|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-17-13 | Alberta Electric System Operator (AESO) | N | **Path 1 Definition Change Project** | In-Service |
|  |  | N | 1-9-14 By email this date AESO announced their desire to expedite path rating process. The definition change includes defining the new Bennett 520S which includes only a 500/240 kV transformer. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-17-13 | El Paso Electric (EPE) | N | **Path 47 Verification of Accepted Rating Project** | In-Service |
|  |  | N | 9-17-13 By email this date none of the facility changes noted above impact the Path 47 Existing Ratings, i.e., the 940 MW simultaneous and the 1048 MW non-simultaneous ratings. Please note that this analysis was not intended to evaluate new Path 47 Accepted Ratings but rather to verify if the system modifications adversely impact the Existing Ratings. During the analysis, it was found that the actual Path 47 transfer capabilities may be above published Existing Ratings as verified in this analysis. This may be due to the recent additions of new generation resources and transmission lines in the Southern New Mexico (SNM) transmission territory. This finding however needs further investigation as this analysis was not intended to raise the current Existing Rating on Path 47. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-03-13 | Arizona Public Service (APS) | N | **Hassayampa – N. Gila #2 Transmission Project (Path 49 Upgrade)** | 6/1/2015 |
|  |  | N | 8-3-13 By email this date With the addition of the HANG2 project, APS is anticipating increasing the Path 49 non-simultaneous rating as well as increasing the load serving capability of the Yuma area. Also, APS will be working with the sponsors of the N. Gila-Imperial Valley #2 500 kV project to determine a new Path 49 rating. To date, APS does not have a proposed rating for the HANG2 project but it is anticipated to be between 600-700 MW without the N. Gila-Imperial Valley #2 500 kV project and approximately twice that with the project. The anticipated in-service date for the HANG2 project is June 1, 2015.  With the submittal of this letter, Arizona Public Service will begin a Comprehensive Progress Report study in support of the new rating. |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-13 By email this date HANG 2 project requested phase 2 status and distributed the comprehensive progress report. Comments and requests to be part of the project review group are due December 17, 2013. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-29-11 | Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) | N | **TOT 1A (Path 30) Limit Calculation Update Project** | 12/2013 |
|  |  | N | 08-29-11 By e-mail this date, Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the TOT 1A (Path 30) Limit Calculation Update Project. This project is initiated to update the TOT 1A limit calculation methodology and no changes to the current E-W transfer capability of 650 MW are being sought. In addition, a request for interest in participation in a Project Review Group was made. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 6-12-13 By email this date the comprehensive progress report was distributed for review. Interest in participation in the PRG is due June 26, 2013. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 1-7-14 By email this date Path 30 is granted phase 3 status. The transfer capability remains 650 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-03-11 | Calpine Corp. | N | **Sutter Energy Center Interconnection Relocation Project** | ? |
|  |  | N | 08-03-11 By e-mail this date, Calpine Corp. initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Sutter Energy Center Interconnection Relocation Project. Sutter Energy Center is a nominal 540 MW natural gas-fired CC plant located in Sutter County, CA that currently connects to the 230 kV bus at WAPA’s O’Banion Substation and has been operational since 2001. Calpine submitted a request to the CAISO in January 2010 to establish a new 600 MW interconnection for the plant to the CAISO-controlled grid on PG&E’s Table Mountain-Tesla 500 kV line. The existing 230 kV connection to WAPA will be disconnected and the Sutter plant will connect directly to the CAISO-controlled grid. Calpine initiated the Project Rating Review Process in order to identify impacts to COI (Path 66) or other rated paths and to identify required measures to mitigate negative impacts on the path ratings. Calpine also solicited interest in participating in the Study Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-30-11 By e-mail this date PG&E declared their interest in participating on the Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-14-11 By e-mail this date Calpine provided a meeting summary from the Sutter Study Review Group kickoff meeting and provided information for the next meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-15-11 By e-mail this date WAPA provided comments to the meeting minutes and some suggestions for adherence to the Rating Review Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-21-11 By e-mail this date USE Consulting provided a draft study plan for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-21-11 By e-mail this date WAPA provided some comments to the draft study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-27-11 By e-mail this date WAPA provided some comments to the draft study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-10-12 By e-mail this date Ben Williams provided an update to the PCRG indicating that work continues. Calpine, PG&E, and CAISO are working through the Large Generator Interconnection Agreement issues and that must also be included in the study’s Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-02-11 | Southwest Transmission Partners, LLC | N | **North Gila-Imperial Valley #2 Project** | Q2/2016 |
|  |  | N | 08-02-11 By e-mail this date, Southwest Transmission Partners initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the North Gila-Imperial Valley #2 Project. This project is planned to be an 85 mile double-circuit 500 kV line and would parallel the existing North Gila-Imperial Valley line. It is expected to provide for an increase of WECC Path 46 (WOR) up to 2400 MW and an increase of Path 49 (EOR) up to 1200 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-26-11 | Great Basin Energy Development LLC (GBHVDC) | N | **Great Basin HVDC Project** | 12/2016 |
|  |  | N | 07-26-11 By e-mail this date, Great Basin Energy Development, LLC initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Great Basin HVDC Project. This project is planned to achieve 1000 MW of transfer capability between NVEnergy’s Tracy switching station near Reno, NV and WAPA’s O’Banion switching station near Yuba City, CA. This will be accomplished by use of a 400 kV underground cable using VSC HVDC converter technology. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 06-08-10 | Southern California Edison (SCE) | N | **Path 46 Rating Verification with Mohave Generating Station Shutdown** | ? |
|  |  | N | 06-08-10 By e-mail this date, Southern California Edison (SCE) initiated the Expedited Project Rating Review Process for the Path 46 Rating Verification with Mohave Generating Station Shutdown. SCE plans to verify that the current Path 46 (West of Colorado River) accepted rating of 10,623 MW can be maintained with the Mohave Generating Station shut down. SCE also solicited participation in a Project Review Group to develop the Comprehensive Progress Report. A study plan for this project was submitted for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-16-10 By e-mail this date LDWP requested entry in the Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-26-10 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments to the project study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-08-10 By e-mail this date First Solar requested entry in the Project Review Group as a correspondent only. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-30-10 By e-mail this date SCE provided the first base case for study use as well as a revised study scope including comments from LADWP, NV Energy, SRP and APS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-31-10 By e-mail this date PDS Consulting provided comments to the study scope and base case provided by SCE on 07-30-10. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-16-09 | TransCanada Corp. | N | **Chinook 500 kV HVDC Transmission Line Project** | Q1/2015 |
|  |  | N | 09-16-09 By e-mail this date, TransCanada Corp. initiated Phase I of the WECC 3-Phase Project Rating Review Process for the Chinook 500 kV HVDC Transmission Line Project. The Chinook Project consists of a 1000 mile, 500 kV HVDC transmission line from the Harlowton, MT area to the Eldorado Valley area south of Las Vegas, NV with an intermediate converter station in the Borah (American Falls) area of Idaho. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Coop (BEPC) submitted a list of questions concerning the Chinook Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-16-09 | TransCanada Corp. | N | **Zephyr 500 kV HVDC Transmission Line Project** | Q1/2015 |
|  |  | N | 09-16-09 By e-mail this date, TransCanada Corp. initiated Phase I of the WECC 3-Phase Project Rating Review Process for the Zephyr 500 kV HVDC Transmission Line Project. The Zephyr Project consists of an 1100 mile, 500 kV HVDC transmission line from the Medicine Bow, WY area to the Eldorado Valley area south of Las Vegas, NV with an intermediate converter station in the Borah (American Falls) area of Idaho. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-17-09 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Coop (BEPC) submitted a list of questions concerning the Zephyr Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-02-09 | Pacific Power  (PACE) | N | **Hemingway – Captain Jack 500 kV Line Project** | 2013 |
|  |  | N | 03-02-09 By e-mail this date, Pacific Power (division of PacifiCorp) initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Hemingway – Captain Jack 500 kV Line Project. The proposed project consists of a new 320 mile 500 kV line between the newly proposed Hemingway substation near Melba, Idaho to PacifiCorp’s 500 kV interconnection at Captain Jack substation in southern Oregon. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested participation on the Phase II Project Review Group for the Hemingway-Captain Jack Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-26-09 | Sea Breeze Pacific  (SBP-RTS) | N | **Juan de Fuca 2 Cable Project** | 12/2013 |
|  |  | N | 01-26-09 By e-mail this date, Sea Breeze Pacific (SBP-RTS) submitted the Regional Planning Project Review Report for the Juan de Fuca 2 Cable Project. This project is an 1100 MW HVDC Light interconnection between Ingledow Substation in the lower British Columbia mainland and the Kitsap/South Bremerton Substations, through southern Vancouver Island to allow the option of a future Multi-Terminal interconnection with Pike Substation on Vancouver Island |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-23-09 | Sea Breeze Pacific  (SBP-RTS) | N | **Triton South Project** | 2017 |
|  |  | N | 01-23-09 By e-mail this date, Sea Breeze Pacific (SBP-RTS) initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process for the Triton South Project. This project consists of two 1100 MW HVDC Light interconnections, one between Gold River Substation on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada, and Moraga Substation in San Francisco, CA, and one between Port Alberni Substation on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada and Embarcadero Substation in San Francisco, CA. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-06-09 | Pacific Gas and Electric Company | N | **Canada – Northern California Transmission Project S-N Rating (CNC Project)** | 2015 |
|  |  | N | 02-06-09 By e-mail this date co-sponsors Avista Corp., British Columbia Transmission Corp., PacifiCorp, and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. initiated Phase I of the Project Rating Review Process to establish a south-to-north rating for the Canada-Pacific Northwest-Northern California Transmission Project (CNC Project). The north-to-south rating is currently being evaluated in separate studies in the Project Rating Review Process. The preliminary POS includes 500 kV HVAC facilities from Selkirk in southeast British Columbia to the proposed Northeast Oregon (NEO) Station with an intermediate interconnection at Devils Gap Substation in Spokane, 500 kV HVDC facilities from NEO Station to Collinsville Substation in the San Francisco Bay Area with a possible third terminal at Cottonwood Area Substation in northern California, and voltage support at the interconnecting substations as well as remedial actions for project outages. Both south-to-north and north-to-south ratings are targeted at 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-30-06 | Sea Breeze Pacific | N | **Sea Breeze Pacific West Coast Cable Project** | 2010 |
|  |  | N | 11-01-06 By e-mail this date WECC distributed the October 30, 2006 Sea Breeze Pacific letter requesting initiation of the Project Rating Review Process for a new 500 kV DC bi-pole connection between Alston, OR and the San Francisco Bay area. A review group meeting is proposed for November 20, 2006 in Seattle, WA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-09-06 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific proposed an initial meeting of the Project Review Group to be held 11-20-06 in Portland, OR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-17-06 By e-mail this date WECC distributed an email from Sea Breeze Pacific indicating that the initial meeting of the Project Review Group was being changed from November 20 to December 20, 2006. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for the West Coast Cable Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-1-06 | Nevada Hydro Company, Inc. (TNHC) and The Lake Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EMVWD) |  | **Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project (LEAPS) and the Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500 kV Interconnection** | 2007/2009 |
|  |  | N | 03-1-06 The Nevada Hydro Company, Inc. (TNHC) and it’s partner The Lake Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EMVWD) requested the initiation of the Project Rating Review process for establishing an accepted rating for Lake Elsinore Advanced Pump Storage Project (LEAPS) and the Talega-Escondido/Valley-Serrano 500 kV Interconnection |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-23-06 By e-mail this date TNHC indicated the LEAPS had not been listed as a project in the WECC rating process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-28-06 By e-mail this date TNHC requested support from the CISO for the LEAPS project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-28-06 By e-mail this date the NWPP requested background information on the transmission associated with the LEAPS project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-03-06 By e-mail this date TNHC sent information about the LEAPS project to the NWPP. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-06 By e-mail this date TNHC sent a copy of the **Congressional Delegation letter to the LEAPS review team.** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-06 By e-mail this date TNHC thanked the review team for helping with the draft report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-06 By e-mail this date APS submitted comments regarding the submission of project studies directly to DOE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-23-07 By e-mail this date TNHC distributed a letter indicating that the final FERC Environmental Impact Study for the LEAPS Project is available on the WECC website and requested Phase II status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-28-07 By e-mail this date a CPR and letter from TNHC was distributed requesting Phase II status for the LEAPS project. In addition, a request was made for interest in forming a Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-27-07 By e-mail this date LADWP submitted comments to the TNHC EIS and indicated that it is deficient the required information for a CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-30-07 By e-mail this date PG&E noted the same deficiencies addressed by LADWP immediately above and provided a summary of required information for a CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-07-07 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided comments as well as noting that the EIS as provided by TNHC doesn’t address CPR-required topics. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-08-07 By e-mail this date SRP noted that the TNHC EIS doesn’t contain information required by a CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-25-08 By e-mail this date TNHC indicated that a new consultant (Siemens) has been hired to take this project through the WECC 3-phase Rating Process. TNHC also requested interest in formation of a new PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-04-08 By e-mail this date SDGE declared their interest in participating on the PRG for the TE/VS and LEAPS Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-09-08 By e-mail this date the project sponsor distributed a draft copy of the study plan for this project to the members of the Project Review Group for their review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-12-11 By e-mail this date SDGE requested that TNHC submit a progress report to WECC since it has been over a year since the Phase I study plan was submitted to the PRG and no further information has been distributed. |  |

# PROJECTS BELOW ARE INACTIVE IN THIS FILE

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-29-11 | Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) | N | **TOT 1A (Path 30) Limit Calculation Update Project** | 12/2013 |
|  |  | N | 08-29-11 By e-mail this date, Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the TOT 1A (Path 30) Limit Calculation Update Project. This project is initiated to update the TOT 1A limit calculation methodology and no changes to the current E-W transfer capability of 650 MW are being sought. In addition, a request for interest in participation in a Project Review Group was made. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 6-12-13 By email this date the comprehensive progress report was distributed for review. Interest in participation in the PRG is due June 26, 2013. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 1-7-14 By email this date Path 30 is granted phase 3 status. The transfer capability remains 650 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-19-13 | Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc. (TSGT) | | N | **Keota Interconnection TOT 3 Definition Change** | December 2015 |
|  |  | | N | 8-16-13 By email this date Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc. (TSGT) desires to expedite the Rating Process for re-defining a WECC Path 36 element. TSGT is undertaking a project to sectionalize the Laramie River Station (LRS)- Story 345 kV line for a radial load serving connection, at a point approximately 60-65 miles north of Story along the line. This line is an element of WECC Path 36, also known as TOT 3. The definition of TOT 3 for this line will need to be updated, with no change to the metered locations. The attached report details the change needed to the path definition and an analysis showing no negative impacts to the existing and future ratings of TOT 3. The projected in-service date is December 2015. The comprehensive progress report was distributed with the aforementioned email. |  |
|  |  | |  |  |  |
|  |  | | S | 11-12-13 By email this date a letter from the PCC chair, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination and Path Rating Processes, Path 36 was hereby granted an Accepted Rating, the effective date to coincide with the completion of the Keota Project. There is no change to the existing accepted rating of Path 36 which remains 1680 MW North to South (Maximum). |  |
| 03-07-12 | NV Energy (NVE) | N | | **Southern Nevada Transmission Interface Progject (Path 81 Redefinition)** | 4/2013 |
|  |  | N | | 03-07-12 By e-mail this date; NV Energy initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the redefinition of Path 81. The new non-simultaneous rating for the path will be 3948 MW South-to-North (NVE import) and 4458 MW North-to-South (NVE export) as measured at the SNTI line BA boundaries. A Comprehensive Progress Report was also distributed on March 7, 2012. This email also announced the formation of a Project Review Group and requested interested parties to respond by April 6, 2012 |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*C | | 5-7-12 By email SNTI received comments from Idaho Power and TransWest Express. Six Entities expressed interest in participating in the Project Review Group. The first meeting is planned for 5-14-12. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*C | | 5-7-12 By email a meeting was scheduled for May 14, 2012 to discuss the study plan and the comments received. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*C | | 6-27-12 By email the study plan was distributed for comments. Comments due 7-5-2012. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*C | | 7-5-12 By email Idaho Power submitted comments on the Study Plan. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*S | | 7-12-13 By email to the project review group with a included zip file study results were sent to the PRG for review. A PRG meeting is scheduled to be held on 7/29/13. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 7-29-13 SNTI meeting materials were sent out for the meeting being held on this date. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 8-1-13 By email this date the meeting notes for the meeting held on 7/29/13 were sent out along with the comprehensive progress report with comments due on the report. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*S | | 10-2-13 By email this date NVEnergy distributed the final Comprehensive Progress Report for PCC review and 30 day comment. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | \*S | | 11-4-13 By email this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting SNTI an Accepted Rating of 4533 MW N-S and 3970 MW S-N. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-22-13 | PacifiCorp (PAC) | N | **TOT 4A/4B (Path 37/38) Project** | 12/2013 |
