APS) |  | | **Increase the Southern Navajo (Path 51) Path Rating to 3,200 MW** | 2010 |
|  |  | N | | 06-15-06 Arizona Public Service Company (APS) on behalf of Path 51 owners requested the initiation of the Project Rating Review process for establishing an accepted rating for the Southern Navajo path (Path 51) from 2,264 MW to 3,100 MW. APS and others will be performing the studies. |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 11-07-07 By e-mail this date the TSS chair distributed a letter granting Phase II status to the Southern Navajo Upgrade Project for a proposed rating of 3200 MW. No comments to the CPR and no interest in formation of a review group was received. The project involves only upgrades to the four existing series capacitors in the path. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 10-23-09 By e-mail this date APS distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review. Since initiation of this project, which includes upgrades to the four series capacitors located within Path 51, the original proposed rating of 3200 MW has been reduced to 2800 MW. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | N | | 11-30-09 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed notice that the Path 51 Uprate Project has successfully completed Phase II and achieved Phase III status for an Accepted Rating of 2800 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9-29-97 | PAC |  | **Midpoint-Summer Lake 500kV Line Rating** | - |
|  |  | N | 9-29-97 By letter dated September 26, 1997, PAC announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Rating Process to achieve an Accepted Rating for the Midpoint-Summer Lake line as a separate path between southern Oregon and Twin Falls. They announced a Phase 2 Review Group meeting for some time in October. | Comments due  10/26/97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 6-14-00 By letter dated June 14, 2000, TSS granted Phase 2 status for the project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 2-21-02 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a letter announcing its plans to begin the process of reforming the Project Review Group and form the Phase 2 Project Review Group for the Midpoint-summer Lake 500 kV line rating in the west to east direction. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 6-13-02 By e-mail this date a letter from California members of the MPSL was sent to PacifiCorp restating the concerns about the Phase 2 rating process for the Midpoint-Summer Lake 650 MW eastbound rating. Members signing the letter were SMUD, PG&E, CISO, SCE, and TANC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-30-05 By e-mail this date PAC indicated a Midpoint-Summer Lake 500 kV Rating Studies meeting is scheduled for 09-21-05 in Portland, OR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-14-05 By letter this date SMUD, PG&E, CISO, SCE, WAPA, and TANC sent a letter to PAC indicating that the approach PacifiCorp is taking in the MPSL rating studies is inconsistent with the “Overview of Policies and Procedures for Regional Planning Project Review, Project Rating Review and Progress Reports” |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-22-05 By e-mail this date PAC distributed for comment a base case and study plan to the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-23-05 By e-mail this date PAC distributed a revised base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-28-05 By e-mail this date SMUD, PG&E, CISO, SCE, WAPA, and TANC sent an e-mail to PAC that indicates the short time to review the base case, study plan, and respond by December 2, 2005 is not reasonable. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-9-05 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting distributed comments regarding three major aspects of MPSL WECC Phase 2 Rating Study; 1) adherence with WECC Procedures, 2) the Study Plan, and 3) the 2005 HS base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-06-06 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting (TANC) submitted comments questioning PAC’s e-mail dated 1/24/2006. In the 1/24/06 e-mail PAC stated that the study plan was approved with the exception of the starting conditions. TANC does not agree that the study plan was approved. TANC feels there are many outstanding issues and significant items that are not reflected in the study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-07-06 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted comments regarding PAC’s study plan and other issues. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-18-06 By e-mail this date PAC submitted a revised study plan including two significant additions and a number of minor updates |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-01-06 By e-mail this date BPA submitted comments to the revised study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-07-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments questioning the choice of the study year being summer 2006 instead of being closer to the planned in-service date of the new accepted rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-13-06 By e-mail this date PAC addressed LDWP questions from 09-07-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-25-07 By e-mail this date PAC distributed a revised study plan and schedule for the Midpoint-Summer Lake 500 kV Line Rating. PAC also distributed Appendices to the previously prepared NOPSG report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-22-08 By e-mail this date PAC distributed a comprehensive phase 2 report and appendices to the PRG for the Midpoint-Summer Lake 500 kV line eastbound uprate study for their comment. A review group meeting was scheduled for March 21, 2008 at the Portland PDX. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-05-08 By e-mail this date PAC distributed a change of date for the review meeting. The meeting is now scheduled for march 19th at the Portland PDX. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-06-08 By e-mail this date BPA submitted comments to the comprehensive phase 2 report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-30-08 By e-mail this date PAC distributed a revised study report to the review group that included comments from the March 19, 2008 review group meeting in Portland. QV study results provided by BPA were also included. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-30-08 By e-mail this date NorthWestern Energy (NWE) provided comments to the study report that PAC distributed on 04/30/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-01-08 By e-mail this date BPA provided comments to the study report that PAC distributed on 04/30/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-12-08 By e-mail this date PAC responded to BPA’s comments from 05/01/08 by providing requested simulation plots. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-12-08 By e-mail this date PAC responded to the NWE comments of 04/30 and indicated that they would be addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-13-08 By e-mail this date BPA provided 4 additional comments to the study report that PAC distributed on 04/30/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-15-08 By e-mail this date PAC responded to BPA’s comments of 05/13 and requested additional clarification on two of the comments |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-15-08 By e-mail this date BPA provided the clarification requested by PAC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-22-08 By e-mail this date SCE and LADWP submitted comments to the PACE study report indicating that no studies were reported on with respect to simultaneous interactions between MPSL and PDCI. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-25-08 By e-mail this date PACE responded to the SCE and LDWP comments of 08/22/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-26-08 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted additional comments requesting information on both non-simultaneous and simultaneous studies and results. LDWP indicated that they believe simultaneous studies have not yet been completed for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-17-08 By e-mail this date PACE sent a copy of the Phase I study report from 1998 to LDWP with their non-simultaneous study work. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-24-08 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted additional comments to PACE suggesting that since the non-simultaneous studies were completed 10 years ago, the results are stale and should be re-done due to many changes in system topology, dynamics data modeling improvements. It was also requested that the simultaneous studies be revisited and that the whole PRG be involved in discussions concerning these issues. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-01-08 By e-mail this date PACE submitted a Phase II Study Review Group Report to PCC and TSS for their review. Comments are due by 10/30/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-24-08 By e-mail this date LDWP contacted the PCC and TSS chairs claiming that PacifiCorp had failed to follow the WECC 3-Phase Rating Process by not including LDWP in the Midpoint-Summer Lake Phase II Review Group activities, including development of the Phase II Report, and by failing to perform LDWP-requested simultaneous and non-simultaneous studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-24-08 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair informed LDWP that the Midpoint-Summer Lake Project and associated WECC 3-Phase Rating Process issues is on the meeting agenda for discussion at the October 31, 2008 PCC meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-28-08 By e-mail this date, a letter from the CAISO, PG&E, SCE, SMUD and TANC was submitted with comments to the PACE report of 10-01-08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-29-08 By e-mail this date, Portland General Electric submitted substantial comments to PacifiCorp’s Phase II Rating Study Study Review Group Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-31-08 By e-mail this date, Avista Corp. submitted a letter indicating that the recent MPSL studies distributed by PacifiCorp noted that slight impacts to Avista’s transmission system occurred for certain BPA 500 kV contingencies around the Idaho panhandle. However, the recent addition of two pieces of equipment in the Avista area mitigate the above-mentioned impacts to the Avista system. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-02-08 By e-mail this date PACE distributed 3 new base cases to PRG members as requested at the 10-31-08 PCC Meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-08-08 By e-mail this date the CAISO noted that Celilo reactive support in one of the PacifiCorp-distributed cases of 12-02-08 is inconsistent with PDCI flows. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-09-08 By e-mail this date PG&E noted some line rating and shunt element discrepancies in the base cases PacifiCorp distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-09-08 By e-mail this date LADWP requested the addition of two topology changes within the LA area to the cases distributed by PacifiCorp on 12-02-08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date PACE indicated the requested changes would not be made to the cases because of the difficulty in comparing study results from new cases to those of old cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date LADWP reiterated their request to update the cases with their changes to correctly model their system. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date PACE noted that since the LADWP updates aren’t expected to have a significant effect on the system, it would be easier to compare study results without adding them. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date LADWP again requested that their changes be made to the cases in order to correct improper representation of their system. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date PACE indicated that the requested LADWP updates would be incorporated in the study cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-06-09 At the October 2008 PCC meeting, PacifiCorp was asked to perform additional studies for the Phase II Rating Report. By e-mail March 6, 2009 PacifiCorp submitted the Midpoint-Summer Lake Phase II Addendum Studies and Report for 30-day review with comments due by April 6, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-27-09 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted two comments to the Phase II Report submitted by PacifiCorp on March 6, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-03-09 By e-mail this date Southern California Edison, Sacramento Municipal Utilities District, Transmission Agency of Northern California, Pacific Gas & Electric, Bonneville Power Administration, and Western Area Power Administration-SNR submitted comments to PacifiCorp’s Phase II Addendum Studies and Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-13-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a revised Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review, which addresses all comments received from study group members through 4/3/09. Upon acceptance of this report, PacifiCorp requests Phase III status with an accepted rating of 550 MW west-to-east for the Midpoint-Summer Lake 500 kV line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-09-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed an updated study report with revisions requested by LDWP. PacifiCorp requested Phase III status in the WECC 3-phase rating process. The revised report was posted on the WECC web site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-22-09 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that on 07/09/09, members of the Project Review Group reached agreement on the Phase II Project Rating Report issued on 05/13/09. As a result, the Midpoint-Summer Lake Project was granted Phase III status and an Accepted Rating of 550 MW west to east. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-19-07 | PacifiCorp | N | **Populus - Terminal Transmission Project** | 2010 |
|  |  | N | 11-19-07 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp announced the initiation of the Expedited Review Process for the Populus - Terminal Transmission Project. The proposed project consists of a new 345 kV station (Populus) in southeastern Idaho and a new 176 mile-long 345 kV double circuit transmission line connecting this new station to PacifiCorp’s existing Ben Lomond and Terminal substations in Utah. Additionally, the existing Bridger-Borah, Bridger-Kinport, and Ben Lomond-Borah 345 kV lines will be looped in and out of the Populus substation. A Comprehensive Progress Report was distributed for review and comments were requested by December 21, 2007. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested, with a notification deadline of December 21, 2007. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-16-08 By e-mail this date, the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Populus-Terminal Transmission Project has achieved Phase II status. Comments to the CPR were received from Idaho Power Co., NorthWestern Energy, and the Western Area Power Administration. All parties agreed that their comments can be addressed during the Phase II study process and PacifiCorp is committed to do so. These three entities also agreed to participate in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-08-08 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a Phase II Project Rating Report for the Populus-Terminal 345 kV Project for 30-day review by PCC. Any comments are due by 11/7/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-20-08 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status to the Populus-Terminal Project with an Accepted Rating of 1600 MW north-to-south and 1250 MW south-to-north. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-30-05 | WAPA |  | **Path 36 (TOT3) Upgrade (Miracle Mile – Ault 230 kV Transmission line)** | 2009 |
|  |  | N | 01-05-05 By e-mail this date WAPA announced their intent to increase the TOT3 transfer capability by 75 MW (1605 to 1680 MW). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-10-06 By letter this date the TSS Chair confirmed that the proposed rating increase for Path 36 due to the construction of the Miracle Mile-Ault 230 kV line project has achieved Phase 2 status for a new rating of 1680 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-05-07 By e-mail this date WAPA requested interest in formation of a Project Review Group and also submitted a draft Phase II rating report as background information for those who are interested in participating in the Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-27-07 By e-mail this date PRPA submitted a list of seven comments concerning the power flow(s) being used in the studies for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-19-08 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted a Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review by PCC for the Path 36 75 MW Upgrade Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 07-16-08 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed indicating that WAPA’s TOT 3 Upgrade Project (Miracle Mile-Ault 230 kV transmission line) has achieved Phase III status with an accepted rating of 1680 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-19-05 | Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. |  | **Montana Alberta Tie Project** | 2007 |
|  |  | N | 08-19-05 By letter this date Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. initiated the process to include the Montana Alberta Tie project in the regional planning process. The project is to build a 230 kV transmission line from Lethbridge, Alberta to Great Falls Montana. The expected project rating is 300 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-02-06 By letter this date, the TSS chair issued a letter indicating that the Montana Alberta Tie Project met all the requirements for Phase 2 and granted Phase 2 status for a rating of 300 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-01-06 By e-mail this date Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. submitted a scope change to the original project due to additional constraints identified. Because of the scope change, Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. re-opened the Project Review Group to new membership for another 30 days (until 10/31/06). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-12-07 By e-mail this date Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. submitted another scope change to the original project by removing the wind generation connection sensitivity analysis to expedite the path rating approval. The associated wind farms are not scheduled to be connected to the MATL line until shortly after the MATL line is in-service. Said wind farms will not be connected until MATL obtains a path rating modification at a later date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-25-07 By e-mail this date Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. submitted via 3 separate e-mails a Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review by PCC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-28-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed indicating that the MATL project has achieved Phase III status with an accepted rating of +/- 300 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-23-05 | IID |  | **Imperial Valley to San Felipe 500 kV Project** | 12/2010 |
|  |  | N | 11-03-05 By letter this date IID initiated the Phase 1 process for the Imperial Valley – San Felipe 500 kV Project. The project is to build a 500 kV transmission line from the Imperial Valley Substation owned by SDGE and IID to a new IID San Felipe Substation. The expected project rating is 1000 MW or higher. IID requested the formation of a review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By letter this date the WECC staff distributed a letter announcing that IV San Felipe has achieved Phase 2 Status. The rating of the project is expected to be 1000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-03-07 By e-mail this date IID indicated that the Imperial Valley – San Felipe 500 kV Project has been cancelled. The project will be removed from the Phase II log. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-15-06 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP) | N | **Path 27 Upgrade (Intermountain Southern Transmission System DC Line)** | 04/2009 |
|  |  | N | 08-23-06 By e-mail this date, the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP) requested the formation of a review group and Phase 1 status for increasing the Path 27 rating from 1920 MW to 2400 MW. In addition, a comprehensive progress report was submitted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-10-06 By e-mail this date, the WECC Staff distributed a letter indicating that the Path 27 Upgrade Project has achieved Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-22-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources submitted comments to LADWP concerning the Path 27 Phase II study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-04-06 By e-mail this date, SCE provided comments to LADWP concerning the Path 27 Phase II study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-19-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources submitted additional comments to LADWP concerning the Phase II study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-03-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided post-transient IPP bipolar outage study results to address SPR’s questions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-03-07 By e-mail this date SPR requested clarification on IPP bipolar outage study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-04-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided pre- and post-project base cases along with one-line diagrams and requested comments/changes to the base cases by 01-10-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-05-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided corrected IPP bipolar outage study results to address the SPR e-mail of 01-03-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-08-07 By separate e-mails this date both PACE and SCE provided power flow changes to the base cases that LDWP provided on 01-04-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-09-07 By e-mail this date SDGE provided power flow changes to the base cases that LDWP provided on 01-04-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-09-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the Path 27 Upgrade – Phase II Study Plan and requested comments to it by 01-16-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-10-07 By separate e-mails this date both PACE and SPR provided comments to the Path 27 Upgrade – Phase II Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-10-07 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated that they had received all comments/changes to the base cases they distributed for review on 01/04/07 and would begin making the requested changes. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-12-07 By separate e-mails this date both SCE and SDGE submitted comments to the Path 27 Upgrade – Phase II Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-14-07 By e-mail this date LDWP provided responses to all comments received to the Study Plan |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-16-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an updated and final version of the Path 27 Upgrade – Phase II Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-23-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an approved updated version of the Path 27 Upgrade – Phase II Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-29-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed pre- and post- project simultaneous Path 27 and TOT 2 base cases for the PRG to review. Comments were requested by 02-02-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-01-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed pre- and post- project simultaneous Path 27 and Path 61 base cases for the PRG to review. Comments were requested by 02-05-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-01-07 By separate e-mails this date both PACE and SDGE submitted comments to the simultaneous Path 27 and Path 61 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-01-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed updated pre- and post- project simultaneous Path 27 and Path 41 base cases for PRG review. Additional comments were requested by 02-06-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-12-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed some study results for simultaneous TOT2/Path 27, Path 26/Path 27, and Path 61/Path 27. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-30-07 By e-mail this date SPR submitted two comments concerning Path 32. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-30-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed additional study results for Paths 32, 41, and 46 simultaneously with path 27. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-01-07 By e-mail this date LDWP addressed the two comments submitted by SPR on 04-30-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-18-07 By e-mail this date Pacificorp expressed concerns over the simultaneous study results that LADWP presented at the 05-04-07 WATS/WECC PRG Meeting. Pacificorp requested that either additional studies be performed or that restrictions to the IPP DC Upgrade rating be clearly indicated in the final rating report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-03-07 By e-mail this date Pacificorp requested an update on the scheduled in-service date of the IPP DC Upgrade, completion of the study report, and asked if help was needed in performing additional studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-06-07 By e-mail this date LADWP indicated that Pacificorp’s concerns (noted in the 05-18-07 entry above) would be addressed in the final report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-26-07 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed a draft version of the PRG Accepted Rating Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-30-07 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed the appendices to the draft version of the PRG Accepted Rating Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-30-07 By e-mail this date PACE submitted comments to the draft PRG Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-02-07 By e-mail this date LADWP responded to PACE regarding their comments from 07-30-07 and agreed to address the issues. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-07-07 By e-mail this date LADWP noted that comments to the PRG Study Report distributed on 07-26-07 are due by August 16th. A conference call is scheduled for August 20th to approve the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-15-07 By e-mail this date SPR requested that LDWP include the study results from 05-01-07 in the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-16-07 By e-mail this date LADWP agreed to include the additional information in the Phase II report and provided the proposed text. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-16-07 By e-mail this date SPR indicated their request from 08-15-07 had been adequately addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-17-07 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed their final draft of the Phase II Accepted Rating Report for the IPPDC Upgrade to the PRG. Comments from PACE and SPR have been received and addressed in the final draft. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-28-07 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed their PRG-approved final draft of the Phase II Accepted Rating Report to PCC for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-03-07 By letter this date the PCC Chair indicated that the Path 27 IPPDC Upgrade Project has achieved Phase III status for an accepted rating of 2400 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-12-07 | Salt River Project | N | **Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit 4)** | 12/2009 |
|  |  | N | 03-12-07 By e-mail this date the Salt River Project (SRP) distributed a System Impact Study/CPR for the planned Springerville Unit 4 (430 MW net output) and indicated their request for an uprate of Path 54 to 1496 MW. SRP also requested interest in formation of a Project Review Group. Comments to the CPR are due by 05/16/07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-20-07 By letter this date the TSS Chair indicated that SRP has completed all Phase I requirements and has achieved Phase II status for the Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit 4) to a rating of 1496 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-07 By e-mail this date SRP distributed a PRG-approved Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review and requested Phase III status for an accepted rating of 1494 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-05-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed indicating that the Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit #4) has achieved Phase III status for an accepted rating of 1494 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-30-07 | Salt River Project | N | **Path 54 Accepted Rating and Re-definition** | 2007 |
|  |  | N | 01-30-07 By e-mail this date Salt River Project (SRP) distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report proposing changing the Path 54 existing rating to an accepted rating. In addition, Coronado-Cholla would be removed from the definition, leaving only one line (Coronado-Silver King 500 kV) comprising Path 54. Finally, it’s proposed to increase the rating from the current 1100 MW to between 1100 and 1200 MW. SRP also requested interest in formation of a Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 04-11-07 |  | S | 04-11-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the TSS Chair was distributed granting the Path 54 Accepted Rating and Re-definition Project Phase II status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-07 By e-mail this date SRP distributed a PRG-approved Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review and requested Phase III status for an accepted rating of 1133 MW on Path 54. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-05-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed indicating that the Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit #3) has achieved Phase III status for an accepted rating of 1133 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-03-05 | IID / LADWP |  | **Indian Hills-Upland Project (GPN)** | 11/2010 |
|  |  | N | 11-03-05 By letter this date LDWP initiated the process to include the Indian Hills-Upland Project in the regional planning process. The project is to build a 500 kV transmission line from the Indian Hills substation of IID to a new Upland station in LADWP as well as the conversion of the northern half of one Victorville-Century line from 287kV to 500kV. The expected project rating is 1000 MW or higher. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-23-06 By letter this date the TSS Chair granted Phase 2 Status to the Indian Hills-Upland Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-23-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the pre-project HA2010 and HA2009 base cases, the EOR one-line diagram, and a summary of the EOR N-1 contingency results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-24-06 By e-mail this date LDWP sent to the review group the pre and post project base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-25-06 By e-mail this date K. R. Saline submitted an epcl routine to remove the duplicate Imperial Valley-El Centro phase shifting transformer. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP thanked K. R. Saline for the epcl routine. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-27-06 By e-mail this date SCE submitted comments regarding the Green Path Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-27-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an updated 2010 HA pre-project base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an epcl to be applied to the pre and post Project cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-27-06 By e-mail this date SCE thanked LDWP for incorporating its comments in the Comprehensive Progress Report and the Phase 2 Study Plan. In addition, SCE submitted a few more comments to the Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | O2-27-06 By e-mail this date LDWP updated the 2010 ha pre-project base case including:   1. Elimination of area 99 2. Elimination of duplicated IV-ECSS Phase Shifter 3. Elimination of inadvertently system swing bus CPU-U5 (Bus #20141) 4. Same SDGE impedance as in the 10ha-combo-mohoff-15\_sdge\_cfe\_iid\_noproj.sav sent on Friday 2/24/06   Also attached was the branch differences between the 10ha-combo-mohoff-15\_sdge\_cfe\_iid\_noproj case and the EARLIER 10ha\_lagp\_pre\_project case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-28-06 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting submitted a few minor comments on the LA Green Path Study Plan Rev 1.0. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-28-06 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted comments regarding Rev 1.0 of the Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted a revised study plan in response to comments submitted by SCE on 02-27-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated that if the base cases being prepared by Sempra were not complete that LDWP would have proceed with the previously prepared cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a revise study plan that address the comments received to the version 1 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date latest pre-project base case compiled jointly by SGD&E and LADWP. Also, attached are the EOR one-line diagram and the summary of the EOR N-1 contingency screening results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-06-06 By e-mail this date SCE requested the removal of the Valley 115 kV SVCs from the case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-06-06 By e-mail this date LDWP thanked SCE for the information needed to remove the SVCs. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-06-06 By e-mail this date Sempra indicated that it had concerns regarding the Green Path Project Rev 2.0 Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-08-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated, it would follow the study plan rather than accept Sempra’s recommendation. LDWP intends study interaction between IVSF and Sunrise in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-10-06 By e-mail this date IID identified changes that need to be made to the V3 base case for 2010 HA |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-27-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed pre-project and post project base cases to the project review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-31-06 By e-mail APS asked if the Sunrise project is part of the Green Path North project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-31-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicate the Sunrise project and the Green Path North project were different. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-31-06 By e-mail this date the CISO recommended the pre-Green Path North Project case include the Sunrise the Sunrise/IID Green Path Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP asked three question about the CISO comment of 07-31-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-01-06 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the three questions from LDWP from 08-01-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a post-project base case with SCE’s Lugo-Rancho Vista line looped into Hesperia. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to the questions from the CISO that were submitted on 7-31-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-04-06 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted comments requesting that LDWP study as a sensitivity the Sunrise Powerlink / Green Path project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-10-06 By e-mail this date SCE provided post-project base case power flow corrections to the project review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-25-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed final pre-project and post-project base cases to the project review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-25-06 By e-mail this date SRP provided post-project base case power flow corrections to the project review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-10-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed results of the non-simultaneous rating studies to be presented at the 10-17-06 WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-18-06 By e-mail this date LDWP sent a switching sequence for loss of IV-Miguel w/RAS to SDGE for verification and requested a 2010 SDGE updated system model to be included in study simulations. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-18-06 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to LDWP’s question and provided the requested 2010 SDGE updated system model. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-23-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed updated results of the non-simultaneous rating studies after incorporation of the 2010 SDGE updated system model. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-01-06 By e-mail this date SCE submitted comments to LDWP’s Green Path Project Non-Simultaneous Study Results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-02-06 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to and addressed all of SCE’s comments from 11-01-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-06-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed results of the path 27 and path 44 simultaneous rating studies to be presented at the 12-12-06 WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-05-07 By e-mail this date SDG&E distributed an e-mail indicating that David Wang is the new contact person for all GPN correspondence. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-25-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a draft Phase II rating report for review and requested that any comments be sent to them by June 4th. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-25-07 By e-mail this date SDG&E requested two base cases that were specified in the draft Phase II rating report to review results that were achieved. The two power flow cases were provided by LDWP. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-26-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed Volume II of the draft Phase II rating report for review. Volume II consists of 13 separate emails containing stability plots. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-31-07 By e-mail this date SRP questioned how the uncertainty of the DPV2 line will affect the GPN Project and requested that LDWP address this in their final report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-31-07 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to SRP’s questions from 05/31/07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-31-07 By e-mail this date SCE indicated that DVPV2 should still be included in studies because no firm decision has been made concerning it. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-05-07 By e-mail this date SDG&E submitted comments in the form of editorial modifications to the draft Phase II rating report submitted by LDWP on 05/25/07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-05-07 One of the two base cases sent to SDG&E on 05-25-07 was the wrong case. The correct one was sent to them and as a result, SDG&E modified their submitted comments from 06-05-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-11-07 By e-mail this date LDWP thanked SDG&E for their comments and distributed a red-line version of the draft Phase II rating report after having incorporated SDG&E’s comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-11-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a final Phase II Project Rating Report to PCC for their 30-day review along with 3 additional emails containing stability plots. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-13-07 By e-mail this date a request from LDWP was distributed to PCC for Phase III status for the Green Path North Project at 1200 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-12-07 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted comments to the Phase II rating report indicating that there is no demonstration that WECC reliability criterion WECC-S1 is met. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-13-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed required study results to the PRG indicating that the Green Path North Project meets WECC-S1 requirements. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-19-07 By e-mail this date the WATS Chair acknowledged the LDWP study results from 07-13-07 and requested that LDWP either present the results to the PRG for an acceptance vote or discuss further LDWP action at the PRG 07-31-07 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-19-07 By e-mail this date LDWP agreed with the WATS Chair request from 07-19-07 and indicated the study results would be distributed to the PRG for review and acceptance voting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-19-07 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted their written comments and supporting documents for the WECC-S1 requirements. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-21-07 By e-mail this date the WATS Chair requested that LDWP present the results of the WECC-S1 studies at the 07-31-07 PRG meeting, after which they would be voted on. It was further suggested that PCC not approve Phase III status until after study results approval at the PRG meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-27-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed results from their WECC-S1 studies to be presented at the 07-31-07 PRG meeting in San Diego. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-03-07 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an addendum to the GPN final report. A notification was sent out and the addendum was added to the GPN final report on the WECC web site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 08-06-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed indicating that the GPN Project has achieved Phase III status with an accepted rating of 1200 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-30-05 | SCE |  | **EOR 10500 MW Project with EOR 9300 MW upgrade and Devers-Palo Verde No.2** | 2009 |
|  |  | N | 12-30-05 By e-mail this date a Comprehensive Progress Report was distributed for a rating of 10500 MW on the combined projects of EOR 9300 MW upgrade and Devers-Palo Verde No.2 with Path 49 EOR.  Phase 2 status is requested once the 60 day comment period is completed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-06 By e-mail this date SRP requested Phase 2 status for the Combined Projects of the EOR 9300 and DPV2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-16-06 By letter this date the TSS Chair granted that the Combined Path 49 Projects has achieved Phase 2 status for a Combined Path 49 EOR rating increase to 10,500 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a reminder that the Combined DPV2/EOR9300 EOR Project Review Group Meeting #1 will meet on May 10 in San Diego. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the initial draft of the Combined DPV2/EOR9300 Projects Path 49 Rating Study Scope. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-04-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed 2009 Heavy Autumn Base Cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-09-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed revised 2009 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-09-06 By e-mail this date SRP distributed presentations regarding the 2009 base cases for the May 10 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-09-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments regarding the study scope. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-16-06 By e-mail this date WAPA requested that 110/25 MW/MVAR load be added at the BLK MESA Bus # 19019. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-16-06 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated the 110 MW load at the BLK MESA Bus was already modeled on a lower voltage bus. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-19-06 By two e-mails this date SCE distributed the approved the Combined DPV2/EOR9300 Path 49 Rating Study Scope. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-21-06 By e-mail this date SRP submitted comments regarding the study scope. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-17-06 By e-mail this date SCE announce the next DPV2 WECC/WATS Project Review Group meeting for 06-27-06 and presented a new plan of service. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-19-06 By e-mail this date LDWP asked if the pending West-of-River upgrade is stopped if series reactors on one of the lines would relieve congestion. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-20-06 By e-mail this date SCE responded to LDWP’s e-mail and indicated that DPV2 can still achieve the 1,200 MW increase to the EOR and WOR path ratings. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-21-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a reminder of the 06-27-06 meeting time and location. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-22-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a DPV2 SPS Follow-up Report and four additional study scenarios. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-23-06 By four e-mails this date SCE distributed stability plots, DPV2/EOR9300 Projects Path 49 Rating Study Scope – Rev 1, a 2009 HA Base Case, and other study results for the 06-27-06 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-24-26 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the sensitivity studies to demonstrate DPV2 can still achieve the 1,200 MW increase to the EOR and WOR path ratings. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP thanked SCE for performing the sensitivity studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments regarding the SPS Path 61 and EOR at 9255 follow-up report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-28-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed revised Path 49 and Path 46 Rating reports. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-29-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed DPV2 Accepted Path 49 and 46 Rating Study Reports – Revision Updates – Final Draft 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-30-06 By e-mail this date SRP distributed minutes of the June 29 review work group conference call approving the DVP2 Path 49 and Path 46 Final Study Reports. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-23-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed results of a Special Protection Scheme Conceptual Study Report to mitigate post-transient voltage collapse in southern California and Nevada areas with loss of both DPV1 and DPV2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-02-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed an SPS Arming Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-02-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed results from some non-simultaneous studies that were performed with Mohave both on and off line. Results to be presented at the WECC/WATS meeting on 10/17/06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-06-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed study results from the Path 49 Simultaneous SCIT analyses with Mohave both on and off line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-11-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed study results of Path 26 and Path 49 Simultaneous analyses with Mohave both on and off line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-14-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed study results from an SPS Arming Study and development of the DPV12 nomogram. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-16-06 By e-mail this date SRP commented on the SCE Arming Study and recommends further study of the SPS with both the DPV2 and EOR 9300 projects in-service. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-16-06 By three e-mails this date SCE distributed base cases for review with Mohave both on and off line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-18-06 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed GPN power flow updates for the combined DPV2 & EOR Upgrade Sensitivity Studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-20-06 By e-mail this date LADWP distributed Sunrise Powerlink and GPN power flow updates for the combined DPV2 & EOR Upgrade Sensitivity Studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-05-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed simultaneous rating studies with Mohave on-line and off-line to be presented at the 12-12-06 WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-08-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed results of sensitivity studies on Path 49 to be presented at the 12-12-06 WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-08-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a revised study scope for the combined DPV2/EOR 9300 MW Upgrade Project. This is also to be presented at the 12-12-06 WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-26-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a final draft of the DPV2/EOR9300 Study Report for WECC/WATS Peer Review Group 30 day review and approval. Distributed via 4 separate emails. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-28-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a 10-part set of stability plots associated with the 12-26-06 Study Report final draft. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-17-07 By e-mail this date SCE distributed for review a final draft of revision 2 of the DPV2/EOR9300 Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-24-07 By e-mail this date SCE distributed an updated Study Report that included all changes requested during a 01/23/07 WECC/WATS Peer Review Group meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-26-07 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the approved DPV2/EOR9300 Path 49 Rating Report and requested Phase III status following the 30-day review period. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-07 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter confirming that Path 49 (East of Colorado River) has achieved an accepted rating of 10,500 MW in the east to west direction pending completion of the identified upgrades. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-21-06 | California Independent System Operator (CISO) |  | **Path 46 Short Term Upgrades (West of Colorado River)** | 2006 |
|  |  | N | 03-21-05 By letter this date California Independent System Operator (CISO) requested the formation of a review group and Phase 1 status for increasing the Path 46 rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-01-06 By letter this date the CISO requested Phase 2 status for the Path 46 Short Term Upgrades. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-13-06 By letter this date the CISO requested the expedited rating process for the Path 46 Short Term Upgrades. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-11-06 By letter this date the TSS Chair indicated that the WOR upgrade to 10,623 MW had achieved Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-06 By e-mail this date the CISO requested Phase 3 status since no comments were received during the expedited rating process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-13-06 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair confirmed that the Path 46 Short-Term Upgrades (West-of-Colorado River) Project has achieved an Accepted Rating of 10,623 MW in the east to west direction as described in the report and is granted Phase 3, subject to completion of the identified upgrades. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-31-05 | SCE |  | **Devers–Palo Verde No.2 Project (DPV2)/Path 46 Rating** | Summer 2009 |
|  |  | N | 08-31-05 By letter this date SCE distributed the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Project (DPV2)/Path 46 Rating Comprehensive Progress Report and requested the project be given Phase 2 status. The letter also requested interest in forming a Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-28-05 By letter this date the TSS chair issued a letter indicating that the Devers–Palo Verde No.2 Project (DPV2)/Path 46 Rating Project met all the requirements for Phase 2 and granted Phase 2 status for a rating of 11,823 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-01-5 By e-mail this date SCE distributed meeting materials for the DPV2 WOR Project Review Group Meeting #2 on December 6, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-16-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the third revision of the study scope for this project to the project review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-23-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed details regarding the WECC/WATS DPV2 WOR Rating Study meeting #3. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-26-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the agenda for the 02-14-06 DPV2 WATS/Peer Review Group meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the DPV2 Study Scope #3 that had been approved by the Peer Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-02-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the following for the 02-14-06 WATTS review group meeting.  1. DPV2 WORPRG Meeting #3 Agenda  2. Approved HA2009 Pre-DPV2 SCIT Nomogram "Corner Point" Base Case with Mohave In Service  3. Approved HA2009 Pre-DPV2 SCIT Nomogram "Corner Point" Base Case with Mohave Out of Service. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-02-06 By two e-mails this date SCE distributed DPV2 Project Simultaneous SCIT "power flow" study results to be reviewed before the 02-14-06 review group meeting. The original stability results were performed on base cases that had unacceptable PDCI model performance. The new results were performed with a corrected PDCI model. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-10-06 By three e-mails this date SCE distributed additional meeting materials for the DPV2 WOR Project Review Group Meeting #3 on February 14, 2006. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-13-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed corrections to the base cases distributed 02-02-06. The correction was to the PDCI model. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-24-06 By e-mails this date SCE submitted the Volume 1 Report and appendices to the DPV2 Peer Review Group for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-27-06 By e-mails this date SCE distributed draw files used in the DPV2 WOR Study Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP asked if a rating report was already issued and approved. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date CISO indicated the report had not been issued. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date noted that the WOR upgrade studies are based on an assumptive plan of service for the WOR Initial Upgrades. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date SCE indicated the plan of service for the Short Term Upgrade Project assumed in the DPV2 WOR Study was approved in the Short Term Upgrade EOR Rating Study. The plan of service for the Short Term Upgrades represented in the WOR Rating Study is more than just a study concept. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-02-06 By e-mail this date SRP submitted comments about the recommended true up of the Initial Upgrades POS in the DPVII WOR POS study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-06 By five e-mails this date SCE distributed Volume II Stability Plots. Since there were e-mail limitations due to the e-mail size SCE redistributed Volume II in eight e-mails. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-13-06 By e-mail this date SCE announced the next review group meeting is to be held March 28. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-14-06 By e-mail this date LDWP requested the study work be delayed until the interactions between Path 46 and Path 26 in the Short Term Upgrade study are better defined. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-14-06 By e-mail this date SRP submitted four comments regarding the Path 46 WOR Accepting Rating Study process for both the Short Term Upgrade and DPV#2 Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-14-06 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting indicated that it does not believe the completion of the DPV2 Path 46 Rating Study has to be delay if SCE is willing to take the risk of performing more studies in the future. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-24-06 By two e-mails this date SCE distributed sensitivity studies between Path 46 and Path 26 at 4000 MW. The study results indicate not interaction. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-24-06 By e-mail this date SCE distributed all comments received to date and SCE’s responses to the comments. A meeting number 4 agenda was distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments regarding the Path 46 rating report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-27-06 By e-mail this date SCE responded to the comments submitted by LDWP on 03-26-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-21-06 By letter this date SCE indicated that it had completed all the rating requirements for Devers–Palo Verde No.2 Project (DPV2)/Path 46 Rating and requested that phase 3 status with an accepted rating of 11,823 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-24-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair sent a letter to the PCC members informing them that they had 30 days from the posting of the rating report to comment on the conformance of the project with the procedure. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-25-06 By e-mail this date the WECC staff distributed notification that the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Accepted Path 46 Rating Study Report (Volume I and Volume II) was posted on the WECC web site. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-17-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair confirmed that Path 46 (West-of-Colorado River) has achieved an Accepted Rating of 11,823 MW in the east to west direction as described in the report and is granted Phase 3, subject to completion of the identified upgrades. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-24-05 | CISO |  | **Path 26 Upgrade III Project** | 2005 |
|  |  | N | 01-24-05 By e-mail dated Jan 27 the CISO:  1) distributed a letter indicating that it proposes to increase Path 26 to 4000 MW.  2) solicited interest in participation in a Regional Planning Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-27-05 By e-mail this date the TSS chair sent an e-mail indicating that the Path 26 Upgrade Project met all the requirements for Phase 2 and granted Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-28-05 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed an e-mail indicating it was preparing a study plan to investigate the interaction between the Path 26 Upgrade III Project and Paths 41, 61, and 64. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed a draft study plan for the Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-19-05 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted comments about the Path 26 Upgrade III Project Study Plan. In the comments, PG&E noted the existing Path 26 RAS would be used to increase the amount of generation tripped for a Midway – Vincent 500 kV double-line outage. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-02-05 By e-mail this date SCE submitted comments about the Path 26 Upgrade III Project Study Plan. SCE requested that interaction between Path 26 and the Big Creek System and the sensitivity between Path 26 and Tehachapi Development Project be studied. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-03-05 By e-mail this date the CISO responded to the 08-03-05 e-mail from SCE concerning the Tehachapi sensitivity. The CISO believed conceptual projects that have not received any regulatory approval need not be studied. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-03-05 By e-mail this date SCE requested that the Tehachapi Sensitivity Study be studied with wind capacity at 700 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-04-05 By e-mail this date PG&E indicate that its comments on the study plan were not incorporated. PG&E indicates the study plan uses the existing Path 26 SPS to justify the Path 26 rating increase. PG&E has no plans to increase the SPS to 2400 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-04-05 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed a revised study plan for the Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-04-05 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that its major comments on the study plan were not incorporated. The study plan indicated the tripping of more generation that the current Path 26 SPS design. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-04-05 By e-mail this date the CISO indicate that transfers across Path 26 can only achieve 4000 MW by implementing a SPS that can trip up to 2400 MW. A conference call will probably be needed to address the issue. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-11-05 By e-mail this date LDWP requested that the CISO perform simultaneous studies with PVD2 and EOR 9000+. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-22-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-22-05 By e-mail this date CISO notified the review group that a revised study plan will be distributed next week. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-17-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the final study plan for the WECC Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-31-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the benchmark case for Path 26/SCIT study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-31-05 By letter this date CISO announced its intentions to modify the plan of service for the Path 26 Upgrade No. 3 Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-4-05 By letter this date CISO sent a revised letter to the PCC Chair announcing its intentions to modify the plan of service for the Path 26 Upgrade No. 3 Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-30-05 The CISO announced that Janice Zewe of the CISO is now the lead for the WECC Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-15-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the base cases in GE version 15.1\_06 format for the WECC Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 1-05-06 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a base case to study the interaction between Path 41 and Path 26 at 4000. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 1-05-06 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a base case to study the interaction between Path 61 and Path 26 at 4000. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-10-06 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a power flow case with Path 64 flow at the 1200 MW level. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-13-06 By e-mail this date the CISO reminded the review group that comments regarding the base cases were due. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-25-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed a meeting announce for February 16, 2006. The meeting is to go through the preliminary study results for the Path 26 Upgrade III Project WECC rating study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-09-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed a draft meeting agenda for the February 16 review group meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-13-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed meeting materials including the presentation slides, base case summary and contingency lists for the February 16 meeting |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-17-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed the reactive margin study results for the Malin and Tesla 500 kV buses for the outage of two Palo Verde units and South Bay 69 kV-138 kV buses after three outages for five SCIT related cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-21-06 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated the reactive margin would experience a reduction of about 100 MVAR at the Malin 500 kV bus and 340 MVAR at the Tesla 500 kV bus. PG&E would like the results noted in the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-28-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed the “DRAFT Path 26 WECC Rating Increase to 4000 MW (North to South) Project Review Group WECC Phase 2 Rating Report”. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date LDWP requested that the sensitivity/simultaneous study on WOR, DPV2, and EOR9300 be attachment to the Path 26 main report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date the CISO indicated the sensitivity studies requested by LDWP on 03-01-06 would be included in the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-06-06 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted comments regarding the Project Review Group WECC Phase 2 Rating Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-06-06 By e-mail this date the CISO indicated that it would incorporate the PG&E comments into the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-09-06 By e-mail this date CISO distributed sensitivity studies to the review group. The sensitivity studies considered simultaneous interaction between Path 26 at 4000 MW and the EOR 9300 MW Project, the PVD2 Project with EOR at 9255 MW, and WOR at 10,623 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-13-06 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed the DRAFT Path 26 WECC Rating Increase to 4000 MW (North to South) Project Review Group WECC Phase 2 Rating Report that included the sensitivity studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-14-06 By e-mail this date TANC requested additional documentation in an appendix showing study results for the nomogram points developed for the WOR 10623 MW and Path 26 4000 MW sensitivity. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-06 By e-mail this date CISO agreed to include a table with the post transient study results for the corner points of the nomogram in Appendix A. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-06 By e-mail this date By e-mail this date SMUD submitted comments regarding the draft study report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-22-06 By e-mail this date LDWP thanked the CISO for completing the sensitivity studies requested on 03-09-06. In addition, LDWP asked several questions about the sensitivity studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-22-06 By e-mail this date the CISO responded to the questions asked by LDWP on 03-22-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-23-06 By e-mail this date LDWP provided more comments about the studies conducted by the CISO. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-23-06 By e-mail this date the CISO responded to LDWP’s comments indicating a nomogram will be used as the main mitigation for simultaneous interaction between WOR vs. Path 26. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-23-06 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted comments regarding the used a 7% post transient criterion for SCE system. SDGE want supporting documentation for this margin. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-24-06 By e-mail this date the CISO responded to the 03-23-06 e-mail from SDGE. The CISO indicated that its 7% post transient standard is less stringent than WECC’s standard. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-26-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments regarding the Project Review Group’s Phase 3 Rating Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-30-06 By letter this date the CISO sent the PCC Chair the "Path 26 Increase to 4000 MW Project Review Group Phase 2 Rating Report" and requested that the Path 26 Increase to 4000 MW Project be granted an Accepted Rating of 4000 MW and Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-31-06 By e-mail this date the WECC staff distributed the Path 26 WECC Rating Increase to 4000 MW Project Review Group Phase 2 Rating Report and posted it for comment. Comments are due 05-01-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-01-06 By e-mail this date the CISO indicated that it had not received any comments regarding the 03-31-06 Path 26 Project Review Group Phase 2 Rating Report. It requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-01-06 By e-mails this date the PCC Chair and TSS Chair indicated that comments had not been received. The WECC staff indicated there was not response to the 03-26-06 comments from LDWP. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-05-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair indicated Path 26 (Northern-Southern California) has achieved an Accepted Rating of 4000 MW in the north to south direction and is granted Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-13-04 | SRP |  | **EOR Path Rating Expansion by Upgrading the Mead – Phoenix Project (EOR9000+ Project)** | June 2008 |
|  |  | N | 05-19-04 By e-mail this date SRP:  1) distributed a May 13 letter indicating that they propose increasing the EOR to at least 9000 MW by upgrading series capacitors and installing static and dynamic voltage support devices,  2) distributed a comprehensive progress report, and  3) solicited interest in participation in a Regional Planning Review Group.  4) requested Phase 2 status |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-20-04 By e-mail this date the TSS chair sent an e-mail indicating that the EOR 9000+ project had met all the requirements for Phase 2 and granting Phase 2 status with a increase in the Path 49 rating to 9300 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-22-04 By e-mail this date SCE/SRP distributed an e-mail regarding a January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting for DPV2 and EOR9000+. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-17-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided notes from the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting, an attendance list, and results of studies presented by CISO depicting flow duration curves from a production costing simulation with various AZ to California upgrade projects added. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-25-05 By e-mail this date SCE/SRP announced a February 28, 2005 WATS/WECC Peer Review Meeting to be held in San Diego. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed base cases for the WATS study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-8-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed minutes of a 02-03-05 conference call and revised base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-22-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed an e-mail from NEVP indicating the identification of SSR problems and recommended the problems be presented to the WATS review team. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-27-05 By e-mail this date, SCE submitted comments regarding the project rating study. SCE indicated items it wants in the study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-27-05 By e-mail this date, SRP responded to SCE’s e-mail dated 05-27-05. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-10-05 By five e-mails this date, SRP distributed power flow and stability study results to the Peer Review group. The background material for EOR 9000+ Project Review Group meeting on June 20, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-16-05 By e-mail this date, SRP distributed power flow and post transient study results to the Peer Review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-18-05 By e-mail this date SRP distributed a power point presentation for the EOR 9000+ Project Review Group meeting on June 20, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-19-05 By e-mail this date SRP distributed an update for its power point presentation for the June 20, 2005 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-19-05 By e-mail this date, WAPA provided comments about the size of the SVC at Devers. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-08-05 By e-mail this date SRP distributed the EOR 9000+ Upgrade Project Accepted Rating Study Report, Volume I-Main Report to the review group. SRP requested that comments about the report be submitted within 30 days. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-28-05 By e-mail this date, SRP distributed comments that it had previously received from IID, MWD, and LDWP regarding the EOR 9000+ project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-01-05 By e-mail this date, Navigant Consulting asked questions regarding the reactive requirements for simultaneous flows on 10 paths and on SCIT, Path 41, and Path 61. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-02-05 By e-mail this date SRP indicated it would make the necessary clarifications to the final version of the draft report to address Navigant’s concerns. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-04-05 By e-mail this date, SRP distributed revision 2 of the EOR 9000+ path 49 Rating Study Report. SRP requested approval of the report during an August 8 conference call. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-09-05 By e-mail this date SRP issued revision 3 of the EOR 9000+ / Path 49 Rating Report. The report was to be reviewed in a conference call on August 9. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-11-05 By e-mail this date SRP distributed the final study report and correspondence to the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-11-05 By e-mail this date SRP sent the EOR 9000+ Project Rating Report to the PCC Chair and requested that EOR 9000+ be granted Phase 3 status and an accepted rating of 9,300 MW on Path 49. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-12-05 By letter this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the EOR Path Rating Expansion by Upgrading the Mead – Phoenix Project (EOR9000+ Project)has achieved Phase 3 status and an accepted rating of 9,300 MW as described in the final report. This item will be removed from the Phase 2 log next time it is distributed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-12-03 | SCE |  | **Devers–Palo Verde No.2 Project (DPV2)/Path 49 Rating** |  |