|  |  | N | 01-22-13 By e-mail this date, PacifiCorp (PAC) initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the TOT 4A/4B (Path 37/38) Project. The Comprehensive Progress Report was posted on the WECC website for 60 day review on this date as well.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | WECC Path  Name / Number | Without Standpipe 230kV Additions Rating | With Standpipe 230kV Additions Rating | | TOT 4A (37) | 960 MW | 1025 MW | | TOT 4B (38) | 880 MW | 880 MW |   In addition, a request for interest in participation in a Project Review Group was made. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 4-17-13 By email this date this project achieved phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested participation on the Project Review Group for the West of McNary Project |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-10-09 By e-mail this date the original notification letter of 08-18-09 was re-distributed due to an error in the contact information for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-16-10 | Arizona Public Service  (APS) | N | **Path 50 (Cholla – Pinnacle Peak) Uprate** | 2011 |
|  |  | N | 08-16-10 By e-mail this date, Arizona Public Service (APS) initiated Phase I in the Project Rating Review Process for the Path 50 Uprate Project. Past studies have found that the non-simultaneous rating could increase from 50 to 100 MW with the proposed plan of service, with the present existing rating being 1200 MW. The current plan of service for re-rating the Cholla-Pinnacle Peak path involves reconductoring a one mile section of both 345 kV lines to utilize the existing capacity beyond these sections. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-16-2013 By a letter submitted by email this date APS requested that this project be removed from the path rating process at this time. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-20-12 | NWMT |  | **Path 18 Upgrade Project** | 2013 |
|  |  | N | 11-20-12 By e-mail this date, NWMT submitted a Comprehensive Progress Report to increase the rating for Path 18 to 383 MW (North to South. NWMT requested the rating process be expedited. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 01-30-13 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the Path 18 Upgrade has achieved Phase III status and an accepted rating of 383 MW N-S as described in the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 06-07-11 | Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (PG&E) | N | **Path 26 S-N Re-definition Project** | 2011 |
|  |  | N | 06-07-11 By e-mail this date, PG&E initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the Path 26 S-N Re-defin ition Project. The existing Path 26 includes the Midway-Vincent #1, #2, and #3 500 kV lines metered at Midway. Southern California Edison plans to build a new Whirlwind Substation that will be looped into the existing Midway-Vincent #3 500 kV line for integrating renewable generation in the Tehachapi area. This will result in a change to the Path 26 definition as follows: Midway-Vincent #1 and #2 and Midway-Whirlwind #3 500 kV lines, all metered at Midway. The proposed path redefinition will not change the existing S-N rating of 3000 MW. A CPR was posted for 60-day review and a request was made for interest in participation on a PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-13-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy submitted a list of 5 comments to the Path 26 S-N Re-definition CPR from 06-07-11. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-20-11 By e-mail this date PG&E provided a base case to NVEnergy and requested their help in creating a base case with simultaneous maximum flows on Path 26 S-N and Path 52. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-23-11 By e-mail this date NVEnergy sent the base case with requested modifications back to PG&E for simultaneous Path 26 S-N and Path 52 studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-03-11 By e-mail this date PG&E confirmed a request from Modesto Irrigation District to be added to the PRG for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-17-11 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that NVEnergy had previously submitted a list of comments to the CPR of 06-07-11 and provided answers to all comments. In addition, two more simultaneous transfer capability studies were performed and study results were provided. PG&E also noted that NVEnergy is satisfied with PG&E’s response. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-30-11 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that all comments to the CPR have been addressed satisfactorily and officially requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 09-27-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed notification that the Path 26 Redefinition Project is granted Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 3000 MW S-N. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-01-11 | Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) | N | **TOT 5 (Path 39) Re-definition Project** | 2011 |
|  |  | N | 02-01-11 By e-mail this date, WAPA initiated the Expedited Rating Process for the TOT 5 (Path 39) Re-definition Project. This project involves the re-definition of Path 39 due to minor modifications to the path (addition of intermediate bus, relocation of and reduction in number of meters, etc.) and the maintenance of its current “Existing” rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-05-11 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that no comments regarding the TOT 5 Re-definition Project had been received and requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-19-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair noted that the Path Rating Catalog shows the existing rating on TOT 5 as 1675 MW but WAPA claims the existing rating is 1680 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-19-11 By e-mail this date WAPA explained that the 1680 MW rating has been in effect since the late 1990’s and that the rating in the Path Rating Catalog is in error. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-19-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status to the TOT 5 Re-definition Project with an “Existing” rating of 1680 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-11 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that objections had been raised about the TOT 5 Re-definition Project due to the fact that a request for formation of a Project Review Group (PRG) was never distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-27-11 By e-mail this date a retraction to the Phase III status letter for this project was distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-11 By e-mail this date the Expedited Rating Process for the TOT 5 Re-definition was re-initiated and a request was made, asking for interest in formation of a PRG by 06-02-11. In addition, a CPR was distributed along with the e-mail. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-07-11 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that no comments had been received to the CPR distributed on 05-03-11 and no interest was received in formation of a PRG. WAPA therefore requested Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 06-10-11 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status and an Existing Rating of 1680 MW to the TOT 5 (Path 39) Re-definition Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 10-26-10 By e-mail this date BCTC provided the Path 3 S-N Rating Increase Phase I CPR for 60-day review along with a letter requesting Phase II status and interest in participating in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-27-10 By e-mail this date SMUD declared interest in participating in the PRG for this project and also submitted two comments to the CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-13-10 By e-mail this date BCTC acknowledged SMUD’s interest in participating in the PRG. BCTC provided an answer to one of the comments from SMUD and indicated that the other comment will be addressed during Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-23-10 By e-mail this date BPA provided a list of four comments to the project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-12-11 By e-mail this date BCH provided responses to BPA’s comments of 12-23-10 and provided an updated CPR incorporating these comments. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-24-11 By e-mail this date BPA indicated that they have no additional comments to the Path 3 S-N CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-01-11 By e-mail this date BCH indicated that all comments received by SMUD and BPA have been addressed in the Phase I CPR satisfactorily and requested Phase II status. Further, BCH noted that both SMUD and BPA requested participation on the Phase II PRG and that the Phase II PRG kick-off meeting was planned for February 2011. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-19-09 | PacifiCorp  (PACE) | N | **TOT 4A/4B Transmission Path Rerate** | ? |
|  |  | N | 05-19-09 By e-mail this date, PacifiCorp initiated the Expedited Review Process for the TOT 4B Redefinition. Basin Electric is currently constructing the Hughes-Dryfork-Sheridan and Dryfork-Carr Draw 230 kV lines. The Tongue River-Sheridan section of the Dryfork-Sheridan 230 kV line will cross the existing TOT 4B boundary at Sheridan so with the addition of an element to the TOT 4B path, technical studies will be required to update the existing TOT4A/4B operating nomograms, last updated in April 1991. PacifiCorp requested interest in participation in development of the Phase I Comprehensive Progress Report and in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 07-30-10 By e-mail this date, PacifiCorp (PAC) initiated the Expedited Project Rating Review Process for the TOT 4A/4B Transmission Path Rerate. System upgrades outlined in the 05-19-09 log entry above have been made that affect the definitions of both paths so to obtain accepted ratings, this rerate project is being taken through the Rating Review Process. Along with the notification letter, PacifiCorp provided a Comprehensive Progress Report for 60-day review along with a request for interest in participating on the Phase 2 Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-06-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp noted that during the 60-day review period of the Phase I CPR (expedited process), no comments were received. As a result, Phase III status was requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-11-10 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase III status to the TOT 4A/4B Transmission Path Rerate Project with Accepted ratings of 937 MW for TOT 4A and 829 MW for TOT 4B. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-10 By e-mail this date, it was noted by WAPA that even though no request to form a PRG was submitted, a substantial amount of stability analysis was completed during the 60 day review period to verify that the proposed 4A/4B increases could be accomplished with minimal issues regarding the MT system. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-25-08 | Idaho Power Company (IPC) | N | **Path 55 Brownlee East Increase to 1915 MW** | 6/2008 |
|  |  | N | 03-25-08 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company (IPC) requested the Expedited Review Process for the Path 55 Brownlee East Increase to 1915 MW. The project consists of facility additions of a 75 MVAR 230 kV shunt capacitor at Brownlee and increasing Ontario C231 series capacitor ampacity rating from 1430 to 1590 amperes in the Brownlee-Ontario 230 kV line. The project is necessary to provide network transmission service for the Elkhorn Wind Generation Project (65 MW), which is integrated on the Brownlee-Quartz-LaGrande 230 kV line by the North Powder Switching Station near North Powder, OR. The Comprehensive Progress Report was submitted on this date for 60-day review and interest in participating in a Project Review Group was requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-16-08 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp indicated their interest in membership on the PRG for the Path 55 Brownlee East Uprate Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-02-09 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company contacted PacifiCorp and BPA to address their concerns, respectively, on interactions between the Path 55 Uprate and Path 75 Midpoint-Summer Lake as well as Path 55 Uprate and COI. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-08-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp requested study results demonstrating simultaneous maximum transfer flows on Brownlee East and Midpoint-Summer Lake after the Brownlee East Uprate. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-08-09 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Co. provided study results per PacifiCorp’s 04-08-09 request. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-26-09 By e-mail this date IPC provided a revised CPR to BPA and PacifiCorp for their review due to comments received from them. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-18-09 By e-mail this date IPC requested procedural help with the Expedited Rating Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-25-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair provided information regarding the Expedited Rating Process as well as a list of necessary steps that IPC will need to complete in order to proceed with the Rating Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-10 By e-mail this date PPL Energy noted that their comments to the Phase I CPR were editorial in nature and as such, their approval of the final report isn’t necessary. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-03-10 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp stated that an updated “plan of service” must be included in the CPR to include the additional facilities required for the mitigation of the simultaneous interaction between the Midpoint-Summer Lake rating of 550 MW W-E and the path 55 Brownlee East new rating of 1915 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-05-10 By e-mail this date BPA provided comments stating that study results included in the Phase I CPR satisfactorily address simultaneous interactions and a Phase II PRG is not required. This being the case, BPA has no reservations about this project achieving Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-24-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair sent a list of two items that IPC needs to complete before Phase III can be granted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-25-10 By e-mail this date IPC provided an updated CPR with all comments included along with a letter requesting Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-07-10 By e-mail this date IPC distributed an updated CPR for an additional 30-day review per PCC Chair request. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-17-10 By e-mail this date the notification that was distributed 05-07-10 was re-sent because some of the intended recipients didn’t receive it. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-18-10 By e-mail this date PGE provided two comments to the CPR that was distributed for review 05-07-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-18-10 By e-mail this date IPC provided responses to the two comments received from PGE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-18-10 By e-mail this date PGE indicated that the responses received from IPC adequately addressed PGE’s concerns. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-08-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair asked if any comments in addition to PGE’s had been received and if not, IPC should draft a Phase III acceptance letter and send to the PCC Chair. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-10-10 By e-mail this date IPC requested Phase III status for the Path 55 Brownlee East Increase to 1915 MW. IPC indicated that all facilities in the plan of service have been completed and placed in-service. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-14-10 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed notification that the Path 55 Brownlee East Increase to 1915 MW project has achieved Phase III status with an accepted rating of 1915 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 05-07-09 By e-mail this date Portland General Electric distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for 60-day review. Portland General requested Phase II status in the Project Rating Review Process upon acceptance of the CPR and also requested notification of interest in participating on the Phase II Project Review Group. The project has a planned rating of 1500 MW east-to-west and has a target operating date of April 2015. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for the Southern Crossing Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-09-09 During the 60-day CPR review period for the Southern Crossing Transmission Project, it was found that some study simulation results were incorrect. Simulations were re-run and an updated CPR was prepared. By e-mail this date the updated CPR was distributed for an additional 30-day review and a review deadline of 08/06/09. Also, interest in formation of a Phase II Project Review Group was requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-04-09 By e-mail this date Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) submitted three pages of comments to the Southern Crossing Transmission Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-19-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy (PSE) requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-18-09 By e-mail this date PGE provided responses to the comments submitted by BPA on 08-04-09 and indicated that technical issues that were raised will be addressed during Phase II of the Rating Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-25-09 By e-mail this date BPA stated that they believe most of their comments from 08-19-09 are pertinent for Phase I work and should be incorporated in the CPR before transition to Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-05-09 By e-mail this date PGE replied to BPA’s request for further information and provided it to them but indicated that it would not be included in the CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-30-09 By e-mail this date BPA indicated their satisfaction with PGE’s responses from 10-05-09 but that one item still needed to be addressed before transition to Phase II. This remaining item was presented in the e-mail. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-23-10 By e-mail this date PGE submitted a Phase II request letter along with an Appendix to the CPR which contains answers to several of the outstanding comments to the CPR. The remaining comments will be addressed during the Phase II study work. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-28-10 By e-mail this date BPA submitted a list of two items that need to be addressed in the Appendix to the CPR that was distributed 04-23-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-04-10 By e-mail this date PGE provided an updated Appendix which addresses the two items identified in the BPA e-mail of 04-28-10. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-11-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair provided a list of four action items that need to be completed before Phase II can be achieved. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-27-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair provided a draft Phase II acceptance letter to PGE for the Cascade Crossing Project. PGE was asked to update the letter by including a description of the amount of series compensation on two of the project line sections as well as any additional comments they want to add. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-03-10 By e-mail this date PGE provided an updated Phase II acceptance letter to the TSS Chair. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-03-10 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair made one additional comment to the Phase II acceptance letter. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-24-10 | Idaho Power Co. | N | **Path 14 & Path 75 Redefinition and Hemingway In/Out Transmission Project** | ? |
|  |  | N | 02-24-10 By e-mail this date, Idaho Power Co. initiated the Expedited Project Rating Review Process for the Path 14 & Path 75 Redefinition and Hemingway In/Out Transmission Project. This project consists of a new tap on the existing Midpoint-Summer Lake 500 kV line (Hemingway 500 kV) that effectively relocates a metering point on these paths to the Hemingway station. Idaho Power does not seek a new rating on Paths 14 and 75 but wishes to maintain the existing/accepted ratings on these paths. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-12-10 By e-mail this date, SMUD submitted a question concerning base case topology being used with this project. SMUD also requested participation on the Phase 2 PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-10 By e-mail this date BPA submitted a list of three comments to the CPR for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-25-10 By e-mail this date, IPC submitted a letter to the PCC Chair indicating that all comments submitted by SMUD and BPA had been satisfactorily resolved. IPC requested Phase III status at this time. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-08-10 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 14 & Path 75 redefinition and the Hemingway in/out Transmission Project has achieved Phase III status. Paths 14 and 75 are redefined and maintain their currently accepted ratings (Path 14: 1200 MW W-E and 2400 MW E-W) and (Path 75: 550 MW W-E and 1500 MW E-W). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-16-07 | Tri-State Generation & Transmission Association | N | **Eastern Plains Transmission Project (EPTP)** | 2020+ |
|  |  | N | 04-16-07 By e-mail this date Tri-State G&T declared entry into Phase I for the Eastern Plains Transmission Project and requested interest in formation of a PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-15-10 By e-mail this date TSGT indicated that the EPTP project has been delayed, likely beyond the 2020 time frame. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-29-10 By e-mail this date TSGT requested removal of the Eastern Plains Transmission Project from the WECC Path Rating Process. This project will be removed from future releases of this document. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-30-09 | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-09-09 By e-mail this date CFE informed the TSS Chair that comments to the CPR were only received from SDG&E but these comments were only informational in nature and don’t require additional studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-13-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair requested answers to 4 items in order for the Path 45 Uprate Project to be able to transition to Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-23-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E indicated they are satisfied with CFE’s responses to their comments to the CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-29-09 By e-mail this date CFE noted that a response was provided to the TSS Chair regarding the four questions from 10-13-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-09-08 | 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 | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for the Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-17-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for review for the Walla Walla-McNary Transmission Project. The review deadline is September 15, 2009. A request for interest in participation in the Phase II Project Review Group was also made. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-17-09 By e-mail this date Avista Corp. requested entry into the Project Review Group. Two comments to the CPR were also submitted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-19-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy (PSE) requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-15-09 By e-mail this date BPA provided a list of 17 comments to the CPR for this project and also requested membership in the Phase II PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-22-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp acknowledged receipt of BPA’s comments and indicated they will address them during Phase II of the Rating Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-15-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair requested information on four items in order for the Walla Walla-McNary Project to transition to Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-20-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp provided answers to the four items requested by the TSS Chair. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-22-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair listed three additional steps that need to be completed for Phase II transition of the project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-14-09 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed a revised CPR for additional 60-day review based on comments received during the initial review of the CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-14-10 By e-mail this date Pacific Power provided an updated CPR with all comments from Avista, BPA, and Idaho Power included and requested Phase II status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-11-08 | TransWest Express LLC | N | **TransWest Express Project** | 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 | 01-14-08 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Cooperative declared interest in participating in the TransWest Express Project Phase I study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-21-08 By e-mail this date National Grid distributed a notice for the first Phase I Study Group meeting for the TransWest Express Project and requested interest in participation in the PRG. The first meeting is to be held at PacifiCorp offices in Salt Lake City on 4/1/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-03-08 By e-mail this date National Grid distributed a letter indicating that National Grid has relinquished its role as the lead developer for the TransWest Express Project. In a joint press release dated 07/29/08, it was announced that the Anschutz Corp., through its affiliate TransWest Express LLC, had acquired from National Grid its rights in, and the role of lead developer of the TransWest Express Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-24-09 By e-mail this date TransWest Express LLC distributed a letter providing an update on the TransWest Express Project. The project is currently envisioned to be a +/- 600 kV DC transmission line extending approximately 800 miles from south-central Wyoming to the Las Vegas area. The project has a proposed rating of 3000 MW delivered to the southern terminal and a planned in-service date of 2014. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-06-09 By e-mail this date TransWest Express distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the TransWest Express Project for 60-day review. In addition, interest in participation in the Phase II Project Review Group was requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-08-09 By e-mail this date TransWest Express provided notice of a meeting/webinar to be held on 10-19-09 to present the TransWest Express CPR and answer questions about the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-20-09 By e-mail this date WAPA provided a list of comments to the TransWest Express Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-06-09 By e-mail this date TWE distributed notes from the 10-19-09 meeting/webinar indicating issues raised and responses as well as the webinar presentations. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-18-09 By e-mail this date a reminder was distributed indicating that the comment deadline for review of the CPR was 12-04-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-20-09 By e-mail this date WAPA provided a list of comments to the TWE CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-28-09 By e-mail this date TransWest Express LLC submitted a request for entry into Phase II for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-01-09 | San Diego Gas & Electric  (SDG&E) | N | **Path 45 Terminal Change** | 2009 |
|  |  | N | 05-01-09 By e-mail this date, San Diego Gas & Electric initiated the Expedited Review Process for the Path 45 Terminal Change. The project consists of the re-definition of Path 45 (SDG&E & CFE) by revising the termination substation of the Miguel-Tijuana 230 kV line, one of the elements of Path 45. No change in rating is requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-01-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E indicated that no comments to the Path 45 Terminal Change CPR have been received during the 60-day review. SRP asked for clarification on the generation assumption in the tudy base cases but was satisfied with responses received. SDG&E requested Phase III status in the WECC 3-Phase Rating Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-28-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair requested clarification on previous email from SDG&E to determine if all requirements of expedited process have been met. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-29-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E responded to the email from the TSS Chair on 07-28-09 and answered all questions posed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-03-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair indicated that additional analysis is required in order for the Path 45 Terminal Change project to achieve Phase III status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-01-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided study results to address the requested additional analysis as identified in the 08-03-09 email from the TSS Chair and indicated that the CPR will be updated. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-09-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair asked three questions regarding the post-transient study results from SDG&E on 09-01-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-11-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E noted receipt of the questions from the TSS Chair and indicated the questions will be addressed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-23-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided answers to the questions from the TSS Chair and updated post-transient study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-13-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair requested further information regarding Q-V study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-22-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair asked if the requested Q-V studies were going to be performed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-03-09 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair requested a revised CPR that includes the post-transient and transient stability studies that were performed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-05-09 By e-mail this date SDG&E provided the additional study results that were requested by the TSS Chair. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-30-09 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 45 Terminal Change Project has achieved Phase III status after having successfully completed the Expedited Rating Process. The Path 45 definition is now Tijuana-Otay Mesa 230 kV and La Rosita-Imperial Valley 230 kV. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 03-12-09 By e-mail this date Avista Corp. distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Devils Gap 500/230 kV Interconnection to the PG&E CNC Project for 60-day review with a review deadline of May 11, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-29-09 By e-mail this date BCTC indicated interest in participating on the Phase II Project Review Group for the Avista Devils Gap Interconnection Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for the CNC Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-10-07 | TransCanada Energy Ltd. | N | **NorthernLights Project (previously Northern Lights– Celilo Project)** |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-15-08 By e-mail this date TransCanada Energy Ltd. distributed a letter questioning why the WECC Coordinated Planning and Technical Studies Letter dated 12/21/07 included seven projects in the Northwest area but did not include the Northern Lights – Celilo Project. It was requested that the Northern Lights Project be included in the coordinated planning program. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-18-08 By e-mail this date the Alberta Electric System Operator added their strong support for the Northern Lights Project to be included in the coordinated planning program. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date TransCanada Energy Ltd. distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the NorthernLights Project to PCC and TSS for 60-day review. A comment due date of February 9, 2009 was specified. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested, with the same due date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-16-09 By e-mail this date LADWP requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-28-09 By e-mail this date Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. Requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-10-09 By e-mail this date BCTC submitted a list of 3 comments to the NorthernLights CPR but agreed that these issues could be addressed during Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-28-09 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group for the NorthernLights Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-12-07 | Southwestern Power Group II, LLC (SWPG) | N | **SunZia Southwest Transmission Project** | 2011 |
|  |  | 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 | 04-23-09 By e-mail this date SunZia distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project for review and requested entry into Phase II of the Project Rating Process upon acceptance of the CPR. Interest in participation on the Project Review Group for this project was also requested. This project has a planned rating of 3000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-09-09 By e-mail this date SunZia provided a power flow representation of the SunZia Southwest Transmission Project in GE PSLF EPCL format. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 11-26-08 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Hemingway to Boardman Transmission Project for review and comments were requested by February 2, 2009. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested, with a due date of February 12, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 12-22-08 By e-mail this date, co-sponsors Avista Corp., British Columbia Transmission Corp., PacifiCorp, and Pacific Gas & Electric Co. submitted the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Canada/Pacific Northwest-California Transmission Project to PCC and TSS for 60-day review. Comments are due by February 20, 2009. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested, with the same due date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-16-09 By e-mail this date LADWP requested membership in the Phase II Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-11-08 | PacifiCorp | N | **Gateway South Project** | 2013 |
|  |  | 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 | 01-14-08 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Cooperative declared interest in participating in the Gateway South Project Phase I study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-21-08 By e-mail this date National Grid distributed a notice for the first Phase I Study Group meeting for the Gateway South Project and requested interest in participation in the PRG. The first meeting is to be held at PacifiCorp offices in Salt Lake City on 4/1/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-03-08 By e-mail this date a joint National Grid/PacifiCorp letter was distributed indicating that National Grid has relinquished its role as the lead developer for the Gateway South Project. Hereafter, PacifiCorp will continue with the WECC 3-phase rating process and assumes sole sponsorship of the Gateway South Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-21-08 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Gateway South Project for review and comments were requested by January 23, 2009. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested with the same due date. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-25-08 By e-mail this date LDWP requested membership in the Project Review Group for the Gateway South Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-11-08 By e-mail this date Basin Electric Power Co. submitted comments to the Gateway South Project CPR, requesting TOT3 sensitivities. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-07-09 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted 9 comments to the Gateway South Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-16-09 By e-mail this date LADWP submitted 14 questions/comments to the Gateway South Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-22-09 By e-mail this date PACE provided answers to all comments submitted by LADWP and noted that many of the questions will be answered in greater detail during the Phase II rating studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-22-09 By e-mail this date PACE provided answers to all comments submitted by WAPA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-23-09 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that their comments had been addressed satisfactorily and that additional concerns could be addressed during the Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-27-09 By e-mail this date Transwest Express LLC submitted comments to the Gateway South Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-27-09 By e-mail this date PACE provided answers to the comments submitted by Transwest Express LLC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-27-09 By e-mail this date PACE answered the 12-11-08 comments from Basin Electric Power Co. by indicating that TOT3 sensitivities will be addressed during Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-28-09 By e-mail this date LADWP acknowledged that PACE’s answers to their comments of 01-16-09 were acceptable and that follow-up questions would be deferred until Phase II review group meetings. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 11-24-08 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Co. distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Gateway West Project for review and comments were requested by February 2, 2009. Interest in formation of a Project Review Group was also requested, with a due date of February 3, 2009. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-04-09 By e-mail this date WAPA submitted 5 comments to the Gateway West CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-04-09 By e-mail this date PACE provided answers to WAPA’s comments of 02-04-09. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-05-09 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated that PACE’s answers to their comments of 02-04-09 were acceptable and that follow-up questions would be deferred until the Phase II study effort is underway. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 03-12-08 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp announced initiation of its Phase II studies to the PRG for the Populus-Terminal Project and requested input for the study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-30-08 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp initiated Phase II facility rating studies for the Populus-Terminal Project. PAC distributed the study plan and requested Review Group Members to review it and submit comments or suggestions by 6/6/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-16-08 By e-mail this date, the TSS 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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)** | 2011 |
|  |  | 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 | 05-20-08 By e-mail this date LS Power, LLC distributed a draft Comprehensive Progress Report to PCC and TSS for their 60-day review. Comments are due July 18, 2008. LS Power also indicated that a Phase II Project Review Group will be formed and requested interest in participation in it. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-17-08 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated their interest in participation in the Project Review Group for the SWIP North Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-27-08 By e-mail this date PPL Energy Plus submitted comments to the MSTI CPR of 03/28/08. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 08-13-07 By e-mail this date APS distributed a letter requesting Phase II status for the Path 51 Path Rating increase. The path rating is now expected to increase to 3200 MW instead of 3100 MW as originally specified. The Comprehensive Progress Report was posted on the WECC web site and the 60-day review was initiated. Interest in participating in a Project Review Group was also requested. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-14-07 | Basin Electric Power Cooperative | N | **TOT3 300 MW Upgrade Project** | 2019 |
|  |  | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-12-07 By e-mail this date Platte River Power Authority requested inclusion in the PRG and submitted comments to the TOT 3 300 MW Upgrade Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-30-07 By e-mail this date WAPA indicated interest in participation in the PRG and also submitted a comment to be considered and addressed during Phase II of the rating process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 06-19-07 | Trans-Elect, Inc. | N | **Wyoming - Colorado Intertie Project** | 2012 |
|  |  | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-28-07 By e-mail this date PRPA indicated interest in participating in the PRG and submitted thirteen comments to be addressed during the Wyoming-Colorado Intertie Project Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-04-07 By e-mail this date PSCO provided three comments to the CPR distributed on 06-19-07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-26-07 By e-mail this date Trans-Elect, Inc. indicated they have received comments from three separate entities and will address all comments during Phase II studies. The entities submitting comments accepted this response. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-26-04 | Sea Breeze Pacific |  | **±1100 MW Transmission interconnection between the Olympia Peninsula and Vancouver Island, British Columbia. (Juan de Fuca)** | 2008 |
|  |  | 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 | 2-13-05 By e-mail this date WECC distributed the minutes of the December 9, 2004 Regional Plan Study Committee Meeting and project schedule. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-31-06 By letter this date Sea Breeze Pacific Regional Transmission System, Inc. distributed a CPR for the Sea Breeze Pacific Juan de Fuca Interconnection Project and requested Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-03-06 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair notified Sea Breeze Pacific of the requirement of a Regional Planning Report before they can proceed to Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-08-06 By e-mail this date WECC distributed a notification from Sea Breeze Pacific Regional Transmission System, Inc. of a Phase 2 review group meeting to be held on 11-15-06 in Seattle, WA. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-09-06 By e-mail this date WECC distributed corrections from Sea Breeze Pacific to the Phase 2 request letter of 11-08-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-19-06 By e-mail this date BCH submitted comments to the Juan de Fuca Interconnection Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-27-06 By e-mail this date BPA submitted comments to the Juan de Fuca Interconnection Project CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-20-07 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific responded to the BPA comments of 12-27-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-20-07 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific distributed study results from the ABB Consulting Group confirming the ability of the Juan de Fuca project to transmit 550 MW in both the North to South and South to North directions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-10-07 By e-mail this date BPA submitted comments to the Sea Breeze Pacific study results from 04-20-07. BPA requested that items 1-3 from a total of 5 comments be addressed prior to admission to Phase II status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-18-07 By e-mail this date Sea Breeze Pacific provided responses to the BPA comments from 05-10-07. In addition, a Plan of Service Summary was provided for the Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-12-07 | Salt River Project | N | **Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit 4)** | 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 | 06-07-07 By e-mail this date SRP notified TSS that it has met all Phase I requirements for the Path 54 Uprate (Springerville Unit 4) Project. SRP requested Phase II status for this project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-30-07 | Sierra Pacific Resources | N | **Centennial Path Re-Definition** | 2007 |