|  |  | N | 10-10-03 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a letter indicating that they are in the process of finalizing the Plan of Service for the East of the River Path through the construction of the DPV2 Project and solicited interest in participation in a Regional Planning Review Group. | Summer 2009 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-23-04 By e-mail this date Southern California Edison (SCE) distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for DPV2/Path 49 Rating (East of the Colorado River) from 7550 MW to 9255 MW during summer 2009. SCE requested Phase II status. SCE requested comments regarding the report and requested those interested in the formation of a Review Group to contact SCE. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-14-04 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair indicated that PCC accepted the DPV2 regional planning report and indicated that the DPV2 project has completed the regional planning process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-21-04 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair issued a letter indicating that the DPV2 Project has achieved Phase 2 status for an increase of the Path 49 Rating to 9,255 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-21-04 By e-mails this date SCE announced that the 2009 HA cases were complete and distributed the cases including dynamics data file with and without Mohave generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-22-04 By e-mail this date NEVP asked regarding some overloaded items in the 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-23-04 By e-mail this date SCE announced an October 6-7 peer review meeting regarding the EOR Sempra upgrades, the DPV2 project, and the EOR 9000+ project |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-27-04 By e-mail this date SCE updated the 2009 HA cases that were distributed on 09-21-04 with and without Mohave generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-28-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided an additional minor revision to the two 2009 HA cases that were distributed on 09-27-04. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-28-04 By e-mail this date WAPA provided an epcl with some additional minor revision to the two 2009 HA cases that were distributed on 09-27-04. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-28-04 By e-mail this date APS provided a correction to the revisions provided by WAPA on 9-28-04 to the two 2009 HA cases that were distributed on 09-27-04. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-28-04 By three e-mails this date WAPA provided a corrected epcl, based upon the APS comment. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-29-04 By e-mail this date SCE announced a time change for the October 6 peer review meeting and provided a meeting agenda and study scope. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-12-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided updated 2009 HA 9255 MW cases with and without Mohave generation requesting approval during an October 18 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-12-04 and 10-13-04 By e-mails these dates LDWP requested that additional contingencies be conducted related to potential voltage problems in SCE. The e-mails indicated that they should be studied during peak load and high south of Lugo flow. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-12-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided information regarding an October 18, 2004 conference call to discuss DPV2 base cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-13-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided updated 2009 HA 8055 MW cases with and without Mohave generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-13-04 By e-mails this date SCE provided updated 2009 HA 9255 MW cases with and without Mohave generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date LDWP asked regarding the appropriate series compensation level at Mohave on the Mohave – Lugo 500 kV line. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date SCE responded to LDWP regarding the appropriate series compensation level at Mohave on the Mohave – Lugo 500 kV line. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date NEVP questioned differences between post-project cases for EOR9000+ and DPV2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date SCE responded to NEVP comments by detailing steps being taken to verify the questioned data items. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date SCE forwarded the SRP Oct 12 e-mail regarding an October 18, 2004 conference call to discuss base cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date WAPA answered NEVP questions regarding the correct representation of Shiprock – Four Corners 345 kV line and Topock-Parker 230 kV line. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-19-04 By e-mail this date NEVP commented that the difference they noted with Lone But is in the WAPA area and suggested SCE contact WAPA regarding the correct representation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-25-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided updated post DPV2 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-26-04 By e-mail this date SRP asked for approval regarding eliminating n-2 power flow cases from the study plan for the EOR9000+ and DPV2 projects. SCE forwarded the SRP e-mail. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-26-04 By e-mail this date LDWP referred to the NERC Planning Standard S3 and indicated they interpreted the standard to indicate n-2 power flow studies are required. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-26-04 By e-mail this date TANC indicated that n-2 studies should be conducted but can be post transient studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-27-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided the approved Study Plan and the presentation (from the Oct 6 meeting). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-27-04 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that n-2 studies in the study area should be investigated using the power flow program. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-01-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided some needed corrections to the definition of DC lines monitored for the SCIT nomogram. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-01-04 By e-mail this date LDWP identified some comments that had not been included in the DPV2 Rev 2 study plan. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-22-04 By e-mail this date SCE/SRP distributed an e-mail regarding a January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting for DPV2 and EOR9000+. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-28-04 By e-mail this date SCE distributed an e-mail with an agenda and rating study scope for the DPV2 project for the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-29-04 By e-mail this date SCE distributed an e-mail with power flow study results for the DPV2 project for discussion at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-29-04 By e-mail this date ACC asked about a change in Arizona load in the power flow study results for the DPV2 project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-29-04 By e-mail this date SCE answered ACC indicating that the Arizona load change would not affect the results of rating studies and that it came as a result of some changes in Lone Butte modeling made at the request of WAPA . |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-04-05 By five e-mails this date (split into five due to the large size of the files being provided) SCE provided stability plots with study results for the DPV2 project for discussion at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-06-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided post transient study results for the DPV2 project for discussion at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-07-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided additional stability study results in the form of switch decks and a stability results summary table for the DPV2 project for discussion at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-13-05 By e-mail this date SCE responded to comments received at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting regarding islanded subsystems possibly causing divergence of post transient cases simulating loss of path 42 (IID-SCE). There were islanded sub-systems, but the post transient cases still diverge with the islanded sub-systems removed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-13-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided a revised study scope per comments received at the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-13-05 By e-mail this date NEVP provided detailed comments/questions regarding SCE’s study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-17-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided notes from the January 11, 2005 WATS/WECC peer review group meeting, and attendance list, and results of studies presented by CISO depicting flow duration curves from a production costing simulation with various AZ to California upgrade projects added. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-17-05 By e-mail this date TANC provided detailed comments/questions regarding SCE’s study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-18-05 By e-mails this date SCE thanked TANC and NEVP for their review/comments and promised to follow up on comments received. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-18-05 By e-mail this date SRP responded to TANC questions regarding the switching not bypassing series capacitor banks for the Four Corners-Moenkopi 500 kV line that the capacitors are normally operated bypassed and are represented bypassed in study cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-25-05 By e-mail this date SCE/SRP announced a February 28, 2005 WATS/WECC Peer Review Meeting to be held in San Diego. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-31-05 By e-mail this date SRP asked for additional information and questioned differences between SRP and SCE calculations of SCIT nomogram inertia levels. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-31-05 By e-mail this date SCE responded to SRP questions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-01-05 By e-mail this date, NEVP commented regarding the base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 2-23-05 By e-mail this date SCE announced a DPV2 progress meeting on February 28, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 2-23-05 By e-mails this date, CISO distributed meeting materials for the February 28, 2005 review group meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 2-25-05 By e-mails this date, CISO distributed power flow results and stability results for the February 28, 2005 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 2-27-05 By e-mails this date, CISO distributed more power flow and post transient results for the February 28 meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 4-18-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed meeting material to be covered at the DPV2 Project Review Group Meeting #5 on April 20, 2005 in San Diego |  |
|  |  | S | 4-19-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed presentation materials to be covered at the DPV2 Project Review Group Meeting on April 20, 2005. |  |
|  |  | C | 4-20-05 By e-mail this date, TANK indicated the latest version of the OSS Handbook contained a RAS to bypass series caps in the Table Mt - Tesla (at Table Mt) and Table Mt - Vaca Dixon (at both Table Mt and Vaca Dixon) 500 kV lines for any single PACI outage between Malin and Table Mt. Hopefully. He indicated application of this RAS would solve a Round Mt series capacitor overload problem. |  |
|  |  | S | 4-21-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed information about RAS that reduces the flow on the Malin-Round Mtn #2 line for an outage of the Malin-Round Mtn #1 line |  |
|  |  | S | 4-22-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed SCIT Benchmark analysis to reflect the Vincent-Antelope transmission upgrade expected to be in service by 2009 and the DPV2 Project Simultaneous SCIT final study results to be included as Appendix F in the final DPV2 Rating Study Report. |  |
|  |  | S | 5-24-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed the June 21, 2005 DPV2 Project meeting agenda, the Study Scope Revision 5 (which reflects updates related to Path 46), study assumptions for the simultaneous analyses and the sensitivity analyses. |  |
|  |  | S | 6-13-05 By e-mail this date, Members were reminder of the June 21, 2005 DPV2 Peer Review Group meeting. |  |
|  |  | S | 06-17-05 By three e-mails this date CISO distributed the volume 1 of the study report with appendices. |  |
|  |  | S | 06-22-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO distributed a revised final report to address comments receive at the June 21, 2005 DPV2 Peer Review Group meeting. |  |
|  |  | S | 06-22-05 By e-mail this date the CISO distributed a presentation regarding a path 46 study plan to be given at the DPV2 Peer Review Group Meeting. |  |
|  |  | C | 06-23-05 By e-mail this date, SRP discussed issues related to the Palo Verde Hub. |  |
|  |  | C | 06-23-05 By e-mail this date, SRP made additional comments related to studies about the Palo Verde Hub. |  |
|  |  | C | 06-23-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed SRP’s comments about the Palo Verde Hub studies. |  |
|  |  | S | 06-23-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed the meeting minutes for the June 21, 2005 DPV2 Peer Review Group Meeting. |  |
|  |  | C | 06-24-05 By e-mail this date SRP requested that the CISO study the impact of PVD#2 on the maximum PV/Hassayampa simultaneous generation scheduling capability and the impact of PVD#2 on the simultaneous PV G-2 loss. |  |
|  |  | C | 06-27-05 By e-mail this date, SRP expressed concerns about the reactive power and RAS for the PVD2 transmission project. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-06-05 By e-mails this date, SCE distributed information about the rating procedure required to move the project from Phase II to Phase III. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-12-05 By e-mail this date SRP requested that studies be performed to determine the impact of the DPV II Project, with a rating of 1200 MW, on the Palo Verde – COI interface. SRP also requested that a procedure be developed to relieve thermal overloads caused by double line outages. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-12-05 By second e-mail this date, SRP provided a document titled “Results of Palo Verde Hub Generation Sensitivity Considered by SRP" to be included in the Appendix Section of Final Report. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-14-05 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted wording changes and a statement of clarification to be included in the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Project - Path 49 Rating Study Report. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-17-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed revision 2 of the draft final report. The peer review group was asked to approve the report in a conference call on July 19, 2005. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By email this date SCE distributed the July 19, 2005 conference call information. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SRP indicated that it was satisfied with SCE’s efforts to resolve SRP’s concerns and the incorporation SRP’s comments. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the refinements to sections III and IX that addressed SRP’s concerns about performing simultaneous generating capability (SGC) at the Palo Verde/Hassayampa Hub and setting up a group to develop special protection system requirements. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date, SRP commented about the simultaneous studies to be performed regarding the Palo Verde hub. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed more SRP comments. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed revision 2 of the DPV2 EOR Rating Report with LDWP’s comments incorporated. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed more comments from SRP regarding Palo Verde – Hassayampa simultaneous generation studies. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed more comments from SRP regarding the Palo Verde – Hassayampa simultaneous generation studies. SRP wants to make sure the issue of schedule all generation out of the hub was addressed. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE responded to SRP’s comments and agreed to add statements in the DPV2 report to examine the impact of DPV2 on the hub in subsequent studies and the impact of the project on the simultaneous loss of two Palo Verde units. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed comments from WAPA regarding DPV2 on the SCIT. |  |