|  |  | N | 03-30-07 By e-mail this date Sierra Pacific Resources requested initiation of an expedited  review process for the Centennial Path definition change. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-05-07 By e-mail this date the Salt River Project submitted comments to the requested expedited review process for the Centennial Path re-definition. The Salt River Project also provided two powerflow benchmark base cases to investigate the various path rating impacts due to the network configuration changes according to the Centennial Path Redefinition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-16-07 By e-mail this date WAPA DSW requested that NPC demonstrate that the proposed changes will not cause any adverse impact on the neighboring path ratings as well as Western Electric Coordinating Committee (WECC) reliability performance. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-17-07 By e-mail this date SPR responded to the comments posed by WAPA DSW along with supporting study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-07 By e-mail this date SRP provided two benchmark base cases to be used to determine the impact of the Centennial Path re-definition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-07 By e-mail this date SPR acknowledged receipt of the two base cases from SRP and requested clarification on conditions in the cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-07 By e-mail this date SRP provided answers to SPR’s questions noted above. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 04-26-07 By e-mail this date USEConsulting suggested the addition of LADWP’s Green Path North project into the base cases being used for studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-07 By e-mail this date SRP indicated that the Green Path North project doesn’t need to be added to the two base cases above until these cases are reviewed and validated by the WATS Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-01-07 By e-mail this date SPR distributed base cases to WATS prior to their meeting and requested interest in formation of a PRG. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-02-07 By e-mail this date SRP submitted an additional base case for study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-04-07 By e-mail this date SPR distributed a letter to the PCC Chair requesting Phase III status and indicating that all comments had been addressed during the 60-day review. The final report was approved by the PRG members as well as WATS on 5/17/07. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-26-07 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair was distributed granting the Centennial Path Re-Definition Project Phase III Status. The original rating of 3000 MW (N-S) is preserved but metering points on path components are changed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-08-06 | LS Power &  Great Basin Transmission LLC |  | **Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line (Great Basin Transmission Project)** | 2008 |
|  |  | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 05-17-06 By letter this date LS Power Development, LLC distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line for comment and requested phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-14-06 By e-mail this date Comprehensive Progress Report for Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line was distributed to the Operating Committee and asked if there was interest in the formation of a review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-14-06 By e-mail this date LDWP expressed interest in forming a review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-07-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted comments regarding the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Great Basin Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-31-06 By e-mail this date LS Power Development, LLC addressed LDWP’s comments and provided a revised Comprehensive Progress Report for review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 08-08-06 By e-mail this date LDWP submitted additional comments regarding the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Great Basin Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-21-06 By e-mail this date LS Power Development, LLC distributed a Regional Planning Project Review Report and a revised Comprehensive Progress Report for the Great Basin Transmission Project along with a request for Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-07-06 By e-mail this date Sierra Pacific Resources (SPR) submitted comments regarding the CPR for the Great Basin Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 12-07-06 By e-mail this date the Salt River Project (SRP) submitted comments regarding the CPR for the Great Basin Transmission Project and requested participation in Phase II study work along with some suggested items to be evaluated during Phase II. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-14-06 | Arizona Public Service Company (APS) |  | | **Navajo Transmission Project Segment 1** | 2010 |
|  |  | 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 | | 12-21-06 By e-mail this date, APS on behalf of DPA distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the Navajo Transmission Project Segment 1. In addition, a request was made for interest in forming a Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | S | | 02-01-07 By e-mail this date APS distributed a Regional Planning Project Report for the Navajo Transmission Project Segment 1 and noted at the same time that a Project Review Group had been formed to help with Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |
|  |  | | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-10-06 | Sierra Pacific Resources(SPR) | N | **Ely Energy Center and its associated Robinson Summit – Harry Allen 500 kV Transmission Project** | 2011 |
|  |  | 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 | 11-10-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources (SPR) submitted a Comprehensive Progress Report for the Ely Energy Center (EEC)/Eastern Nevada Transmission Intertie (En-ti) 500 kV transmission project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-29-07 By e-mail this date SPR distributed notification of their plans to initiate a Project Review Group and requested that interested parties declare their interest in participating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-27-07 By e-mail this date SPR distributed a letter stating their compliance with all Phase I requirements and requesting Phase II status for the EEC/En-ti 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 04-02-07 |  | S | 04-02-07 By e-mail this date SRP distributed a letter indicating that all Phase I requirements have been completed and they requested entry into Phase II. A Project Review Group has been formed, with APS and TEP as participants. APS submitted comments to the initial CPR and an updated version of the CPR was distributed in the email. All APS comments were addressed except for two that will be addressed during Phase II studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-23-06 | Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP) | N | **Path 27 Upgrade (Intermountain Southern Transmission System DC Line)** | 2008 |
|  |  | 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. In addition, a comprehensive progress report was submitted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-07-06 By e-mail this date, PAC submitted comments to the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 27 Upgrade. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-08-06 By e-mail this date, LADWP addressed all comments submitted by PAC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-20-06 By e-mail this date, SCE submitted comments to the Path 27 Upgrade Project to be addressed in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-25-06 By e-mail this date, LADWP acknowledged the comments submitted by SCE and verified that these comments will be addressed in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 09-25-06 By e-mail this date, SCE indicated they will assist with the additional studies they requested to be run during Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-23-06 By e-mail this date, SDGE submitted comments to the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 27 Upgrade. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-25-06 By e-mail this date, SCE provided power flow cases and switching sequences pursuant to their email of 09-25-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-25-06 By e-mail this date, LADWP responded to SDGE’s comments of 10-23-06 by answering one question and indicating that the remaining five will be addressed in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-01-06 By e-mail this date, LADWP indicated that all comments had either been addressed or will be addressed during Phase 2 and requested Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-23-01 | PG&E |  | **San Francisco Bay Area Bulk Transmission Reinforcement**  **Project** |  |
|  |  | N | 04-23-01 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric solicited interest in participating in or expanding the project of reinforcing the San Francisco Bay Area Bulk Transmission System. If sufficient interest is expressed, a project planning group will be formed and a kick-off meeting announced. Interested parties are requested to respond to Eric Law by May 4, 2001. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | N | 03-22-06 By e-mail this date PG&E provided the following update:   * The portion of the project to reconductor an 8-mile segment of the 230 kV line between Tesla and Newark Substations was in service Feb 2005.  This should be removed from future reporting. * The remaining portion of the project to reconductor the Metcalf-Moss Landing Nos. 1 and 2 230 kV lines (35 miles) with 954 SSAC conductors is expected to be in service by December 2007.   This project is not being rated and will be removed from the next distribution. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-06-06 | Salt River Project(SRP) |  | **Path 63 Re-definition (Perkins-Mead-Marketplace 500 kV Line)** | 2006 |
|  |  | N | 10-06-06 By letter this date, the Salt River Project (SRP) requested the expedited review process for the re-definition of Path 63 to include only the Perkins-Mead 500 kV line. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 10-23-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources (SPR) submitted comments to the Path 63 Re-definition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-02-06 By e-mail this date, the Salt River Project (SRP) addressed Sierra Pacific’s comments of 10-23-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 11-03-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources submitted comments to Salt River’s response of 11-02-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-06-06 By e-mail this date, Sierra Pacific Resources retracted previous objections to the Path 63 Re-definition. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-09-06 By e-mail this date, the Salt River Project distributed a summary of comments and responses to the Path 63 Re-definition and requested Phase 3 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-12-06 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 status to the Path 63 Re-definition. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-21-06 | California Independent System Operator (CISO) | N | **Path 46 Short Term Upgrades (West of Colorado River)** | 2006 |
|  |  | N | 03-21-05 California Independent System Operator (CISO) requested the formation of a review group and Phase 1 status for increasing the Path 46 rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-02-06 By two e-mails this date the CISO sent a Final Draft Report to the review group and asked for comments by July 3, 2006. The project increases the Path 46 non-simultaneous rating by 505 MW from 10,118 MW to 10,623 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-28-06 By two e-mails this date the CISO distributed the WOR Short-Term Upgrades Final Report with Appendices. Also, Gary DeShazo was thanked for the WOR Short Term Upgrades presentation give at the WECC/WATS meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 07-10-06 By two e-mails this date the CISO WECC/WATS Peer Review Group distributed DVP2 Path 49 and Path 46 Final Study Reports to WECC. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-16-01 | PNM |  | **Northern New Mexico Transmission Development** |  |
|  |  | N | 04-16-01 By e-mail this date Public Service Company of New Mexico announced their intent to enlarge their northern New Mexico transmission system and solicited interest from potential participants. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-16-01 By e-mail this date Xcel Energy responded to the April 16 notification from PNM and requested to be included in the list of interested parties. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-01-01 By letter this date PNM announced to all parties expressing interest in the project that a meeting to further advance the planning for the project would be held June 13, 2001. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-16-01 By e-mail this date PNM distributed a copy of the Northern New Mexico Transmission Investigation Feasibility Study to the entities that attended the June 13, 2001 presentation of Expansion of Northern New Mexico Transmission and solicited interest in the possibility of combining transmission needs. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-02-01 By e-mail this date PNM distributed a copy of the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Northern New Mexico Transmission Project and requested Phase 2 Status. PNM also solicited interest in forming a WSCC Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-2-96 | TSGT  (Formerly PEGT) |  | **Colorado-New Mexico 230 kV Interconnection Project (CNMIP) [Previously known as Northeast New Mexico Reinforcement (NNMR)]** | - |
|  |  | N | 10-24-96 By letter dated October 22, 1996, PEGT announced an October 29, 1996 kickoff meeting for joint planning studies of increasing the reliability of the northeastern New Mexico area. This letter referred to an October 2, 1996 letter announcing the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-12-96 By letter dated November 5, 1996, PEGT transmitted the minutes of the October 29 meeting and a preliminary scope document for the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-7-97 By letter dated February 4, 1997, PEGT announced the second meeting of the study group to be held on 2/28/. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-24-97 By letter dated February 21, 1997, PEGT transmitted a red-lined draft of the minutes of the October 29 meeting and the agenda for the 2/28/97 study group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-24-97 By letter dated March 18, 1997, PEGT distributed minutes of the 10/29/96 meeting, draft minutes of the 2/28/97 meeting, a second draft of the study scope, and reports of studies performed to date. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-30-97 By letter dated October 23, 1997, PEGT announced the third project meeting, to be held in Albuquerque on 12/5/97. |  |
|  |  | C | 12-3-97 By letter dated December 1, 1997, PEGT transmitted the draft summary report for Phase 1, to be discussed at a meeting 12/5/97 in Albuquerque. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-11-98 By letter dated April 29, 1998, PEGT transmitted the final study summary report for Phase 1, incorporating comments which had been submitted by study participants following the third project meeting held 12/5/97. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-10-02 At the January 2002 TSS meeting, the PNM representative reported that this project was now included in the Path 48 upgrade project, and the old entries from the PEGT project should be removed from the log. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-26-02 By e-mail this data Tri-State Generation & Transmission Association requested that this project be re-included in this log, reporting that PNM is currently conducting a study to determine the NNMI (PATH 48) increase by including the CNMIP as part of NNMI. TSGT would like to retain the existing NNMR description in the Phase 1 Project list at least until PNM submits a comprehensive progress report expected by September 30, 2002. At this time TSGT also indicated that due to the TSGE merger with PEGT in July 2001, the “Member System” identifier for this project should be changed from PEGT to TSGT. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 9-20-05 By e-mail this date TSGT provided notice that a Path Flow and Transmission Study report was completed for the CNMIP. The report was filed with the Public Utility Commission of Colorado and subsequently cleared of the “Stipulation” between Tri-State and PSCO. TSGT moved the completion date of the CNMIP to December 2006.  Pursuant to the “System Impact Study Agreement between TSGT and PNM”, PNM will include the CNMIP as a component of the existing Northern New Mexico Interface (NNMI or Path 48). PNM has completed a comprehensive report titled “NNMI Rating Increase after Adding the Colorado-New Mexico Interconnection Project into NNMI.” In addition, PNM and Tri-State will submit this report, together with the “Path Flow” report to WECC to initiate the three phase rating process. Future development and activities of this project will be updated under the NNMI rating increase project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date PNM distributed a letter that the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Colorado-New Mexico Interconnection Project (CNMIP) for Path 48 (NM2) has been posted to the WECC website review. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-15-06 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair asked PNM if it wanted the CNMIP to go through the Regional Planning Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-23-06 By e-mail this date PNM indicated that the CNMIP is to serve local load in northeast New Mexico. PNM and TSGT do not intend to go through regional planning or seek an accepted rating. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-04-06 By letter this date PNM requested that the Colorado-New Mexico Interconnection Project (CNMIP) be granted Phase 3 status through the WECC Expedited Process and that the Path 48 Accepted Rating be established as 1849 MW (simultaneous) and 1970 MW (non-simultaneous). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-05-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair indicated that Path 48 has completed the WECC Project Rating Review Process and achieved Accepted Ratings of 1849 MW (simultaneous) and 1970 MW (non-simultaneous). CNMIP was granted Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 12-06-05 By e-mail this date IID distributed a cover letter and comprehensive progress report for the Imperial Valley to San Felipe 500 kV project. It requested the formation of a review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-7-05 By e-mail this date LDWP announced a Regional Planning meeting for the IID Imperial Valley-San Felipe Project from 12 noon to 2:30 pm. On December 20, 2005. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-19-05 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the agenda for the December 20, 2005 meeting for the Green Path Coordinated Projects. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 1-31-06 By letter this date SDGE distributed comments regarding the IID’s Comprehensive Progress Report on the Imperial Valley to San Felipe 500 kV Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-06-06 By e-mail this date SDGE requested that loads in the 2009 base cases be updated to reflect 2010 conditions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-10-06 By e-mail this date IID responded to 01-31-06 comments from SDGE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-13-06 By e-mail this date IID distributed the Regional Planning Compliance Report for its IV-San Felipe Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-15-06 By letter this date SDGE submitted comments regarding IID’s Regional Planning Compliance Report - Imperial Valley San Felipe Transmission Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-23-06 By letter this date IID responded to SDGE’s comments of 03-15-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-13-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair indicated the Regional Planning Project Review has been completed |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-25-06 By letter this date IID requested that the San Felipe Project be granted Phase II status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By letter this date the WECC staff distributed a letter announcing that IV San Felipe has achieved Phase 2 Status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-01-05 | SDGE |  | **Sunrise Powerlink Project** | 6/2010 |
|  |  | 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 | 12-19-05 By e-mail this date the CISO announced a conference call on 1-10-06 to review and approve the Sunrise Powerlink Study Scope document and the El Centro transformer RAS 2010 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-06-06 By e-mail SDGE announced that a Regional Planning meeting for the Sunrise Powerlink Project was scheduled forMonday, January 9, 2006. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-13-06 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the Sunrise Powerlink Project and requested Phase 2 status following a 60-day review period. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-06-06 By e-mail this date SDGE requested that loads in the 2009 base cases be updated to reflect 2010 conditions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-06 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed to the PCC and TSS the Regional Planning Project Report for its Sunrise Powerlink Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-08-06 By e-mail this date LDWP requested that two of its employees be added to the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-08-06 By e-mail this date the WECC staff distributed to the PCC and TSS the Regional Planning Project Report for SDGE’s Sunrise Powerlink Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-24-06 By e-mails this date SDGE distributed the heavy autumn pre-project base cases for the Sunrise Powerlink project to the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-09-06 By e-mail this date, PG&E expressed concerns that the requested rating (1000 MW) and actual flow (857 MW) demonstrated in the comprehensive progress report do not match. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-14-06 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments regarding the SDGE’s comprehensive progress report. LDWP’s comments ranges from the flow on the line do not match the requested rating to the documentation is not sufficient. LDWP 14 major concerns about the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-14-06 By letter this date SDGE distributed its Regional Planning Project Report and requested approval that the Regional Planning Project Review Process has been completed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair issued a letter that the Regional Planning Project Review has been completed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-15-06 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed the PCC Chair’s letter. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-22-06 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the comments made by PG&E on 03-09-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-22-06 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the comments submitted by LDWP on 03-14-06. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-23-06 By letter this date SDGE requested Phase 2 status for theSunrise Powerlink Project and distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report and all comments with SDGE’s response. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-27-06 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted comments about the Comprehensive Project Report. PG&E indicated the report did not demonstrate a non-simultaneous rating of 1000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-27-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated to the TSS Chair that SDG&E has not demonstrated in its Comprehensive Progress Report that the Sunrise Powerlink Project (SPP) met the WECC/NERC Reliability criteria at 1000 MW nor should the project be granted Phase 2 status with a Planned Rating of 1000 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-26-06 By letter this date SDG&E requested acceptance of the Sunrise Powerlink Comprehensive Progress Report and the granting of Phase 2 status. In addition the new report contained (1) the demonstration of 1000 MW across the Sunrise Powerlink, (2) SDG&E’s Response to PG&E Comments to Sunrise Powerlink CPR, and (3) SDG&E’s Response to LADWP Comments to Sunrise Powerlink CPR. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-03-06 By letter this date the WECC staff distributed a letter announcing that Sunrise Powerlink has achieved Phase 2 Status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-30-05 | BEPC/WAPA |  | **Path 36 (TOT3) Upgrade (Miracle Mile – Ault 230 kV Transmission line)** | 2010 |
|  |  | N | 09-30-05 By e-mail this date BEPC and WAPA announced their intent to increase the TOT3 transfer capability from 1605 MW to 1980 MW by 2010. The present Western’s Miracle Mile – Cheyenne – Ault 230-kV upgrade, planned for completion in 2009, has a proposed increase of 75 MW on TOT3 (1605 to 1680 MW).  The additional 300 MW increase is in response to requests for new capacity across TOT3. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-30-05 By letter this date WAPA distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report and requested phase 2 status for the Path 36 Upgrade project (Miracle Mile – Ault 230 kV Transmission Line). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-09-06 By e-mail this date WAPA requested interest in forming a Project Review Group for the proposed increase in the Total Transmission Capability of Path 36. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-10-06 by letter this date the TSS Chair confirm 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 12-30-05 | SCE |  | **EOR 10500 MW Project** | 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-23-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated the comprehensive progress report does not contain simultaneous studies which need to be studied in Phase 2. LDWP requested the LA Green Path project be included as a sensitivity study in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 02-27-06 By e-mail this date SRP responded to the 02-23-06 e-mail from LDWP. SRP indicated the recommend study items would be included in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 03-01-06 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted comments regarding the Comprehensive Progress Report on the Combined Projects of EOR 9300 MW Upgrades and Devers – Palo Verde No. 2 with Path 49 EOR at 10,500 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 03-03-06 By e-mail this date SRP indicated SDGE’s comments would be incorporated as appropriate into the study scope of the future Phase 2 study plan. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-03-05 | IID / LADWP |  | **Indian Hills-Upland Project** | 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 | 11-22-05 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a final comprehensive status report and requested the formation of a review group and Phase 2 status after a 60 day comment period. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-7-05 By e-mail this date LDWP announced a Regional Planning meeting for the LADWP Indian Hills-Upland Project will be from 8:30 am to 11:00 am. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-19-05 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the agenda for the December 20, 2005 meeting for the Green Path Coordinated Projects. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-22-05 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a study plan for the Green Path Project Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-30-05 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the Regional Planning Report for the Indian Hills-Upland Project for review and comment by PCC and TSS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-13-05 By e-mail this dated SCE submitted comments regarding the Indian hills-Upland Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-23-06 By e-mail this date SDG&E submitted comments regarding the comprehensive progress report for the Indian Hills-Upland Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 01-30-06 By letter this date SDG&E distributed comments regarding the Regional Planning Compliance Report on the Indian Hills – Upland 500kV. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-31-06 By e-mails this date LDWP sent its response to the comments from SDGE to the PCC Chair and SDGE. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-1-06 By letter this date the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that LDWP has completed the Regional Planning Project Review. A final Regional Planning Project Report for the Indian Hills-Upland Project was also distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-06-06 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to comments submitted by SDGE on January 30, 2006. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-06 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to comments submitted by SCE on January 13, 2006. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated the 60 day comment period for the Indian Hills-Upland Project was completed. LDWP received comments from two entities and had responded to the comments. LDWP requested that Phase 2 status be granted. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-06-06 By e-mail this date SDGE requested that loads in the 2009 base cases be updated to reflect 2010 conditions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-07-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a list of individuals participating in the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-10-06 By e-mail this date LDWP asked SDGE if it could help with the 2010 Heavy Autumn and 2010 Heavy Summer base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-10-06 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated there is not enough progress in compiling the 2010 base cases due to the delays encountered by SDGE to justify a meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-17-06 By e-mail this date LDWP requested the release of the original 2009 base cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-17-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed an epc file for the LA Green Path (LAGP) project and requested Phase 2 status. The project is being represented in the 2010HS1 base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-21-06 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a revised LAGP study plan. LDWP will request approval of the plan at the WATS/WECC conference call on February 27. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-21-06 By e-mail this date LDWP requested a copy of the HA pre-project cases as well as the interim HS cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-21-06 By e-mail this date SDGE sent LDWP the 2010-HA base case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-22-06 By e-mails this date LDWP and the TSS Chair had communication regarding the Phase 2 status letter. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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 letter 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 09-15-05 By letter this date Montana Alberta Tie, Ltd. (MATL), issued a comprehensive Progress Report about the project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-12-05 By letter this date Montana Alberta Tie, Ltd. (MATL) distributed the WECC Regional Planning Project Report for the Montana Alberta Tie transmission project. With the submission of the report, MATL requested that PCC review the report to ensure that MATL had complied with the WECC Regional Planning Guidelines. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 01-24-06 By letter this date Montana Alberta Tie, Ltd. sent a letter to the TSS chair requesting Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-02-06 By letter this data, 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-31-00 | NAPG |  | **Powder River Project** | 2003 |
|  |  | N | 03-31-00 By e-mail this date NAPG announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Rating Process for a proposed 345 kV interconnection between a new Two Elk Substation in WY and a planned termination at the Ft. Lupton Substation in the Denver, CO area. The project will involve a rating increase of 200-300 MW for Paths 36 (TOT3) and 40 (TOT7). NAPG requested that those interested in participating in a Project Planning Group contact it by 4/15/00. | Comments due  5/31/2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-10-00 By e-mail this date NAPG announced the First Progress Report for the Revised Rating of TOT3 and TOT7 due to the addition of the Powder River-Denver Project was available on the WSCC Bulletin Board for review. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-31-00 By e-mail this date NAPG announced the meeting minutes for the May 11, 2000 planning meeting for the Powder River-Denver Project were posted on the WSCC BBS. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-08-06 By e-mail this date NAPG notified WECC that the Powder River – Denver Project is cancelled. This project will be removed from Phase 1 with the next distribution. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-10-96 | PSC |  | **PSC-SPS Tieline** | - |
|  |  | N | 10-21-96 By letter dated October 10, 1996, Public Service Company of Colorado announced a proposed tieline connecting PSC and Southwestern Public Service in the Southwest Power Pool. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-26-98 By letter dated October 20, 1998 PSC transmitted a Summary Report describing how the project had complied with the RPPC Guidelines, and asked for PCC approval. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-26-99 By letter dated February 19, 1999, PSC transmitted the Initial Progress Report and invited participation in an Ad Hoc Study Review Group. The first meeting of the group was scheduled for April 8, 1999 in Denver. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-19-99 By letter this date the Chairman of PCC stated that the PCC approved the project’s compliance with the RPPC Guidelines. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 02-09-06 By letter this date PSCO requested the removal of the PSCO - SPS Tieline from the 3-phase rating logs. The project in PSC’s opinion is not significant to interconnected reliability. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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 | 09-02-05 By e-mail this date SCE indicated studies need to be performed before the units to be tripped are identified. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-09-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the request for Phase 2 status of DPV2/Path 46 and the formation of a review group to the members of the DPV2/ Path 46 review group. A study scope was attached. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-12-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed a revised scope of study and a notification of a conference call on September 22, 2005 to approve the scope of study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 09-29-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the approved DPV2 WOR Rating Study Scope revision #2 to the review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-12-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the agenda for the October 18, 2005 review group meeting and two 2009 Heavy Autumn Base Cases (one with Mohave in service and one without Mohave). |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-13-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed two power flow base cases and one dynamic file for **non-simultaneous** Path 46 (West of River) Study. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-14-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the following meeting materials for the October 18, 2005 meeting.  1. Appendix A - DPV2 Project Review Group Path 46 Rating Study Scope Rev. 2  2. Appendix B - Dynamic Stability and Post Transient Switch decks  3. Appendix C.1.a - Control Area Summary of Pre-contingency Base Cases  4. Appendix C.1.b - Path Flow Summary of Pre-contingency Base Cases  5. Appendix C.1.c - Power Flow Diagrams of Pre-contingency Base Cases  6. Appendix C.1.d - Power Flow Analysis Summaries |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-14-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the DPV2 Project "Stability and Post Transient" study results for the October 18, 2005 meeting.  1. Appendix C.2.a - Stability Analysis Summaries  2. Appendix C.3.a - Post Transient Analysis Summaries |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the new base cases and dynamic data file to replace the cases distributed 10-14-04. In addition, the results were distributed of the non-simultaneous study for the West of River path at the current WECC rating of 10,118 MW and proposed 10,623 MW (+505 MW more).  The frequency study results to be used in the transient stability analyses were distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-16-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a replacement to Appendix C.2.a of the Stability Analysis Summary DPV2 WOR Non-simultaneous "Stability and Post Transient" study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-24-05 By e-mail this date CISO materials for the WECC/WATS conference call on Thursday, November 3, 2005. The items are:   1. Pre-path uprate non-simultaneous power flow base case with Path 46 (WOR) flow at 10,118 MW (current WECC-approved rating), 2. Post-path uprate non-simultaneous power flow base case with Path 46 (WOR) flow at 10,623 MW (proposed +505 MW increase), 3. Dynamic data file for use for the above two power flow cases, 4. Final draft of study plan, 5. Draw files and corresponding epcl's. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-26-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a revised WOR 10,118 MW power flow base case with the Path 49 short-term transmission upgrades off-line and with the SCIT flow updated for both pre and post-project power flow base cases with the correct elements that comprise total SCIT flow. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-27-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed another revision to the WOR 10,118 MW power flow case. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-3-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the final report from the Short Circuit Work Group regarding Devers - Palo Verde No. 2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-15-05 By e-mail this date SCE provided notice of a conference call scheduled for 11-22-05 to approve the pre-DPV2 SCIT Nomogram "corner point." The pre-DPV2 Project SCIT power flow base cases (version 14.3) was distributed for review prior to the call. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-15-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the Power Flow, Post Transient and Stability results related to the pre-DPV2 SCIT Nomogram "corner point".  1. Appendix D.1.a - Control Area Summary of Pre-contingency Base Cases  2. Appendix D.1.b - Path Flow Summary of Pre-contingency Base Cases  3. Appendix D.1.c - Power Flow Diagrams of Pre-contingency Base Cases  4. Appendix D.1.d - Power Flow Analysis Summaries  5. Appendix D.2.a.1 - Stability Analysis Summary  6. Appendix D.3.a - Post Transient Analysis Summary |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-16-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed materials for the next WECC/WATS conference call including the power flow base cases for the SCIT simultaneous evaluation for the WOR short-term upgrades path rating study:   1. Pre-project power flow base case with WOR at 10,118 MW, EOR at 7,550 MW and SCIT at 12,396 MW.  The corner point was determined with the Palo Verde - Devers #1 500kV line contingency, resulting in the Hassayampa - N.Gila 500kV line flow at 99.34% of the emergency line rating. 2. Post-project power flow base case with WOR at 10,623 MW (+505 MW), EOR at 8055 MW (+505 MW) and SCIT at 12,901 MW (+505 MW).  The corner point was determined with the Palo Verde - Devers #1 500kV line contingency, resulting in the Perkins - Mead 500kV line flow at 100.68% of the line series capacitors emergency rating. 3. Dynamic data file to be used to the above power flow cases. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-21-05 By e-mail this date CISO distributed results for the WOR Short-Term Upgrades SCIT simultaneous study for approval at conference call scheduled for the next day. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date SCE distributed announcement of the DPV2 WOR Project Review Group Meeting #2 on December 6, 2005. The DPV2 Project meeting agenda and the pre-DPV2 Project power flow base cases (version 14.3) was distributed. Base cases approved at the previous meeting were distributed. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-28-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the DPV2 Project Simultaneous SCIT "Stability and Post Transient" study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-28-05 By e-mail this date SCE distributed the DPV2 Project Simultaneous SCIT "power flow" study results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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 | 11-15-05 By e-mail this data SPR announced a WATS/WECC Peer Review meeting to be held DEC 6 in Phoenix, AZ. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-20-05 | NWMT |  | **AMPS Upgrade for Montana-Idaho Path 18** | July 2005 |
|  |  | S | 04-20-05 By e-mail this date, NWMT submitted a Comprehensive Progress Report to increase the rating for Path 18 to 356MW. NWMT requested the rating process be expedited. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-29-05 By e-mail this date, the PCC Chair issued a letter indicating that the Path 18 Upgrade for Montana-Idaho has achieved Phase III status and an accepted rating of 356 MW as described in the report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 they propose increasing Path 26 to 4000 MW  2) solicited interest in participation in a Regional Planning Review Group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 02-17-05 By e-mail this date, LDWP requested participation in the path 26 upgrade III project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 04-25-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO distributed a comprehensive project report and requested Phase 2 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 5-24-05 By e-mail this date PG&E submitted comments regarding the Path 26 Upgrade III comprehensive project report. The report did not identify simultaneous interactions with other paths for N-2, address zero reactive margin at Vincent 500kV bus, and permitted 2420 MW of Midway area generation to be armed in a RAS that is above an existing maximum limit of 2100 MW. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-26-05 By e-mail this date, LDWP submitted comments regarding the comprehensive project report. The draft report did not address any known simultaneous interactions. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-26-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO responded to the 05-26-05 comments submitted by LDWP. The CISO did not agree that simultaneous inter action studies were required because the operations group had performed the studies. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 05-27-05 By e-mail this date, LDWP indicated that it had the simultaneous studies, but thought they should be included in the comprehensive project report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 05-27-05 By e-mail this date, the CISO responded to the 05-27-05 comments submitted by LDWP. The CISO indicated that it preferred to reference existing simultaneous studies results during the Phase 1 because new study results would be similar and new simultaneous studies would be conducted in Phase 2. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-24-05 By e-mail this date, LDWP submitted comments and requested additional studies regarding interaction with Paths 41, 61, and 64; 9000+ and the PVD2 projects; and WOR Upgrade I. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 06-27-05 By e-mail this date WECC distributed a letter requesting Phase 2 Status for the Path 26 Upgrade III Project. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-23-93 | BPA |  | **West of Hatwai (WOH), West of Noxon (WON) Ratings** | - |
|  |  | N | 4-20-93 By letter dated April 20, 1993, BPA reported its intent to develop ratings for the West of Hatwai (WOH) and West of Noxon (WON) cutplanes. These two new cutplanes do not have a WECC rating. The proposed ratings are at least 2800 MW for WOH and 3500 for WON. BPA will request that the ad-hoc review group formed to review the Montana-Pacific Northwest 2200 MW rating also review the WOH and WON ratings. Studies are underway. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-5-96 By letter dated November 5, 1996, WWP expressed concerns about including WON in this request or in the WSCC Path Rating Catalog, and asked that the Phase 1 report on WOH be submitted with all references to WON removed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-13-04 | SRP |  | **EOR Path Rating Expansion by Upgrading the Mead – Phoenix Project (EOR9000+ Project)** | Phase II |
|  |  | N | 05-19-04 By e-mail this date SRP:  1) distributed a 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 II status | June 2008 |

Please see the “Log of Projects Identified for the WECC Regional Planning Process” for log entries for this project.