|  |  | C | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed comments from SMUD indicating the minutes of the June 20th meeting and the statement in the 23rd study report do not agree. SMUD also recommended that the wording in the report on page 64 from at appropriate heavy to maximum flow” to “maximum flow.” |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE responded to SMUD’s comments and clarified the reasons for the statements in the report. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-18-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed appendices that were impacted by the changes made in revision 2. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-19-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed note of the July conference call. A Conference call was scheduled for July 25, 2005. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-21-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a notice that it was forming the DPV2 Operational Studies Peer Review Group to further address specific design and operational aspects of the DPV2 project. The study areas include:   * Sub-synchronous Resonance * Palo Verde Hub * SPS for Double Contingency * Palo Verde Simultaneous Generation Capability * Palo Verde – CFE Interaction |  |
|  |  | C | 07-25=05 By email this date SCE distributed a comment from LDWP about mitigating thermal overloads on Perkins transmission facilities and SCE’s response to the comment. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-25-05 By email this date SCE distributed Revision 3 of the DPV2 Rating Report that addressed LDWP’s comment regarding mitigating thermal overloads on Perkins transmission facilities. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-26-05 By e-mail this date, SCE distributed the July 25, 2005 conference call minutes and noted the DPV2 / Path 49 Accepted Rating Study Report was approved. |  |
|  |  | S | 07-27-05 By e-mail this date, the SCE sent a letter to PCC Chair requesting that Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 Project / Path 49 Rating Project be given Phase 3 status. |  |
|  |  | C | 09-02-05 By e-mail this date DENA asked if the generation to be tripped in the special protection system had be identified. |  |
|  |  | S | 08-30-05 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the Devers-Palo Verde No. 2 / Path 49 (East of the Colorado River) has achieved Phase 3 status and an accepted rating of 9,255 MW as described in the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7-20-92 | WAHQ |  | **Navajo Transmission Project (NTP)** | 12-2002 |
|  |  | N | 7-20-92 By letter dated July 17, 1992, WAHQ invited all interested WSCC members to participate in studies for the Navajo Transmission Project (NTP). The first meeting of the study group was held on August 6, 1992. The planned rating for the project is 1200 MW on the eastern segment and 1350 MW on the western segment. Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 8-25-93 By letter dated August 25, 1993, WAHQ transmitted a Comprehensive Study Report for the NTP. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-30-95 By letter dated January 30, 1995, PCC identified NTP as one of the projects which should report as to how it had complied with the requirements of the WSCC Regional Planning Review Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-7-95 By letter dated April 5, 1995, WAHQ announced the formation of a Phase 2 Review Group for the NTP and invited PCC, TSS, and OC members to participate. Tentative date May 23. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-12-95 By letter dated June 26, 1995, WAHQ announced the second meeting of the NTP Review group, scheduled for July 27, 1995. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-19-95 By letter dated July 14, 1995, WAHQ transmitted Version 1 of the study plan for the NTP Phase 2 accepted rating studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-28-95 By letter dated August 24, 1995, WAHQ transmitted minutes of the first two meetings of the Phase 2 Review Group for the NTP. Meeting #1, held 5/23/95, removed the Glen Canyon-Navajo interconnection from further consideration. At Meeting #2, held 7/27/95, a major point of discussion involved the interplay between NTP and the East of River and Four Corners West ratings. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-28-95 By letter dated September 25, 1995, WAHQ announced the third meeting of the NTP Review group, scheduled for October 11, 1995. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-16-95 By letter (undated) received 11/16/95, WAHQ announced the fourth meeting of the NTP Review group, scheduled for November 30, 1995. A copy of Version 3 of the Study Plan, dated 11/7/95 was included. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-27-95 By letter dated 11/20/95, WAHQ submitted benchmark pre-NTP stability cases with EOR transfers at 7550 MW (see EOR2 Project). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-29-96 By letter dated 1/22/96, WAHQ announced the fifth meeting of the NTP Review group, scheduled for February 8, 1996. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-02-96 By letter dated 1/31/96, WAHQ transmitted results of studies with EOR flows at 8900 MW, for discussion at the Review Group meeting 2/8/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-11-96 By letter dated 3/6/96, WAHQ transmitted minutes of the 2/8/96 Review Group meeting, a SCIT nomogram with NTP added, and the final Phase 2 Study Plan. The next meeting will be 4/2/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-21-96 By letter dated 3/18/96, WAHQ transmitted results of studies with increased flows on PDCI and COI, for discussion at the Review Group meeting 4/2/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-11-96 By letter dated April 9, 1996, WAHQ reported as to how SWIP had complied with the requirements of the WSCC Regional Planning Project Review Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-22-96 By letter dated 05/17/96, WAHQ transmitted minutes of the 4/2/96 Review Group meeting and announced the next meeting for June 16, 1996. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-17-96 By letter dated 06/12/96, WAHQ transmitted Version 4 of the Study Plan, plus study results and plots for review at the next NTP Review Group meeting, rescheduled for June 26, 1996. They also included a complete membership list for the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-15-96 By letter dated 11/11/96, the Dine Power Authority invited interested parties to attend a meeting about NTP. Speakers were scheduled to address technical and economic topics associated with the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-24-97 By letter dated 1/22/97, WAHQ transmitted the final Accepted Rating Report for the project. No further meetings of the Review Group are anticipated. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-27-97 At the January 1997 TSS meeting, WAHQ announced that the project had been delayed to 2002. | 12-2002 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 2-10-97 By letter dated 2/6/97, LADWP commented on the Accepted Rating Report and suggested more studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-18-97 By letter dated 2/12/97, NEVP raised concerns which they claim were not addressed by the Accepted Rating Report, and requested that the Review Group meet again to discuss them. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-10-02 By e-mail this date a copy of an e-mail sent to WECC Trans-Elect TM on 12-05-02 was sent to PCC and TSS. The e-mail was an announcement that Trans-Elect NTD and Dine’ Power Authority have signed an agreement to pursue the completion of the Navajo Transmission Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-21-04 |  |  | **Path 26 Upgrade II Project** |  |
|  |  | N | 05-21-04 By e-mail this date WECC distributed a CISO April 8, 2004 letter including:   1. A comprehensive progress report regarding increasing the rating of Path 26 from 3400 to 3700 MW during 2005. 2. Requesting interest in formation of a review group, 3. Requesting Phase II status. | Summer 2005 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-17-04 By letter this date, the TSS chair indicated that the Path 26 Upgrade II Project had achieved Phase II status for a rating of 3,700 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-06-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO provided a revised draft version of the Review Group rating report. For the revised report, the SCIT flows were reduced to within the nomogram and studies were redone. Path 26 flows were studied in combination with maximum Path 61 flows. This e-mail also includes a plan of service. Also included is a request for availability for a review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-07-05 By e-mail this date, LDWP indicated they are available for a review group meeting the first week in February. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-07-05 By e-mail this date, PG&E asked several questions regarding the rating studies/report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-10-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO responded to PG&E questions regarding the rating studies/report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO distributed a draft report addressing comments from LADWP and a few others. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-08-05 By e-mail this date, SMUD asked several question regarding the rating studies/report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-08-05 By e-mails this date, CISO indicated that it would review the SMUD concerns at a review group meeting. The meeting was change to February 25, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-14-05 and 02-15-05 By e-mails these dates, the CISO announce a review group meeting for February 25, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 02-23-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed the Path 26 Upgrade II review group report and presentation slides for Feb. 25 Meeting at Alhambra. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO distributed a revised review group report for Path 26 Upgrade II study for your final comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-02-05 By e-mails this date, LDWP and PG&E requested more time to comment about the Path 26 Upgrade II report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-02-05 By e-mail this date, CISO extended comments until March 8, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-03-05 By e-mail this date, PG&E submitted comments about the Path 26 Upgrade report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO responded to PG&E’s comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-03-05 By e-mail this date, PG&E submitted additional comments about the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO responded to the additional comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-03-05 By e-mail this date, PG&E submitted additional recommendations for the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-04-05 By e-mail this date, CISO responded to comments from PG&E and SMUD by revising the Path 26 report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-07-05 By e-mail this date, PG&E responded with more comments about the 03-04-05 version of the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-31-05 By e-mail this date, CISO distributed the Path 26 Upgrade II-Final Review Group Rating Report to the group to view. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 05-02-05 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the Path 26 Upgrade II Project has achieved Phase III status and an accepted rating of 3700 MW as described in the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-31-04 | AVA/BPA |  | **West of Hatwai System Upgrade Projects** | December 2006 |
|  |  | S | 03-31-04 By e-mail this date AVA and BPA distributed a March 30, 2004 letter including:   1. a comprehensive progress report regarding the West of Hatwai System Upgrade Projects, 2. requesting formation of a review group, 3. indicating that a May 27, 2004 review meeting is scheduled in Portland. 4. Indicating their intention to request phase II status in 60 days. 5. Announcment of an intended transfer capability of 4277 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-10-04 By e-mail this date, the TSS chair indicated that the West of Hatwai upgrade projects had achieved Phase II status with a requested rating of 4277 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-05 By e-mail this date, the WECC staff sent the Path 6, West of Hatwai Review Group Rating Report to the PCC Chair, PCC members and OC members for comment. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 03-31-05 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that Path 6 West of Hatwai System Upgrade Projects has achieved Phase III status and an accepted rating of 4277 MW east to west as described in the report. This item will be removed from the phase II log next time it is distributed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-07-03 | SDGE |  | **Path 49 Upgrade** | Fall/Winter 2005 |
|  |  | N | 04-07-03 By e-mail this date, San Diego Gas and Electric (SDGE) distributed a letter dated March 28, 2003 announcing a project to upgrade the rating of Path 49 (EOR) from 7550 MW to 8310 MW. SDGE also distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the project and solicited interest in participation in a review group. SDGE requested the expedited process for this upgrade. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-01-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a letter inviting interested parties to participate in a kickoff meeting for the WECC Peer Review Group for the Path 49 Upgrade on May 16. A Peer Review Group Schedule was included in the letter. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-19-04 By e-mail this date; the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 49 Upgrade project has completed the Regional Planning Process. The October 29, 2003 study report is attached. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-28-04 By e-mail this date SDGE provided information regarding a June 15, 2004 Path 49 Peer Review group meeting to finalize base cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-23-04 By e-mail this date SCE announced an October 6-7 peer review meeting regarding the EOR Sempra upgrades, the DPV2 project, and the EOR 9000+ project |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-30-04 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a draft report for the EOR 8055 MW studies and indicated that the results would be discussed at the October 6-7 meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-04-04 By e-mail this date SRP commented regarding concerns about flow distribution between southern and northern EOR lines, Mohave retirement, simultaneous SCIT/EOR transfers and simultaneous maximum transfers. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-04-04 By e-mail this date CISO thanked SRP for comments and provided responses regarding the SRP comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-05-04 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated support of SRP comments and asked about WOR studies, short circuit studies, and simultaneous limits. LDWP also indicated they have concerns regarding a reported system collapse in the SCE control area for an N-1 contingency. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-12-04 and 10-13-04 By e-mails these dates, LDWP requested additional contingencies be conducted related to potential voltage problems in SCE. The e-mails indicated that they should be studied during peak load and high south of Lugo flow. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-13-04 By e-mail this date, CISO provided updated 2009 HA 8055 MW cases with and without Mohave generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date the CISO stated the opinion that the Path 49 Upgrade study is not the right forum to address potential voltage problems in SCE because the problems are primarily related to load levels at the Valley substation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date SCE indicated that the solution to mitigate the voltage concern in the Valley system has been developed and is under internal SCE review. The e-mail indicates that the mitigation of the Valley voltage problem will be handled within the Annual Expansion Assessment Process, and is not a Path 49 rating issue. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided further clarification regarding needed studies related to voltage problems at the Valley substation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date LDWP reemphasized their opinion that the voltage issues are an issue with the Path 49 upgrades. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date SCE suggested that the Valley voltage problem should be discussed during the next review group meeting, and LDWP responded, agreeing to discuss during the next meeting/call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date SRP indicated their opinion that the Valley voltage issue should be discussed before the next review group meeting Nov 30 and suggested a special meeting be scheduled. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date, CISO indicated that it would run a sensitivity study to look at the impact from the 8055 project on the Valley voltage performance so study results could be discussed at the next meeting. SCE responded that it agreed with the CISO approach. SRP suggested that LDWP define its request so the sensitivity study would address its specific concern. LDWP responded its concurrence with the approach. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date, SRP confirmed that no 7% generation margin is required for either Palo Verde or Navajo plant stability in any N-2 contingency dynamic simulation runs. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-18-04 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair issued a letter indicating that the Path 49 Upgrade (to 8,055 MW). Project has achieved Phase II status for an increase of Path 49 Rating to 8055 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-12-04 By e-mail this date CISO issued a draft final report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date NEVP commented regarding the draft final report but indicated the comments did not require changes to the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided answers to the NEVP comments regarding the draft final report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date NEVP clarified their request for frequency plots. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-18-05 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the Path 49 Upgrade Project has achieved Phase III status and an accepted Path 49 Rating of 8055 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-14-02 | PG&E |  | **Path 15 Upgrade (north-to-south)** |  |