Please see the DPV2 log entries for discussion regarding development of the base cases, which are shared.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-30-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided specific meeting times, an Agenda, and a study plan for the EOR9000+ project to be discussed at the October 6 peer review meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-13-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided information regarding an October 25, 2004 conference call to discuss base cases and study plan approval. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date NEVP questioned some overloaded system elements in the base cases, questioned the Hoover dispatch, and indicated that NEVP will be running stability cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date RW Beck indicated that Hoover dispatch can be above 400 MW as long as the lake level remains above the lower inlets. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-14-04 By e-mail this date NEVP questioned differences between post-project cases for EOR9000+ and PDV2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-15-04 By e-mail this date SCE forwarded the SRP e-mail regarding an October 25, 2004 conference call to discuss base cases and study plan approval. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided information to WECC regarding the specific power flow changes required to represent the EOR9000+ project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date SRP informed the TSS chair that they have met the requirements of the regional planning process and the requirements to enter phase II and requested phase II status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided information regarding the plan of service for the EOR 9000+ project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-22-04 By e-mail this date the TSS chair asked if SRP had received a letter from the PCC chair indicating that the regional planning process is complete for the EOR9000+ project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-23-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided to WECC specific data for the EOR9000+ project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-14-04 By e-mail this date the PCC chair distributed a letter indicating that the regional planning process is complete. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-14-04 By e-mail this date SRP sent an e-mail indicating that the EOR 9000+ project had met all the requirements for phase II and requesting phase II 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 II and granting phase II status with a increase in the Path 49 rating to 9300 MW. Accordingly, this item will be removed from the active phase 1 log next time it is distributed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-09-04 | EPE |  | **Re-Definition of Path 47** |  |
|  |  | N | 02-09-04 By e-mail this date El Paso Electric Company (EPE) distributed a letter indicating they have changed the definition of Path 47 and that this change has no impact on the accepted rating. To preserve the integrity of the accepted rating EPE intends to follow the WECC Expedited Rating Process to change the definition of the path. Indicating that all the affected parties are already aware of this change and have no concerns, EPE did not distribute any studies. | In service |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-09-04 By e-mail this date PNM reported that they are familiar with the modified description of Path 47 and do not have any concerns. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-06-05 By letter this date the PCC chair confirmed that the path 47 rating retained an accepted status with the change in metering point. Accordingly, this item will be removed from the active phase 1 project log next time it is distributed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-07-03 | SDGE |  | **Path 45 (CAISO-CFE) Uprate** |  |
|  |  | N | 04-07-03 By e-mail this date, a letter from San Diego Gas and Electric (SDGE) was distributed announcing SDGE’s intentions to complete the Part B study (800 MW northbound during summer) prior to summer of 2003, and solicited interest in being added to the review group. On November 1, 2001, an 800 MW rating was granted during fall/winter/spring conditions based on the studies conducted during Part A. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-05-03 By e-mail this date Southern California Edison (SCE) provided comments to SDGE regarding changing IV generation levels in the . |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-06-03 By e-mail this date SDGE agreed to the changes requested by SCE on May 5. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-07-03 By e-mail this date SCE requested changes in the IV generation schedule to SCE, the La Rosita units to PG&E, and the Border Substation units to PG&E. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-15-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-16-03 By e-mail this date IID provided comments to the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-20-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments to the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-21-03 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the comments from IID on May 16 regarding the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-21-03 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the comments from SCE on May 20 regarding the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-22-03 By e-mail this date CFE provided comments to the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-03-03 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the comments from CFE on May 22 regarding the Path 45 Rating Review Work Group Draft Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-13-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a letter dated July 11 and the Path 45 Phase 2 Rating Report, Part B, for the uprating of Path 45 to 800 MW in the northbound direction for summer conditions. This was part of the expedited process initiated with Part A of the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-17-03 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting the Path 45 Upgrade Project Phase 3 Status confirming an Accepted Rating of 800 MW in the northbound flow 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 | 09-5-02 By e-mail this date Southern California Edison (SCE) commented on the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 26 Rating Increase and indicated the need to address simultaneous issues including the impact to the existing SCIT nomogram. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-6-02 By e-mail this date Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LDWP) commented on the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 26 Rating Increase indicating that Path 26 is one of the five SCIT paths and LDWP would require additional studies to determine interactions among these five paths as well as any other simultaneous issues. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-9-02 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) commented on the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Path 26 Rating Increase. PG&E’s comments were regarding the proposed Special Protection Scheme (SPS) to trip Midway Area generation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-13-02 By e-mail this date CISO responded to comments made by LDWP, SCE, and PG&E agreeing that the CISO would need to study the simultaneous interactions among the five SCIT paths due to the Path 26 upgrade. CISO requested input on which SCIT import limits and inertial levels should be studied. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-18-02 By e-mail this date LDWP suggested two base cases for the Path 26 Upgrade studies and provided information on the description of the base cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-24-02 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the final study plan for the path 26 Rating Increase to the Study Group members. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-11-02 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the benchmark cases for the simultaneous study for the path 26 Rating Increase to the Study Group members. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-14-02 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments on the benchmark cases distributed by CISO on November 11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-18-02 By e-mail this date PG&E provided comments on the benchmark cases distributed by CISO on November 11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-21-02 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting provided comments on the benchmark cases distributed by CISO on November 11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-22-02 By e-mail this date SCE provided additional comments on the benchmark cases distributed by CISO on November 11. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-17-02 By e-mail this date CISO distributed study base cases to the study group for the simultaneous study with path 26 at 3400 MW. The e-mail indicated that earlier comments on the benchmark base cases were addressed when developing these cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-14-03 By e-mail this date CISO distributed preliminary results to the study group of the Path 26 Upgrade Study. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-15-03 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting provided comments to the preliminary study results distributed on January 14, 2003. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-16-03 By e-mail this date SCE requested VAR margin results and provided information to perform the studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-17-03 By e-mail this date CISO provided reactive margin test results requested by SCE on January 16. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-21-03 By e-mail this date PG&E provided updated conductor rating information to CISO and requested that the new rating be used. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-27-03 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments indicating they agreed that Path 26 does not have a simultaneous interaction with North of Lugo, but the study did not demonstrate whether or not there is an interaction between Path 26 and other SCIT paths. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-27-03 By e-mail this date CISO responded to LDWP’s January 27 comments regarding Path 26 and other SCIT path interactions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-11-03 By e-mail this date CISO distributed the Path 26 Upgrade Study. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-14-03 By e-mail this date CISO distributed a notice that they may not be able to place the Path 26 RAS in service by summer 2003. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-18-03 By e-mail this date PG&E provided comments to the Path 26 Upgrade Study distributed on 2-11-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-24-03 By e-mail this date, SCE provided comments to the Path 26 Upgrade Study distributed on 2-11-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-25-03 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments to the Path 26 Upgrade Study distributed on 2-11-03 indicating that the SCIT levels needed to be recomputed and that the proposed mitigation for interactions between Path 26 and PDCI were unacceptable. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-25-03 By e-mail this date Navigant Consulting provided comments to the Path 26 Upgrade Study distributed on 2-11-03. |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 09-10-02 By e-mail this date IPC distributed a Phase 2 Rating report and indicated that the report included studies of the proposed Path 15 Uprate as requested by PG&E. IPC further indicated that they believe they have addressed the Phase 2 requirements and requested Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-10-02 By e-mail this date PG&E indicated that they had reviewed the Phase 2 Rating report distributed by IPC and that their concerns had been addressed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 10-31-02 By e-mail this date CISO indicated their desire to be included in a review group if one was formed and noted four concerns they have that they believe should be discussed in more detail in the final report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-24-02 | SCE |  | **Eagle Mountain 230/161 kV-Blythe 161 kV Tie Rating Increase (Path 59)** |  |
|  |  | N | 05-24-02 By e-mail this date Southern California Edison (SCE) distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for a proposed path rating increase for the Eagle Mountain 230/161 kV-Blythe 161 kV Tie (PATH 59) from 72 MW to 218 MW. The new rating would also include a revised definition of the path. SCE requested those interested in the formation of a Review Group to contact SCE and is requesting the expedited process for achieving the new rating. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-24-02 By e-mail this date Puget Sound Energy (PSE) raised questions regarding overloads and transmission upgrades identified in the Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-24-02 By e-mail this date Western Area Power Administration made comments concerning switches and breakers at the Blythe Substation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-29-02 By e-mail this date PSE reported that their questions on the Path 59 Rating Increase had been answered in a phone conversation with SCE. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-07-02 By e-mail this date SCE sent an e-mail to PSE as a follow up to their phone conversation on July 29, 2002. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-26-02 By e-mail this date SCE responded to the Western Area Power Administration comment of 5-24-02. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-05-02 By e-mail this date WALC indicated that their questions had been answered and that they supported the SCE request for a Path 59 rating increase. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-06-02 By e-mail this date SCE indicated there had been no request to form a review group for the Path 59 rating increase and distributed a revised Phase 2 Rating report that included answers to questions received. By this e-mail notification SCE requested Phase 3 status for the Path 59 rating increase. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-24-02 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 status and an Accepted Rating of 218 MW east-to-west for Path 59, contingent upon completion of the upgrades assumed in the Rating Report. Path 59 continues to have an Existing Rating of 72 MW in the west-to-east direction. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-19-02 | PSC |  | **TOT 3 Path Uprate** |  |
|  |  | N | 03-19-02 By e-mail this date Public Service Company of Colorado distributed a letter dated March 15, 2002 announcing their intent to follow the WSCC Expedited Rating Process to change the Accepted Rating of TOT3 from 1588 MW to 1605 MW. PSC also distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Revised Rating of the TOT3 Transfer Path and invited all members interested in the formation of a review group to contact them within 60 days. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-23-02 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp raised questions and comments that they feel should be addressed before the TOT3 path is granted an increase in the Accepted Rating. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-02-02 By e-mail this date Public Service Company of Colorado responded to the questions raised by PacifiCorp in their April 23 e-mail. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-17-02 By e-mail this date PacifiCorp indicated that their concerns and questions raised in their April 23 e-mail have been answered satisfactorily by Public Service Company of Colorado and also indicated that PacifiCorp supports the increased rating of TOT 3 to 1605 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-30-02 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 Status and an Accepted Rating of 1605 MW in the north-to-south direction to the TOT 3 transfer path (Path 36). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-30-02 | PNM |  | **Path 48 (NM2) Northern New Mexico Transmission** |  |
|  |  | N | 01-30-02 By e-mail this date Public Service Company of New Mexico distributed a comprehensive progress report and requested the expedited process for achieving an Accepted Rating for Path 48. PNM also solicited interest in participating in a WSCC Project Review Group. | June 1, 2002  June 1, 2003 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-18-02 By e-mail this date El Paso Electric responded to PNM’s January 30 letter and requested the formation of a WSCC Project Review Group. EPE’s concerns relate to the impact on the simultaneous Path 47 (NM1). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-23-02 By e-mail this date PNM distributed a modified Comprehensive progress report and indicated that the modifications were to address EPE’s comments. PNM indicated that no issues warranting coverage by a review group were raised, and therefore is requesting Phase 3 Status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-06-02 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting Phase 3 status to the Path 48 (NM2) Northern New Mexico Transmission project. With the simultaneous and non-simultaneous Accepted Ratings associated with the Bluewater-West Mesa and Norton-Hernandez 115 kV line upgrades subject to completion of those upgrades. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-05-01 | PG&E |  | **Path 15 Upgrade** |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-23-01 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric solicited interest in the formation of a Regional Planning Review Group for the Path 15 Upgrade Project and distributed a participation form. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-23-01 At the February 2001 PCC meeting, PCC identified the Path 15 Upgrade as one of the projects which should report as to how it will comply with the requirements of the WSCC Regional Planning Review Process. From this point on this project will be reported in the Log of Projects Undergoing WSCC’s Three Phase Rating Process and this Log. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-14-01 By e-mail this date Pacific Gas and Electric distributed a report titled WSCC REGIONAL PLANNING COMPLIANCE REPORT FOR AN UPGRADE TO PATH 15. The purpose of the report is to document how the proposed Path 15 upgrade conforms to the regional planning guidelines in the WSCC Procedures for Regional Planning Project Review and Rating Transmission Facilities. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-16-01 By e-mail this date (letter dated September 26) Pacific Gas and Electric distributed The Path 15 Comprehensive Progress Report as part of the Phase 1 of the WSCC Three-Phase rating process. With the distribution, PG&E requested that this project be granted Phase 2 status. PG&E also announced the formation of a Project Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-26-01 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that, based on PCC review, the Path 15 Upgrade Project conforms to all of the WSCC Regional Planning Guidelines, and recommended the RPPC accept the project as having completed the Regional Planning Process. A copy of the WSCC Regional Planning Compliance Report for an Upgrade to Path 15 was included with the letter. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 1-18-02 By e-mail this date a letter was sent to PG&E informing them that affirmative votes had been received from the majority of RPPC members, and that the Path 15 Upgrade Project has completed the Regional Planning Process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-09-01 | CORL |  | **Path 45 (CAISO-CFE) Uprate** | 2003 |
|  |  | N | 01-09-01 By e-mail this date a letter from Coral Energy dated December 12, 2000, was distributed. The project owner is Energia Azteca X.S. de R.L. De C.V., an affiliate of InterGen Energy. Coral Energy is requesting the expedited process for a rating increase of Path 45 rating from 408 MW to at least 796 MW. The uprate will be facilitated by conductoring the vacant side of the existing La Rosita-Imperial Valley 230 kV transmission line towers. A comprehensive report will be submitted to TSS, PCC, OC, CMOPS, and TOS identifying the proposed pat rating increase. The need to complete the regional planning process will be discussed at the February 2001 PCC meeting. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 07-13-01 by e-mail this date San Diego Gas and Electric requested the expedited WSCC review process for the Path 45 Uprate with an in-service date of November 1, 2001, and invited interested parties to participate in a WSCC review group. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 08-24-01 by e-mail this date San Diego Gas and Electric distributed the WSCC Path 45 Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 10-03-01 by e-mail this date (letter dated September 28) San Diego Gas and Electric distributed the WSCC Path 45 Rating Review Group Report and requested phase 3 status. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 11-01-01 by e-mail this date the PCC Chair granted Phase 3 status to the Path 45 Uprate Project with an accepted rating of 800 MW south-to-north contingent on the completion of the reconductoring of the Imperial Valley-La Rosita 230 kV line. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-07-00 | SPP |  | **Frenchman’s Tap Project** | 8/2001 |
|  |  | N | 01-07-00 By e-mail this date SPP announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Rating Process for a proposed 230 kV interconnection between their existing Ft. Churchill-Austin line and Oxbow Geothermal’s Dixie Valley – Bishop line. They requested that those interested in participating in an Ad Hoc Work Group to prepare the Comprehensive Progress Report contact them by 2/7/00. | Comments due  3/07/2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-26-00 By e-mail this date SPP announced that they are requesting expedited process for achieving and accepted rating of the proposed interconnection and they are also requesting interest in joining the continuing efforts of the AHWG for performing the Comprehensive Progress Report for this project. Those interested in participating in the AHWG should respond prior to June 24. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-31-02 By e-mail this date SPP announced that the three phase rating process for the Frenchman’s Tap Project has been formally abandoned. Future distributions of this log will have this project removed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-17-97 | WAPA-SNR |  | **Table Mt. - Roseville-Elverta Transmission Upgrade** | - |
|  |  | N | 1-17-97 By letter dated January 14, 1997, WAPA Sierra Nevada invited participation in a planning group to address voltage security and transfer capability in the greater Sacramento area. |  |
|  |  | C | 1-10-02 At the January 2002 TSS meeting the WAPA SNR representative indicated that the Table Mt.-Roseville-Elverta project was a conceptual project only, and should be removed from the log. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4-18-96 | BPA |  | **Oliver Delivery 500 kV Transmission Project (ODTP)** | 4/2003 |
|  |  | N | 04-22-96 By letter dated April 18, 1996, BPA reported its intent to follow the 3-step process of achieving an Accepted Rating of 1500 MW on a proposed line connecting BC Hydro with the US, for the purpose of fulfilling the terms of the Columbia River Treaty. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-10-96 By letter dated May 7, 1996, BPA invited those who were interested in participating in a Review Group for ODTP to contact Mike Kreipe by June 1, 1996. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-01-96 By letter dated June 25, 1996, BPA transmitted a map and other details for the proposed ODTP. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-12-96 By letter dated August 6, 1996, BPA transmitted meeting notes and other material from the first Oliver Project Review meeting held at BPA on July 23, 1996. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-11-96 By letter dated September 6,1996, BPA announced the second ODTP Regional Planning Review Meeting, to be held September 17, 1996 in Portland. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-19-02 By e-mail this date, BPA requested that this project be removed from the WECC Log of projects undergoing the Three Phase Rating Process, indicating that in November of 1996 BPA and BCHA agreed that the project would not be pursued. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-04-96 | SPP |  | **Sierra Pacific - PG&E Intertie Rating Study** | 1997 |