|  |  | N | 08-14-02 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) distributed a letter dated August 12, 2002 announcing their intent to increase the north-to-south rating of Path 15 from 1900 MW to 3000 MW. The letter identifies a Comprehensive Progress Report posted on the WECC web site. The necessary facilities are those being built for the increased south-to-north rating which is currently in Phase 2. PG&E requested that any comments be provided by October 12, 2002 and invited those interested in the formation of a review group to respond by October 12, 2002. PG&E indicated their intent to address any comments received on the report in Phase 2, and therefore requested Phase 2 Status. | Late 2004 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-05-02 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting the Path 15 Upgrade (north-to-south) Phase 2 Status. The letter indicated that PG&E agreed to answer remaining questions through studies conducted in Phase 2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-14-02 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments and raised questions regarding the Path 15 North-to-South Rating Study Phase 1 Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-27-02 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to the comments from SCE on November 11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-09-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a study plan for the Path 15 Upgrade Project, north-to-south Rating Study and requested comments by January 17, 2003. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-17-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments to the Path 15 north-to-south study plan to PG&E indicating the new Path 15 N-S studies should be studied with the Path 26 flow 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-22-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a final version of the study plan for the Path 15 Upgrade Project, north-to-south Rating Study. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-22-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments to the 2nd draft of the Path 15 north-to-south study plan to PG&E again indicating the new Path 15 N-S studies should be studied with the Path 26 flow 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-31-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided minor comments to the 2nd draft of the Path 15 north-to-south study plan and indicated, that with those changes, the study plan looked OK. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-19-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a draft of the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 Upgrade Project, north-to-south Rating Study. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-31-03 By e-mail this date SMUD requested a case to explore what could be achieved on Path 15 with COI at its rated flow of 4800 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-01-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to SMUD’s request for a case with COI at 4800 by indicating where in the report this could be found. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-04-03 By e-mail this date PAC provided comments to the draft Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade distributed on 3-19-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-04-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments to the draft Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade distributed on 3-19-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-04-03 By e-mail this date CISO provided comments regarding the WECC S3 Planning Standard to the draft Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade distributed on 3-19-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-07-03 By e-mail this date IPC provided comments to the draft Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade distributed on 3-19-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-14-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to IPC’s comments made on 4-07-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-15-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a description of additional study work they intend to conduct on the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-15-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to the comments from PAC on 4-04-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-16-03 By e-mail this date PAC indicated that they believe summer conditions are the most limiting for flow into Idaho and requested a sensitivity study be conducted for summer conditions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-17-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to the comments from SCE on 4-04-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-17-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a DRAFT Comprehensive Progress Report for the **Path 15 Upgrade in the north to south direction to the Project Review Group Members** requesting review prior to distributing to the WECC members. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-08-03 By e-mail this date BPA provided comments to the DRAFT Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 15 north-to-south Upgrade distributed on 07-17-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-19-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to the comments from BPA on 08-08-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-25-03 By e-mail this date BPA commented on the 8-19-03 response from PG&E to the comments made by BPA on 8-8-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-28-03 By e-mail this date PG&E responded to the comments from BPA on 08-25-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-05-03 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed the Path 15 Upgrade Phase 2 Review Group Rating Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-23-03 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 15 Upgrade Project (n-s) had achieved Phase 3 status with a rating of 3265 MW in the north to south direction. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-11-02 | CISO |  | **Path 26 Rating Increase** |  |
|  |  | N | 07-11-02 By e-mail this date, a letter dated July 1, 2002, distributing the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 26 Rating Increase and requesting Phase 2 status was distributed. The letter requested those interested in participating in a Project Review Group respond by September 2, 2002. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-04-03 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting the Path 26 Upgrade Project Phase 2 Status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-06-03 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a revised draft report of the Path 26 Upgrade Study for review. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-28-03 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments regarding the SCIT corner points in revised draft report of the Path 26 Upgrade Study distributed on  3-6-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-31-03 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the comments made by LDWP on 3-28-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-31-03 By e-mail this date LDWP made additional comments regarding the “official” SCIT nomogram based on CISO’s 3-31-03 response. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-31-03 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the comments made by LDWP on 3-31-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-30-03 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a revised Draft Report for the Path 26 Upgrade, indicating changes were based on comments received. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-15-03 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting indicated that they have no comments on the Revised Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-15-03 By e-mail this date SCE indicated that they have no comments on the Revised Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-19-03 By e-mail this date LADWP commented that several inertia numbers in the revised Draft Report were off by a zero and suggested a review of the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-19-03 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that they have no comments on the Revised Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-02-03 By e-mail this date BPA indicated that they have no comments on the Revised Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-17-03 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting the Path 26 Rating Increase Project Phase 3 Status confirming an Accepted Rating of 3400 MW in the north to south direction. The Existing Rating in the south to north direction remains unchanged at 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-24-02 | IPC |  | **Borah West 250 MW Uprate Project** | Late 2004 |
|  |  | N | 05-24-02 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the Borah West 250 MW Uprate Project. IPC requested that any comments or requests for the formation of a review group be returned to them by July 1, 2002. IPC indicated that if no comments are received they will request Phase 2 status for this project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-31-03 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 2 status to the Borah West 250 MW Uprate Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-06-03 By e-mail this date IPC sent a letter to the PCC Chair indicating they believed they had meet all the requirements of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and requested Phase 3 status for the Borah West 250 MW Uprate Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-24-03 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 Status to the Borah West 250 MW Uprate Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-05-01 | PG&E |  | **Path 15 Upgrade (south-to-north)** |  |
|  |  | N | 04-05-01 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric announced their intent to upgrade the south-to-north rating of Path 15 from 3750 MW to approximately 5000 MW. PG&E will be conducting the necessary Phase 1 Studies. Questions should be directed to Ben Morris (415) 973-7687. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 1-24-02 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 15 Upgrade Project had achieved Phase 2 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-18-02 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a letter dated December 17 and provided the Path 15 Upgrade Review Group Rating Report. With the distribution of the report PG&E requested Phase 3 status with a rating of 5400 MW for the Path 15 upgrade in the south-to-north direction. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-19-02 By e-mail this date PG&E distributed a revised version of the Path 15 Upgrade Project Phase 2 Review Group Rating Report and Appendix 1 that was distributed on December 18. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-05-03 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 15 Upgrade Project (s-n) had achieved Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-15-01 | MPC |  | **Path 8 (Montana-Northwest) Uprate** |  |
|  |  | N | 01-15-01 By e-mail this date The Montana Power Company distributed a comprehensive progress report for re-rating the Montana-Northwest path (Path 8)in the west-to-east direction from 600 MW to 1350 MW. MPC is requesting the expedited process for re-rating this path. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-03-01 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 2 status to the Montana-Northwest path (Path 8) uprate. The letter indicated that The Montana Power company acknowledged there are outstanding technical issues that need to be resolve and committed to address these issues in the Phase 2 rating process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-16-01 By e-mail this date MPC announced a conference call and study schedule for the Northwest-Montana (Path 8) West to East Rating studies. The conference call is scheduled for April 23, 2001. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-14-02 By e-mail this date MPC distributed a draft final Phase II report on Path 8 west-to-east and copies of comments received from all interested parties. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-26-02 By e-mail this date MPC distributed the Phase 2 report for the three phase rating process for Path 8 and requested phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-18-02 By e-mail this date a copy of the Phase 2 report distributed by MPC on March 26 was sent to CMOPS and TOS. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-06-02 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 Status and an Accepted Rating for Path 8 in the west-to-east direction of 1350 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8-20-97 | IPC |  | **Brownlee-Boise 230 kV Project** | 8/2001 |
|  |  | N | 8-20-97 By letter dated August 18, 1997, IPC solicited expressions of interest in improved transfer capability and system reliability across a cutplane between Brownlee and Boise Bench Substation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-12-2000 By e-mail this date, TSS granted Phase 2 status for the Brownlee-Boise project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-20-01 By e-mail this date, IPC distributed the Brownlee-Boise 230 kV Phase 2 Report previously reviewed by the Project Review Group to PCC, OC, TSS, CMOPS, and TOS and asked for a accepted rating of 1750 MW for the initial phase of the project. A copy of the report was posted on the WSCC web site. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-20-01 By e-mail this date, AVA raised questions regarding the description and purpose for some of the cases developed for the Brownlee-Boise Phase 2 Report and requested a better description of each case. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-20-01 By e-mail this date, IPC reported that no substantive comments were received during the 30 day review period and requested Phase 3 status for the Brownlee-Boise Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-30-01 By e-mail this date, The PCC Chair granted Phase 3 status to the Brownlee-Boise Project indicating the Brownlee East transmission path (Path 55) has achieved an Accepted Rating of 1750 MW west to east. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-2-98 | SPP |  | **Falcon-Gonder 345kV Project** | 7/2003 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 12-2-98 By letter dated November 10, 1998, SPP announced a project to interconnect the existing Falcon switching station with a new 345 kV station at Gonder. This is anticipated to increase the Path 32 transfer capability to 400MW west and 230MW east.. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-27-99 By letter dated August 27, 1999, TSS granted Phase 2 status for the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-6-99 By e-mail this date, SPP announced the first meeting of the Project Review Group, to be held 10/19 in Reno NV. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-21-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed meeting notes of the 10/19 meeting of the Project Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-29-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed a draft of the Phase 2 Study Plan for discussion during a scheduled 11/3 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-3-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes of the 11/3 conference call with the Project Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-9-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes of an 11/9 conference call with the Project Review Group, plus a phone and address list for all the members of the group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-10-99 By e-mail this date, SPP responded to a question raised by PG&E. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-12-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed a revised draft Study Plan for review and comment by the Project Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-23-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed meeting notes of the conference call that morning. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-06-99 By e-mail this date, RMI distributed to the Project Review Group a redline of the draft Study Plan, incorporating their comments and questions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-09-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed meeting notes of the 12/07 conference call of the Project Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-10-99 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed the Phase 2 Study Plan approved during the 12/07 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-06-00 By e-mail this date, SPP announced that the planned in-service date had been changed to 7/1/2003. | 7-2003 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-17-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed charts of historical east- and west-bound flows on Path 32, and requesting modifications to the study plan scenario cases to match. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-30-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes of the 1/21 conference call and a revised study plan. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-25-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed updated light winter cases for the Path 32 Studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-28-00 By e-mail this date, SPP announced the next conference call would be May 10. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-10-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed bubble and one-line diagrams for the light winter cases sent out 4-25. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-11-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed summary tables for the light winter cases sent out 4-25. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-12-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes of the 5-10 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-7-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed one-line diagrams and balloon diagrams for the west-to-east heavy summer cases and information on how to obtain the cases, and requested comments by June 19. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-10-00 By e-mail this date, SPP announce the conference call scheduled for July 18, and distributed study results to date. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-18-00 By e-mail this date, SPP reported that PG&E to SCE flows were over the path rating in the recent summer cases and asked for help in checking cases in the future. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-20-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed one-line diagrams and balloon diagrams for the hs001n and hs002n cases. Also distributed were the 7/18 conference call notes and updated study result tables. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-07-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed one-line diagrams for the hs003b and hs004b cases. Also distributed were the flow levels and targets for the cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-28-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed an excel file containing summary tables for the reactive margin, transient stability and powerflow results for the hs003n and hs004n cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-07-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes from the September 6 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-8-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed results of re-run reactive margin studies as a result of discussions on the September 6 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-11-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed a draft report and updated excel files with the study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-26-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes from the 9-22 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-9-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed a draft report, one-line and balloon diagrams for the 10-19 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-20-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed notes from the 10-19 conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-24-00 By e-mail this date, SPP distributed an updated draft of the report asking for comments by November 3. SPP also asked whether the studies to date had addressed concerns and issues members had with the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-3-00 By e-mail this date, LDWP provided comments to the draft report distributed by SPP on October 24, 2000. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-3-00 By e-mail this date, SCE provided comments to the draft report distributed by SPP on October 24, 2000. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-7-00 By letter dated November 7, 2000, SPP distributed the Project Review Group report “Path 32 Re-rate Report”. SPP indicated that there were no outstanding issues within the group at this time. | Comments due  12/10/00 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-19-00 By letter dated December 19, 2000, The PCC Chairman granted the Falcon-Gonder transmission path (Path 32) an accepted rating of 440 MW east to west and 235 MW west to east and the project attained phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4/27/90 | LDWP |  | **Utah - Nevada Transmission Project (UNTP)** | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 5-04-90 By letter dated April 27, 1990 LDWP submitted their 1990 Annual Progress Report for the Utah-Nevada Transmission Project (UNTP) along with powerflow and stability studies to indicate plan of service and planned rating of 1100 MW for the project. Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-30-95 By letter dated January 30, 1995 PCC identified UNTP as one of the projects which should report as to how it had complied with the requirements of the WSCC Regional Planning Review Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-13-95 By letter dated March 8, 1995 LDWP submitted their 1995 Annual Progress Report for the project with a new projected in-service date. | 12-04 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-18-96 At the January 1996 TSS meeting, LDWP announced that the project had been delayed two years. | 12-06 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-27-97 At the January 1997 TSS meeting, LDWP announced that the project had been cancelled. | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8/91 | WWPC |  | **BCHA - WWPC Transmission Interconnection Project** | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 8/91 By letter dated August 1991, WWPC submitted a technical study report for the proposed BCHA-WWPC Transmission Interconnection Project showing a 1000 MW planned rating. Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11/91 By letter dated November 1991, WWPC submitted supplementary technical studies for the Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-30-95 By letter dated January 30, 1995, PCC identified this as one of the projects which should report as to how it had complied with the requirements of the WSCC Regional Planning Review Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-2-95 By letter dated February 27, 1995, WWPC submitted their 1995 Annual Progress Report for the project, with a new projected in-service date of late 2000. | late 2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-18-96 At the January 1996 TSS meeting, WWPC/BCHA announced that the BCHA-WWPC Interconnection Project had been cancelled. This was confirmed by letter dated February 1, 1996. | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7-1-93 | BPA |  | **Westside 2850 MW Intertie Project** | In service |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 7-1-93 By letter dated July 1, 1993, BPA transmitted a Comprehensive Annual Report for the Westside 2850 MW Intertie Project including the BPA/Puget Power/NW Washington Transmission Project, the Ingledow Intertie Uprating Project, and the Bellingham Area Reinforcements. Planned rating 2850 MW, Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-2-93 By letter dated July 30, 1993 BPA announced the formation of a Project Review Group with the first meeting scheduled for 9-23-93. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 5-27-94 By letter dated May 27, 1994 BPA submitted a report on the accepted rating study for the Project to the PCC and declared the Project to be in Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-23-94 By letter dated July 23, 1994 WAPA expressed concerns regarding the proposed Westside 2850 MW Intertie Uprate Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-22-94 By letter dated August 22, 1994 BPA addressed the concerns raised by WAPA. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-11-94 By letter dated October 6, 1994 WAPA reported that the concerns raised in their 6-23-94 letter to BPA had been adequately addressed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-24-95 By letter dated February 21, 1995 PSPL sent their 1995 Annual Progress Report, including a description of the Joint BPA/Puget NW Washington Transmission Project which is the US portion of the BCHA/BPA 2850 MW Uprate. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-6-95 By letter dated February 27, 1995 BCHA submitted their 1995 Annual Progress Report, including an update on the BCH/BPA 2850 MW Uprate stating that the revised plan of service for the project necessitated additional studies which are currently being performed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-28-95 By letter dated March 16, 1995, BPA sent their 1995 Annual Progress Report, including a description of the Bellingham Area Reinforcement which is BPA's name for the US portion of the BCHA/BPA 2850 MW Uprate Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-10-95 By letter dated April 4, 1995, PAC expressed concern about the regional impact of the Project, based on studies performed by PAC and requested that additional studies be performed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-29-95 By letter dated May 22, 1995 BPA stated that Phase 2 of the Project Rating Process was complete with the submittal of the rating report to PCC in May 1994. It described the modified plan of service for the project and reported that studies indicated that the new plan of service would not impact the accepted ratings. | 9-97 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-16-95 By letter dated June 13, 1995, PAC stated that the May BPA report did not completely address their concerns raised in the April 4 letter and asked that the review process be re-opened. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-10-95 By letter dated July 6, 1995, BPA expressed to PCC that the project has complied with all the steps of the WSCC Rating Procedure and should now be in Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-7-95 By letter dated August 1, 1995, PAC stated that they did not believe the project had met the technical or procedural requirements, nor the intent of the rating procedures and should therefore remain in Phase 2 of the process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-9-95 By letter dated August 8, 1995, TNSK expressed concern about use of Tenaska plant tripping as a remedial action scheme and requested that TSS allow a review of the uprating study for accuracy of assumptions relating to the Tenaska plant. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-9-95 By letter dated November 3, 1995, PCC granted an Accepted Rating Status and the project advanced to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-1-94 | EPE |  | **Arroyo Phase Shifting Transformer (APST)** | In service |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 3-1-94 By letter dated March 1, 1994, EPE submitted a comprehensive report for the Arroyo Phase Shifting Transformer. Planned rating of 1048 MW, Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-26-94 By letter dated September 26, 1995, EPE formally announced the formation of an Ad Hoc Review Group for the Arroyo Project. The group met on October 19, 1994. EPE is finalizing the study report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 8-04-95 By letter dated July 28, 1995, EPE submitted the WSCC Review Group Accepted Rating Report for the project and requested approval from the PCC to move into Phase 3 of the WSCC rating process. Member comments due by 9-4-95. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 9-08-95 By letter dated September 5, 1995, EPE reported that no adverse comments had been received and requested that PCC grant Accepted Rating Status of Phase 3 in the WSCC rating process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 9-18-95 By letter dated September 12, 1995, PCC granted an Accepted Rating Status and the project entered Phase 3 of the Project Rating Review Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-27-95 | ANHM |  | **Adelanto - Lugo Transmission Project (ALTP)** | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 2-22-94 By letter dated February 22, 1994, ANHM submitted a comprehensive annual report for the Adelanto-Lugo Transmission Project with a planned rating of 1444 MW. Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-27-95 By letter dated March 24, 1995, M-S-R announced that it would assume the project management for the Adelanto-Lugo Transmission Project (ALTP) and announced the formation of a Phase 2 Review Group, with the first meeting to be scheduled April 19. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-1996 In the 1996 Existing Generation and Significant Additions and Changes to Systems Facilities 1995-2005 Report, SNCL indicated that the project had been cancelled. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-18-94 | MID/TID |  | **Westley - Tracy Transmission Project (WTTP)** | In service |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 4-18-94 By letter dated April 11, 1994, MID and TID transmitted a Westley-Tracy Transmission Project Study Report to the TSS and offered it to other WSCC members, upon request. Planned rating for the project is 323 MW, Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-16-95 By letter dated March 8, 1995, MID and TID submitted an annual progress report for the Project and stated that the project was moving from Phase 2 to  Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-30-95 A conference call occurred with the PCC Chairman, TSS Chairman, WSCC Staff, MID, and TID representatives present. The project was determined to be in Phase 2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-5-95 By letter dated May 1, 1995, MID and TID solicited interest in a WSCC Review Group from the membership of the PCC, TSS, and OC. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-25-95 By letter dated May 25, 1995, SCE expressed concern over possible involvement of either Pacific AC or DC ties in any remedial action schemes being proposed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-15-96 By letter dated February 13, 1996, MID/TID submitted their Annual Progress report and announced that energization is scheduled for 3/1/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1984 | PNM |  | **Ojo Line Extension Project (OLE)** | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | A comprehensive progress report for the Ojo Line Extension Project (OLE) was submitted in 1984 and supplemental information was submitted with the 1987 and 1992 annual progress reports. Planned rating 268 MW, Phase 2 status 6-10-94. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-13-95 By letter dated March 8, 1995, PNM submitted their annual progress report for the project and noted that the viability of alternative routing for the 345 kV line is being explored. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-18-96 At the January 1996 TSS meeting, PNM announced that the OLE project had been cancelled. | Cancelled |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-17-95 | SPP |  | **Alturas Project** | In service |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 4-12-95 By letter dated April 12, 1995, SPP announced the completion of the Alturas Project Review Group Rating Report and consensus of the Review Group. With this submittal, SPP requested a Project Accepted Rating from the PCC and progress to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-22-95 By letter dated May 19, 1995, IPC stated several objections to the project's advancement to Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-31-95 By letter dated July 26, 1995, PCC granted the Alturas Project an Accepted Rating of 300 MW and the Project advanced to Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-24-97 By letter dated January 17, 1997, PG&E raised concerns about the project rating, due to slippage of the schedule and simultaneous restrictions on the operation of COI, PDCI, and Alturas. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 2-3-1997 By letter dated January 23, 1997, SPP responded to concerns about the project raised by the 7/2/97 and 8/10/97 events, and stated their intention to complete the project by 12/21/97. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-30-97 By letter dated June 25, 1997, SPP requested a one-year extension of the completion deadline. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-7-97 By letter dated July 2, 1997, PG&E objected to any extension and indicated that the project should revert to Phase 2 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-16-95 | SDGE |  | **EOR Path Rating Increase 7365 to 7550 MW (EOR2)** | In service |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | N | 6-6-95 By letter dated June 6, 1995, SDGE announced a proposed increase in the Accepted Rating for the East of Colorado River path, from 7365 MW (see EOR Transmission Rating Project) to 7550 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-28-96 By letter dated May 5, 1996, TSS approved the advancement of EOR2 to Phase 2 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-31-96 By letter dated May 17, 1996, SDG&E submitted a revised final draft of their Comprehensive Report and announced the final Review Group meeting for 6/10/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-19-96 By letter dated June 14, 1996, SDG&E submitted the Accepted Rating Report, which was approved by the EOR2 Review Group. | Comments due  07/19/96 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-08-96 By letter dated August 5, 1996, PCC granted the EOR2 Project an Accepted Rating of 7550 MW and the project advanced to Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-26-96 | SDGE |  | **South of SONGS Path Rating (SOS)** | In service |
|  |  | N | 01-22-96 By letter dated January 22, 1996 SDGE reported its intent to follow the 3-step process of achieving an Accepted Rating of 1550 MW north-to-south and 775 MW south-to-north on the existing interconnection between the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) and the SDG&E system. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-12-96 By letter dated December 6, 1996 SDGE announced the formation of a Review Group and issued a supplement to the report of April 1996, stating that they were revising their rating request to 1900 MW, in the N-to-S direction only. The first meeting of the Review Group was scheduled for December 19, 1996. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-18-96 By FAX dated December 18, 1996 and letter dated December 23, 1996, LADWP expressed concerns about the results of previous studies, and suggested additional studies to be run. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-19-96 At the first Review Group meeting, objections were raised to the 1900 MW rating. SDGE proposed instead a dual rating, with one value for all lines in service and another with SWPL out of service, which was agreed to by the group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-23-96 SDGE issued for review a revised Study Plan incorporating the Review Group's input. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-14-97 By letter dated January 8, 1997, SCE claimed that the proposed dual rating did not conform to WSCC standard rating procedures. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-13-97 By letter dated January 9, 1997 SDGE responded to SCE's objection and stated that the issue would be discussed at the January 13 Review Group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-31-97 By FAX dated January 31, 1997 SDGE reported that the dual rating of 1800 MW with all lines in service and no Palo Verde units on line, and 1900 MW secondary rating was agreed to by the Review Group at the January 13 meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-17-97 By letter dated March 14, 1997 SDGE delivered the Final Draft of their Accepted Rating Report and announced the final meeting of the Review Group for 3/21/97 in San Diego. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-31-97 By letter dated March 27, 1997 SDGE transmitted a draft of the 3/21/97 meeting minutes. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-7-97 By letter dated April 4, 1997 SDGE delivered the Accepted Rating Report for the project. | Comments due 5/4/97 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-9-97 By letter dated May 9, 1997 PCC granted the SOS Project an Accepted Rating of 1800 MW and the project advanced to Phase 3 status. |  |