|  |  | N | 3-4-96 By letter dated January 6, 1996, SPPC announced a Path Rating Study for the PG&E-SPPC Intertie, taking into account the impact of the Alturas Project. The first meeting will be held 1/18/96. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-31-02 By e-mail this date SPP announced that the three phase rating process for Sierra Pacific-PG&E Intertie Rating Study has been formally abandoned. Future distributions of this log will have this project removed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-29-95 | SDGE |  | **SDGE - CFE System Path Rating** | - |
|  |  | N | 3-21-95 By letter dated March 21, 1995, SDGE announced a proposed change in the SDGE to CFE system path rating, composed of the Tijuana I-Miguel and the La Rosita-Imperial Valley 230 kV lines. The proposed path rating increase from 408 MVA to 506 MVA is due to the implementation of appropriate operating procedures. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-23-01 | SDGE |  | **South of San Onofre (Path 44) Rating Update** | Comments due  May 23, 2001 |
|  |  | N | 03-23-01 By e-mail this date San Diego Gas and Electric announced their intent to request the expedited process for increasing the north-to-south rating of Path 44 (with one segment of the Palo Verde- Miguel line open) from 2400 MW to 2500 MW and distributed a comprehensive progress report summarizing the study assumptions, methodology, and results. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-11-01 By letter this date San Diego Gas and Electric informed CMOPS and TOS of their intent to implement the new 2500 MW rating for Path 44 within 6 months. SDGE also informed CMOPS and TOS that an Accepted Rating Report was submitted to WSCC on May 25, and that copies are available upon request. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | 06-26-01 By e-mail this date the PCC Chairman distributed a letter granting Path 44 Phase 3 status and an accepted rating of 2500 MW north-to-south whenever any segment of SDGE’s 500 kV Southwest Power Link is out of service, subject to installation of the 230 kV transformer at Escondido Substation, as discussed in the Accepted Rating Report. The Accepted Rating Report was also distributed to PCC, OC, and TSS. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-15-00 | LDWP |  | **Victorville-Lugo Path Uprate** | 2001 |
|  |  | N | 11-15-00 By e-mail this date a letter dated November 7, 2000, and a progress report regarding the Victorville- Lugo 500kV Transmission Line Rating Study was distributed. LADWP and SCE announced their intent to follow the expedited process of achieving an Accepted Rating of 2400 MW from Victorville to Lugo the existing Victorville-Lugo 500 kV Transmission Line. | Comments due  1/16/01 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-02-01 By e-mail this date APS submitted questions to LADWP and SCE regarding the proposed upgrade to the existing Victorville-Lugo 500 kV Transmission Line. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-05-01 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted questions to LADWP and SCE regarding Victorville-Lugo 500 kV Transmission Line rating report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-31-01 By e-mail this date LADWP responded to the questions raised by APS (1-02-01) and SDGE (1-05-01). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-05-01 By e-mail this date SDGE submitted questions as to whether certain contingencies should have been run for this study. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-09-01 By e-mail this date SCE responded to questions raised by SDGE on 02-05-01. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-13-01 By e-mail this date SDGE raised additional questions regarding the contingencies list from their 02-05-01 letter and asked that the report be modified to include the pertinent information. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-22-01 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to the  02-13-01 questions from SDGE. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-23-01 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed a revised report to interested parties in response to the  02-13-01 questions from SDGE. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-23-01 By e-mail this date SDGE indicated they were satisfied with the revised report and had no further questions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-09-01 By e-mail this date LDWP requested confirmation from APS that all questions had been satisfactorily answered. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-12-01 By e-mail this date APS responded to the 03-09-01 request from LDWP indicating that APS had no problems with the technical results, but did have concerns over the format of the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-19-01 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated that they would be re-issuing the original report with an addendum to incorporate questions and comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-06-01 By e-mail this date LDWP re-issued the original report with an addendum to incorporate information requested by APS. The e-mail also indicated that all WSCC member comments had been satisfied and LDWP/SCE would be requesting Phase 3 Status in the near future. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-11-01 By e-mail this date LDWP sent a letter to the PCC Chair requesting a Phase 3 Status for the Victorville-Lugo Path Uprate. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-24-01 By e-mail this date a letter from the PCC Chair granted Phase 3 Status to the Victorville-Lugo Path Uprate with an accepted rating of 2400 MW from Victorville to Lugo. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-15-01 | MPC |  | **Path 8 (Montana-Northwest) Uprate** | 2003 |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-24-99 | SDGE |  | **Valley – Rainbow 500 kV Interconnection** | 6/2000 |
|  |  | N | 11-24-99 By letter dated November 19, 1999, SDGE announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Rating Process for a proposed 500 kV interconnection between Valley Substation (SCE) and a new Rainbow Substation (SDGE). The project includes various associated transmission and other equipment, as required. | Comments due  1/24/2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-12-00 By letter dated July 12, 2000 SDGE announced they decided not to pursue a WSCC Accepted Rating for the Valley-Rainbow 500 kV line. SDGE also announced a Cal-ISO stakeholder meeting to be held on July 26, 2000. Also distributed was the Valley-Rainbow 500 kV Project Feasibility Study Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-10-00 By letter dated August 4, 2000, LDWP expressed concerns regarding regional impact of the Valley-Rainbow 500 kV line as demonstrated by joint study results posted on the California ISO Website. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-28-00 By letter dated August 22, 2000, SDGE responded to the concerns expressed by LDWP in their August 4, 2000 letter. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-3-00 By e-mail this date, SDGE requested that the Valley-Rainbow 500 kV line project be removed from this Log. See letter distributed July 12, 2000. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | P | 9-02-99 By letter dated August 31,1999, IPC transmitted the Comprehensive Progress Report for a new 50-mile 230 kV line between Brownlee and Paddock Jct., along with other line upgrades, designed to increase the Brownlee East capacity to 1625 MW. | Comments due  10/31/1999 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-14-00 By letter dated October 27, 1999 AVA expressed concerns regarding the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-14-00 By letter dated October 28, 1999 PAC questioned both the Comprehensive Report and the applicability of the Three-Phase Rating Process, and demanded that IPC comply with the RPPC procedures for assessing impact on other paths. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-07-00 By letter dated January 26, 2000 AVA stated that IPC had not responded to their concerns, nor, to their knowledge, to those expressed by other utilities in the area. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-24-2000 By letter dated February 24, 2000 A. Perez, the PCC Chair, stated that PAC, BPA, and AVA were not satisfied that the project had met the requirements to progress to Phase 2, and he requested the four organizations to resolve their differences by 3/31/00, with a report submitted to PCC by 4/7/00. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-28-2000 By e-mail this date, IPC distributed a letter dated June 27, 2000. The letter indicates Idaho Power’s position that the regional planning review process has been completed and another regional planning review is unwarranted. At this time, IPC is requesting Phase 2 status and announced they are forming a project review group to address non-commercial technical performance issues. The first meeting of the review group will be July 28, 2000 |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 10-14-97 By letter dated October 3, 1997, SDGE asked to be included in the Review Group and requested a copy of the non-simultaneous rating study report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-1-97 By letter dated November 26, 1997, SDGE stated that they did not feel the Comprehensive Study Report adequately addressed potential regional planning issues and impacts on other systems. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-5-98 By letter dated January 2, 1998, SDGE responded to PAC’s proposed study plan with suggestions for cases and outages to be examined, and emphasized that all regional planning/operation issues should be addressed in parallel with WSCC Phase 2 studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-16-98 By letter dated January 15, 1998, PAC transmitted revision 3 of the Phase 2 Study Plan and scheduled a conference call for the Review Group on 1/26/98. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 1-22-98 By letter dated January 21, 1998, SDGE responded to revision 3 by questioning the intended use of a rating for one section of an already rated path, which does not alter the overall rating for the path. They also pointed out that WSCC procedures for moving to Phase 2 have not been complied with. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-6-98 By e-mail dated February 5, 1998, PAC transmitted revision 4 of the Phase 2 Study Plan, and the Revised Phase 1 Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-11-98 By e-mail dated February 11, 1998, PAC announced another conference call for 2-19-98, for the purpose of approving the Phase 2 Study Plan. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-17-98 By letter dated February 5, 1998, PAC distributed the revised Phase 1 Comprehensive Progress Report, originally dated 11/7/97, revised 1/12/98. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-24-98 By letter dated February 18, 1998, SDGE responded to the 2-5-98 transmittal of the Comprehensive Progress Report with continuing concerns about the definition and application of the proposed rating, and full compliance of the project with the WSCC Rating Procedure. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-4-2000 By letter dated May 1, 2000, PAC requested that phase 2 status be granted for this project. PAC indicated they continue to agree that all unresolved technical issues will be addressed in the phase 2 rating process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-14-2000 By letter dated June 14, 2000, TSS granted Phase 2 status for the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-23-00 | PSC |  | **TOT 3 Path Uprate** |  |
|  |  | N | 05-30-00 By letter dated May 23, 2000, PSC announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Expedited Rating Process to change the Accepted Rating of TOT3 from 1509 MW to 1588 MW. PSC also announced the formation of a Review Group and distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report for the Revised Rating of the TOT3 Transfer Path. | Comments due  7/23/2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-02-00 By e-mail this date NAPG requested participation in the review group for the TOT 3 Path Uprate. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-27-00 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter granting phase 3 status to the TOT 3 Path Uprate. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 11-19-99 | SDGE |  | **South of San Onofre (SOS) 500kV Path Rating** | - |
|  |  | P | 11-19-99 By e-mail dated November 19, 1999, SDGE announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Expedited Rating Process to achieve an Accepted Rating for the South of SONGS Path (WSCC Path 44) in the north-to-south direction. Currently this path has an accepted rating of 1800/1900 MW in the south-to-north direction, and no rating in the opposite direction. SDGE also transmitted the Comprehensive Progress Report for the project. | Comments due  1/19/2000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-14-00 By letter dated November 19,1999, LADWP asked several questions about the study methodology and assumptions, and requested some additional reports. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-04-00 By e-mail dated February 4, 2000, SDGE submitted the Accepted Rating Report for the project in electronic form. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-29-00 At the PCC meeting of February 11, 2000, an Accepted Rating was approved, of 2200 MW with all lines in service and 2400 MW with any segment of the Southwest PowerLink out of service. With this action, the project progressed to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5-12-99 | WAPA-RMR |  | **TOT 3 Path Uprate** | In service |
|  |  | P | 8-23-99 By letter dated May 12,1999, WAPA-RMR transmitted the Comprehensive Project Report for uprating of the TOT3 (Path 36) transmission path to 1509 MW. | Comments due  7/12/1999 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-21-99 By letter this date, WAPA-RMR stated that the project had been discussed at the 7-9-99 PCC meeting, and no adverse comments had been received, and Phase 3 status had been granted. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-23-99 By letter this date, PCC granted Phase 3 status and an accepted rating of 1509 MW. The original report was redistributed with this letter, and the PCC Chair asked that any concerns be addressed to him by 9-10-99. | Comments due  9/10/1999 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-2-98 | SPP |  | **Falcon-Gonder 345kV Project** | 2/2002 |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 2-12-99 By e-mail this date, SDGE inquired concerning the RPPC compliance of the project and availability of a Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 3-26-99 By letter dated March 22, 1999 SPP distributed the Comprehensive Progress Report, Vol. 1. They stated that Vols. 2-4, containing detailed information on the studies, diagrams, and plots were available upon request. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 4-13-99 By e-mail this date SPP responded to SDGE’s inquiry, and stated that the Comprehensive Progress Report was distributed to TSS on 3/22. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-20-99 By e-mail this date SDGE acknowledged the 4/13 response, but stated further concerns relating to Phase 2 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 4-30-99 By letter dated April 29, 1999, SPP transmitted the final draft of the System Impact Study Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-24-99 By letter dated June 22, 1999, SPP requested Phase 2 status for the project. | Comments due  8/22/99 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-23-99 By letter dated August 20, 1999, SDG&E requested the formation of a Phase 2 Review Group, and asked to participate. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-24-99 By letter dated August 24, 1999, SPP requested contact by those interested in participating in the Review Group. |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-18-99 | SCE, SDGE, CAISO |  | **North and South of San Onofre Rerating Project** | Phase 3 |
|  |  | N | By letter dated January 18, 1999 SCE, SDGE, and CAISO requested an immediate rerating of Paths 43 and 44, following the WSCC expedited process for path rating. | Comments due  3/18/1999 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 5-19-99 By e-mail, PCC granted the rerate Phase 3 status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-23-96 | NEVP |  | **Crystal Transmission Project** | Phase 3 |
|  |  | N | 12-23-96 By letter dated December 19, 1996, NEVP announced proposed transmission facilities and a new Crystal substation to eventually serve as the southern terminal of the SWIP project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-29-98 By letter dated June 19, 1998, NEVP transmitted a Comprehensive Progress Report and announced that they intend to follow the WSCC Expedited Rating Process to achieve an Accepted Rating for the Crystal-Allen path in the Crystal Transmission Project. They solicited interest in formation of a Phase 2 Review Group. | Comments due 8/19/98 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-13-98 By letter dated July 8, 1998, SDGE asked to be included in the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-17-98 By letter dated August 12, 1998, LADWP provided comments and asked to be included in the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 8-17-98 By letter dated August 12, 1998, WAPA voiced some concerns and asked to be included in the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-13-98 By letter dated October 7, 1998, WAPA stated that NEVP had satisfactorily addressed their concerns of 8/12/98 in a letter dated 9/15/98 (of which we have no copy). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 12-28-98 By letter dated December, 17 1998, NEVP transmitted their response to issues raised by prospective Review Group members, and recommended that this be accepted as the Phase 2 Review Group report. A conference call was scheduled to discuss the recommendation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 06-07-96 | PNM |  | **Rio Puerco Series Capacitors Project (RPCP)** | In service |
|  |  | N | 06-07-96 By letter dated May 31, 1996, PNM submitted a Comprehensive Report on the project, indicated its intent to follow the expedited process of achieving an Accepted Rating increase of 88 MW on the Four Corners to Northern New Mexico path, and solicited interest in forming a Review Group. | Comments due  8/7/96 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-01-96 By letter dated June 26, 1996, Plains Electric G&T expressed interest in participating in a Review Group for RPCP, and detailed some of their concerns. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-08-96 By letter dated July 3, 1996, EPE expressed concern over the impact of RPCP on the Arroyo phase shift angles, with consequent reduction in transfer capability, and asked to be included in a Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-19-96 By letter dated July 15, 1996, PNM responded to the concerns of PEGT, and stated that they would be forming a Review Group if it was needed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-22-96 By letter dated July 16, 1996, PNM responded to the concerns of EPE, and stated that they would be forming a Review Group if it was needed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-09-96 By letter dated August 28, 1996, PNM announced that all concerns which might require a Phase 2 Review Group had been addressed to the satisfaction of the commenters, and requested Phase 3 status for the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-17-96 At the October 1996 TSS Meeting, the Chairman announced that the project had fulfilled all the requirements to move to Phase 3, and was awaiting only a formal letter from PCC confirming that status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-15-96 By letter dated November 8, 1996, PCC granted Accepted Rating status, and the project advanced to Phase 3 of the rating process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 05-09-96 By letter dated April 30, 1996, SDGE submitted a Comprehensive Progress Report on SOS, requested advancement to Phase 2, and solicited any interest in formation of a WSCC Accepted Rating Review Group. | Comments due  7/9/96 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-24-96 By letter dated June 21, 1996, SCE expressed concerns about the north-to-south rating not being qualified for operating conditions, as the south-to-  north was, and the potential impact on the SDG&E import nomogram. They requested formation of and participation in a Phase 2 Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-08-96 By letter dated June 28, 1996, APS expressed concerns about simultaneous interactions between SOS and EOR, and asked for a Phase 2 Review Group to be formed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 9-18-97 TSS approved the amended Comprehensive Progress Report, and the project moved to Phase 2. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-12-95 | SCE |  | **West of River Path Rating (WOR)** | In service |
|  |  | N | 12-12-95 By letter dated December 7, 1995, SCE reported its intent to follow the expedited process of achieving an Accepted Rating of 10,118 MW for the existing Arizona -California West-of-River (WOR) path, with the MPP, MAP, Moenkopi-Eldorado, and EOR projects in service. A Comprehensive Progress Report and request for Review Group were included. | Comments due  2/10/96 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-12-96 By letter dated January 10, 1996, BPA requested that three additional stability studies be run, and reserved the right to request formation of a Review Group if any significant reliability problems were identified in these studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-01-96 By letter dated January 29, 1996, SCE responded to the above request of BPA, and transmitted the study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-05-96 By letter dated February 1, 1996, SCE responded to a 1/29/96 request of PG&E to perform an additional stability study. Results showed that the system met the WSCC Reliability Criteria under the conditions requested. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-12-96 By letter dated February 7, 1996, PG&E expressed satisfaction with the study results and withdrew their request for a Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-13-96 By letter dated February 9, 1996, BPA expressed satisfaction with the results of the three studies they had requested, and withdrew their request for a Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-26-96 By letter dated February 21, 1996, SCE requested Accepted Rating status for WOR. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 03-08-96 By letter dated March 4, 1996, PCC granted Accepted Rating status for WOR, and the project advanced to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 | 6-16-95 By letter dated June 16, 1995, WAHQ expressed concern about the proposed rating and indicated their interest in participating on a Review Group for the project. |  |

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-3-95 | LHEW |  | **Dry Fork Energy Storage Project (DFES)** | Delayed  Indefinitely |
|  |  | N | 2-3-95 By letter dated January 30, 1995, LHEW requested the participation of WSCC Member Systems in the formation of a Regional Planning Work Group to study transmission system upgrades in Wyoming associated with the Dry Fork Energy Storage Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 6-5-95 By letter dated May 30, 1995, LHEW announced that the Dry Fork Project effort was being reduced substantially and that any future study effort would be announced to the WSCC. Based on the current status of this project, this item will be placed on the inactive log. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6-1-95 | LDWP |  | **Victorville - Lugo Path Rating (VLTL)** | In service |
|  |  | N | 6-1-95 By letter dated May 24, 1995, LDWP transmitted a Comprehensive Progress Report for the rating of the Victorville-Lugo Path and solicited interest in the formation of a Project Review Group. Proposed rating is 1950 MW north-to-south and 900 MW south-to-north. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 7-25-95 By letter dated July 20, 1995, City of Vernon requested the formation of a review group to determine an accepted rating for the Victorville-Lugo path. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 11-16-95 By letter dated October 30, 1995, City of Vernon withdrew their request for the formation of a review group and accepted the proposed rating of 1950 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 11-16-95 By letter dated November 9, 1995, LDWP requested Accepted Rating status and advancement to Phase 3 of the Project Rating Review Process. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | S | 12-14-95 By letter dated December 8, 1995, PCC granted an Accepted Rating Status and the VLTL project advanced to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-10-04 | IPC |  | **Path 55 (Brownlee East) Upgrade** |  |
|  |  | N | 02-10-04 By e-mail this date Idaho Power Company (IPC) distributed a Comprehensive Progress Report for the upgrade of Path 55 (Brownlee East) from 1750 MW to 1850 MW. IPC requested those interested in the formation of a Review Group to contact IPC and is requesting the expedited process for achieving the new rating. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-12-04 By e-mail this date NWMT reported interest in participating in the Path 55 Upgrade Review Group and cited potential impacts to Path 18 and Montana voltages. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-12-04 By e-mail this date AVA reported interest in participating in the Path 55 Upgrade Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-01-04 By e-mail this date BPA provided comments on IPC’s Comprehensive Progress Report for the upgrade of Path 55 (Brownlee East) from 1750 MW to 1850 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-21-04 By e-mail this date IPC provided responses to BPA and NWMT comments on IPC’s Comprehensive Progress Report for the upgrade of Path 55 (Brownlee East) from 1750 MW to 1850 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-29-04 By e-mail this date BPA indicated the IPC responses were satisfactory regarding the upgrade of Path 55. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-27-04 By e-mail this date NWMT indicated the IPC responses were satisfactory regarding the upgrade of Path 55. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-04-04 By e-mail this date IPC provided an updated comprehensive progress report, indicated all questions had been addressed, and requested that the project be granted phase II and Phase III status with a Path 55 accepted rating of 1850 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-01-04 By e-mail this date the PCC chair issued a letter granting Phase III status for the Path 55 Upgrade to 1850 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-19-03 | LDWP |  | **Path 41 Rating Increase** |  |
|  |  | N | 12-19-03 By e-mail this date, Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LDWP) distributed a comprehensive progress report and requested the expedited process for increasing the rating of Path 41 through the installation of a third parallel transformer. The notice also solicited interest in participation in a WECC Peer Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-06-04 By e-mail this date SCE expressed interest in participating in the WECC Peer Review Group for the Path 41 Rating Increase Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-15-04 By e-mail this date the CAISO expressed interest in participating in the WECC Peer Review Group for the Path 41 Rating Increase Project and provided comments on the comprehensive progress report distributed by LDWP on 12/19/03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 01-27-04 By e-mail this date the LDWP announced a Project Review meeting to be held on February 6, 2004. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 02-12-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments on the comprehensive progress report distributed by LDWP on 12/19/03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-04-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided revised cases and study results (table 18) to SCE and copied the review group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-02-04 By e-mail this date, SCE provided comments regarding the Review Group Meeting held on April 1. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-06-04 By e-mail this date LDWP responded to the April 2 comments from SCE and indicated that in response to the comments, the section on Mitigation had been revised, and asked LDWP to indicate if their concerns were met. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-06-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments regarding the revised mitigation. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-06-04 By e-mail this date LDWP indicated they had incorporated all parties' comments and perspectives in the final Comprehensive Progress Report On Sylmar to SCE- Path 41 Upgrade report and distributed a copy to SCE and the CISO asking for their final acceptance and approval. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-14-04 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the April 16 request from LDWP indicating that there could be other operating scenarios which have not been studied and reviewed though case E is unlikely extreme. Before we study and review all the possible scenarios, CISO would rather say that the simultaneous stressed scenario is possible. CISO request that an operating nomogram and associated procedures be developed prior to the completion of the project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-15-04 By e-mail this date SCE responded to the April 16 request from LDWP indicating the report was acceptable to SCE. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-19-04 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the April 16 request from LDWP indicating the report was acceptable to CISO. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-21-04 By e-mail this date LDWP distributed the final report from the review process and requested Phase III status for the Path 41 rating increase with an accepted rating of 1600 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-24-04 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Path 41 Rating increase had achieved Phase 3 status with a bi-directional rating of 1600 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-14-03 | NEVP |  | **Centennial 500 kV Project** |  |
|  |  | N | 10-14-03 By e-mail this date, Salt River Company (SRP) and Nevada Power Company (NEVP) distributed a comprehensive progress report and requested the expedited process for the Centennial 500 kV Project. The notice also solicited interest in participation in a WECC Peer Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 10-17-03 By e-mail this date WAPA-DSW expressed interest in participating in the WECC Peer Review Group for the Centennial 500 kV Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 10-28-03 By e-mail this date SRP distributed a draft agenda for the PEER Review Group Meeting at the Nevada Power office for the Centennial 500 kV Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 12-19-03 By e-mail this date NEVP distributed notes taken from the WECC Centennial Peer Review Group Conference Call of Friday, December 19, 2003. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 01-16-04 At the January TSS meeting NEVP gave a presentation on the Centennial Project and answered questions from TSS members. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-11-04 By e-mail this date NEVP distributed results of the additional analysis asked for the members of the Centennial Review Group. The analysis goes into  detail concerning the original WATS 2004 Spring case, plus the analysis on two new SCIT cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 02-20-04 By e-mail this date NEVP announced that the next meeting for the Centennial Project WECC Regional Review Group would be March 2nd, 2004. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-02-04 By e-mail this date NEVP distributed a copy of the presentation that was given to the group during the March 2 Centennial WECC Regional Review Group meeting. A list of the action items from the meeting was included. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 03-05-04 By e-mail this date NEVP distributed the final draft report of the Review Group's Centennial report.  The reported includes comments discussed at the last regional draft meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-01-04 By e-mail this date SRP and NEVP distributed requested study results (final reviewed report) regarding interaction with the SCIT nomogram, indicated that all the Phase II requirements had been met and requested that the Centennial project be granted Phase III status with an accepted rating of 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-12-04 By e-mail this date the TSS Chair reported to the PCC Chair that at the last TSS meeting (April 2004) TSS was asked for and provided confirmation that the Centennial Project has resolved all outstanding issues and from TSS’s view, the project is ready to move to Phase 3. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-21-04 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter indicating that the Centennial 500 kV Project had achieved Phase 3 status with a rating of 3000 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. 2. Requesting interest in formation of a review group, 3. Requesting Phase II status. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-07-04 By e-mail this date PG&E provided comments regarding the Path 26 Upgrade II project comprehensive progress report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-24-04 By e-mail this date PAC expressed interest in participating in the Path 26 Phase II review group due to potential impact upon TOT2 and Path C. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-16-04 By e-mail this date LDWP expressed interest in participating in the Path 26 Phase II review group and provided comments regarding the report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-16-04 By e-mail this date CISO responded to the LDWP comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-06-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided clarification regarding some of their comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-15-04 By e-mail this date CISO thanked everyone for their comments on the comprehensive progress report and promised to address them in phase II. CISO also promised to send the draft study plan and asked for interest in a review group kickoff meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-16-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided a draft study plan with comments due August 4, 2004. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-19-04 By e-mail this date PG&E provided comments regarding the draft study plan and the interactions between path 26, COI and Path 15. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-25-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided comments regarding the draft study plan. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-26-04 By e-mail this date CISO responded to some of the LDWP comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-28-04 By e-mail this date LDWP commented regarding the CISO response to their comment regarding inclusion of the 505 MW project in studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-03-04 By e-mail this date CISO indicated that SCE had requested a 1 week extension to August 9 to provide comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-10-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided a final study plan. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-10-04 By e-mail this date PAC commented that potential interactions with TOT2 should also be investigated. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-11-04 By e-mail this date LDWP commented that COI and Path 15 should be stressed to their N-S ratings for studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-11-04 By several e-mails this date CISO, PG&E and LDWP corresponded regarding simultaneous flow limits between COI, Path 15, and Path 26. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-19-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided a pre-project case for the simultaneous study of Path 26 vs. Path 41 for review. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-23-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided pre-project cases with SCIT inertia at 90000 MWS and 80000 MWS for study of the simultaneous interactions between path 26 and the other SCIT paths (i.e. WOR, North of Lugo, PDCI, IPPDC). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-25-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided pre-project cases for the P26 vs. S. of Lugo and P26 vs.  path 61 (Lugo-Victorville) simultaneous studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-27-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided a pre-project case for studying the interaction between  Path 26 and the Path 15/COI paths. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-30-04 By e-mail this date LDWP commented regarding the Path 26 RAS and Path 15 flow limits. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-30-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided a response to LDWP. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-31-04 By e-mail this date PG&E provided a report documenting operating nomogram limits developed by Path 15 Expansion Project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 09-17-04 By letter this date, the TSS chair indicated that the Path 26 Upgrade II Project had achieved Phase 2 status for a rating of 3,700 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 03-31-04 |  |  | **West of Hatwai System Upgrade Projects** |  |
|  |  | 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. Announcement of an intended transfer capability of 4277 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-24-04 By e-mail this date WECC Distributed an Agenda for the May 27, 2004 review group meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-24-04 By e-mail this date BPA indicated they intend to request Phase II status before the August 2004 TSS meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-04-04 By e-mail this date PGE commented regarding the West of Hatwai System Upgrade projects Phase I report and indicated interest in participating in the review group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-04-04 By e-mail this date BPA responded to PGE and clarified that they did not intend to propose direct Colstrip generator tripping for this project. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-06-04 – 06-07-04 By e-mails these dates the TSS and PCC chairs corresponded regarding requirements to enter Phase II. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-10-04 By e-mail this date the TSS chair indicated that the West of Hatwai upgrades had achieved Phase II status with a requested rating of 4277 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. 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 | 04-23-04 By two e-mails this date TANC provided comments regarding the DPV2 report and expressed interest in participating in the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-28-04 By e-mail this date NEVP provided comments regarding the DPV2 report and expressed interest in participating in the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-13-04 By e-mail this date SRP requested the power flow base case so they could understand the system representation and assumptions in the study prior to make any comments regarding the DPV2 Comprehensive Progress Report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-13-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided the requested power flow base case to SRP. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-14-04 By e-mail this date LDWP expressed interest in participating in the Regional Planning Review Group for the DPV2 Project and provided comments regarding the DPV2 Comprehensive Progress Report. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-20-04 By e-mail this date PG&E expressed interest in participating in the Review Group and suggested that in phase II they represent Path 26 at 2700 MW per the recent Path 26 comprehensive progress report. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-28-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided suggested contingencies to study and asking regarding interactions with the WOR rating. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 05-28-04 By e-mail this date SCE responded to the May 28 LDWP e-mail and indicated their intention to prepare base cases to study the WOR rating. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-21-04 By e-mail this date; NEVP indicated that their phase I comments have all been addressed and that their remaining comments could be addressed in Phase II. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-23-04 By e-mail this date; NEVP provided comments regarding the batch plotting file for DPV2 and EOR9000+ studies. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-28-04 By e-mail this date; NEVP commented that the DPV2 project should include all the contingencies as in the EOR9000+ project and requested that the same study criteria be used. NEVP also commented that a short circuit analysis should be conducted and provided several other comments. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-28-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided their slide presentation from the July 21-22 project kickoff meeting and asked for power flow changes to the 2009 case by July 30. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-29-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided power flow changes (in the form of epcl routines)to bring the current non-simultaneous 8055MW EOR benchmark cases up to the 2008-09 time frame. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-29-04 By e-mail this date LDWP provided power flow changes (in the form of epcl routines) and load forecasts for 2008. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-29-04 By e-mail this date SCE asked LDWP to confirm that the changes provided will work for 2009 autumn. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-30-04 By e-mail this date IID provided power flow changes (in the form of epcl routines) to reflect the  2009 Heavy Autumn condition. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-13-04 By e-mail this date SCE provided revised 2009 Heavy Autumn power flow cases incorporating the changes received for final review and approval. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-16-04 By e-mail this date NEVP commented regarding the revised 2009 Heavy Autumn power flow cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-16-04 By e-mail this date SCE requested formation of a small short circuit study group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-17-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided some final fine-tuning changes to the power flow cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-18-04 By e-mail this date CISO provided some final power flow changes. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-18-04 By e-mail this date SDGE provided some final power flow changes. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-20-04 By e-mail this date SCE requested comments regarding batch plots desired for review of dynamic study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-23-04 By e-mail this date NEVP commented regarding the batch plots. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-24-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided their batch plotting file. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-26-04 By two e-mails this date SCE provided updated cases and summarized an August 20 call regarding items needed for approval of the 2009 Heavy Autumn cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-26-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided some changes that had been missed in updating the 2009 Heavy Autumn cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-26-04 By e-mail this date NEVP provided some additional voltage tuning changes to the 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-30-04 By e-mail this date NEVP again provided their voltage tuning changes to the 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-30-04 By e-mail this date SCE listed participants in the short circuit study and asked regarding availability for a conference call. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 08-31-04 By e-mail this date SCE reissued final 2009 Heavy Autumn cases and indicated that all changes received were included and that they would consider the cases approved Friday September 3, 2004. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-31-04 By e-mail this date WAPA requested inclusion in the short circuit study group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-31-04 By e-mail this date SRP provided voltage tuning changes to the 2009 HA cases and approved the final cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 08-31-04 By e-mail this date SDGE provided a spreadsheet to use to check overloads in the 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 09-02-04 By e-mails this date NEVP and LDWP provided a line rating change for the 2009 HA cases. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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 Path 49 Rating to 9,255 MW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-07-03 | SDGE |  | **Path 49 Upgrade** |  |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-22-03 By e-mail this date a letter from owners, operators, and stakeholders of Path 49, the Navajo Transmission System, and the Mead-Phoenix/Mead Adelanto Projects distributed a letter to the PCC Chair, the TSS Chair, and the Director of Grid Planning for the CAISO, requesting that the Path 49 Upgrade go through the WECC Regional Planning Process rather than the expedited process. Signatories to the letter were the WATS Chair, IID, LADWP, NEVP, SRP, USBR, and WAPA-DSW. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 04-23-03 By e-mail this date Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LDWP) commented on the Study Plan distributed by SDGE on April 21. In their comments, LADWP indicated that they believe additional studies are required to demonstrate the non-simultaneous capability before pursuing the simultaneous issues. LADWP indicated they have many questions and comments concerning the study plan on both non-simultaneous and simultaneous aspects. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 04-23-03 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the April 23 comments from LDWP indicating that the study plan is intended for non-simultaneous Path 49 Upgrade and is open for comments. SDGE expressed appreciation for LADWPs participation in the process. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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 | 05-08-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a letter to PCC and TSS requesting WECC members to provide information on potential parallel (concurrent) transmission projects, feasible alternatives/competing projects, and/or suggested changes to the project plan of service for the Path 49 rating increase. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-19-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided a response to the action items requested by SDGE at kickoff meeting. SCE also provided a copy of the Path 26 Rating Study Phase 2 Report for reference. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 05-27-03 By e-mail this date SRP, LADWP, NEVP, USBR, and WAPA-DSW provided comments on the Comprehensive Progress Report distributed by SDGE for the Path 49 Upgrade. The letter indicates that the signatories believe that the report failed to address several requirements and was incomplete in addressing other requirements. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-18-03 By e-mail this date SDGE responded to the April 22 request from the owners, operators, and stakeholders of Path 49, the Navajo Transmission System, and the Mead-Phoenix/Mead Adelanto Projects. In the response SDGE indicated they would be making a presentation at the upcoming PCC meeting. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 06-18-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed to PCC files for a presentation to be made at the PCC meeting on the proposed Path 49 upgrade. A copy of this distribution was sent to TSS on 06-20-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-24-03 By e-mail this date SCE provided comments on the Study Plan for the Path 49 upgrade distributed by SDGE on 04-07-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-17-03 By e-mail this date SDGE distributed a Study Plan for the Path 49 Upgrade to the Review Group. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-22-03 By e-mail this date SRP provided comments on the Study Plan for the Path 49 Upgrade distributed by SDGE on 07-17-03. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 06-02-04 By e-mail this date LDWP asked SDGE regarding intended WOR rating updates associated with projects that upgraded EOR ratings. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-23-04 By e-mail this date CISO issued a study plan/completion schedule for series capacitor upgrades to achieve an EOR rating of 8055 and power flow plots/study results. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | S | 07-26-04 By e-mail this date, SDGE provided an accelerated schedule for work related to the Palo Verde West series capacitor upgrade project (EOR8055). |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | C | 07-28-04 By e-mail this date LDWP clarified their interest in studying interactions between EOR and Path 26 with maximum flows on COI, Path 15, PV Devers, and Hassyampa-North Gila. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 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. |  |