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# Projects Removed from Logbook due to merging

Projects that were listed in the Path Rating process Logbook but have been merged into another project.

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-21-07 | LS Power & Great Basin Transmission LLC | N | **SWIP North Transmission Project**(previously known as Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Midpoint-White Pine 500 kV transmission line) | 2014 |
| 2-22-07 |  | N | By email 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. |  |
| 8-11-08 |  | S | By email this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter stating that the SWIP North Transmission Project has achieved Phase 2 status with a proposed rating of 1400 MW southbound and 2000 MW northbound. |  |
| 9-28-09 |  | S | By email this date the SWIP-North PRG leader distributed for review a draft write-up and summary of the preliminary non-simultaneous studies as well as two base cases and associated dynamics data that were used to run the studies. |  |
| 10-14-09 |  | C | By email this date Idaho Power Co. submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 9-28-09 for review. |  |
| 10-18-09 |  | C | By email this date NV Energy submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 9-28-09 for review. |  |
| 10-20-09 |  | C | By email this date PG&E submitted a list of comments to the draft write-up of study results distributed on 9-28-09 for review. |  |
| 8-2-10 |  | S | By email this date Great Basin Transmission (GBT) provided notice that Utility System Efficiencies (USE) will now be providing technical assistance with the Phase 2 study effort. An updated Study Plan was distributed for review and comment. |  |
| 8-3-10 |  | S | By email this date seven base cases were distributed by USE for review and comment. |  |
| 8-12-10 |  | C | By email this date SMUD submitted two comments to the study plan provided by USE.  |  |
| 8-13-10 |  | C | By email this date PG&E indicated that updates to the study cases as well as comments to the study plan are forthcoming. |  |
| 8-16-10 |  | C | By email this date TransWest Express provided a list of 4 comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan. |  |
| 8-17-10 |  | C | By email this date IPC provided numerous comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan. |  |
| 8-18-10 |  | C | By email this date PG&E provided a two-page list of comments to the SWIP-North Phase 2 study plan as well as some change files for the power flow cases to be used in the Phase 2 studies. |  |
| 8-18-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided a response to SMUD’s comments of 8-12-10. |  |
| 9-10-10 |  | C | By email this date SMUD acknowledged USE’s response on 8-18-10 and re-iterated one of their concerns from the original comments on 8-12-10. |  |
| 9-10-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting responded to SMUD’s comment on 9-10-10 and agreed to modify a section of the Phase 2 study plan to address SMUD’s concerns. |  |
| 9-10-10 |  | C | By email this date PG&E indicated that power flow parameters regarding COI flows are acceptable. This was one of PG&E’s concerns in their comments from 8-18-10. |  |
| 9-10-10 |  | C | By email this date SMUD indicated that USE Consulting’s response from this same date is acceptable. |  |
| 9-15-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided responses to all comments received from PG&E on 8-18-10 and noted that an updated study plan is forthcoming. |  |
| 11-7-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided responses to all comments received from TransWest Express on 8-16-10. |  |
| 11-7-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided the finalized SWIP-North Phase 2 Study Plan for PRG review. |  |
| 1-20-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate emails SWIP-North Path 66 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review.  |  |
| 1-28-11 |  | S | By email this date LS Power provided notification of a SWIP South PRG meeting to be held 3-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
| 1-31-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed the draft study report for the SWIP-North N-S non-simultaneous studies to the PRG for review. |  |
| 1-31-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate emails SWIP-North Path 14 W-E & E-W simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review.  |  |
| 1-31-11 |  | C | By email this date PG&E provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 N-S & S-N base cases concerning modification of COI flows. |  |
| 1-31-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of PG&E’s comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 base cases and indicated the requested changes would be implemented. |  |
| 2-1-11 |  | C | By email this date PACE provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 66 base case representation of TOT 2B/2C. |  |
| 2-2-11 |  | C | By email this date SMUD re-iterated PG&E’s 1-31-11 comments to the Path 66 base cases. |  |
| 2-4-11 |  | C | By email this date IPC submitted a list of four comments to the base case used to provide the SWIP-North N-S non-simultaneous studies as distributed by USE Consulting on 1-31-11. |  |
| 2-14-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed the draft study report for the SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous studies to the PRG for review. |  |
| 2-23-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided notice of a joint SWIP-North and SWIP-South PRG meeting to be held in Las Vegas, NV on 3-22-11. |  |
| 2-28-11 |  | C | By email this date PACE submitted a list of six comments to the draft SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous study report as distributed by USE Consulting on 2-14-11. |  |
| 2-28-11 |  | C | By email this date SMUD requested additional detail on some of the information included in the draft SWIP-North S-N non-simultaneous study report. |  |
| 3-7-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate emails SWIP-North Path 65 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
| 3-17-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed the SWIP-North N-S and S-N non-simultaneous study reports to the PRG after having added all previously received comments. |  |
| 3-17-11 |  | C | By email this date PACE submitted an additional comment to the SWIP-North non-simultaneous study reports. |  |
| 3-17-11 |  | S | By email this date NVEnergy addressed the comment from PACE and stated that the SWIP-South team is working on an answer to it. |  |
| 3-18-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate emails SWIP-North Path 26 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
| 4-4-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG via two separate emails SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 N-S & S-N simultaneous base cases and associated base case parameters for review. |  |
| 4-5-11 |  | C | By email this date IPC submitted comments to the SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 information distributed by USE Consulting on 4-4-11 and noted that there is potential for significant interaction between Borah West and SWIP North.  |  |
| 4-11-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of IPC’s comments of 4-5-11 and indicated that simultaneous interaction analyses will be performed on both Path 17 and Path 19. |  |
| 4-12-11 |  | C | By email this date WAPA provided comments to the SWIP-North Path 17/Path 19 base cases. |  |
| 4-12-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting acknowledged receipt of WAPA’s comments of the same date and indicated their comments will be added into the study base cases. |  |
| 1-18-12 |  | S | Cases for simultaneous studies were distributed for comment. Comments due on February 1, 2012. |  |
| 6-22-12 |  | S | PRG report was sent on this date. |  |
| 7-25-12 |  | C | Comments from NV Energy received. |  |
|  |  | S | By email this date LS Power provides a status update on the PRG studies. The PRG has addressed all comments and as a result are awaiting additional feedback from PG&E and SCE about additional sensitivity studies.  |  |
| 2020 |  | N | SWIP North and SWIP South PRGs were combined into a single project. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-8-06 | LS Power & Great Basin Transmission LLC | N | **SWIP-South Project**(formerly known as Great Basin Transmission LLC’s proposed Harry Allen-Robinson Summit transmission line—Great Basin Transmission Project) | 2012 |
| 12-30-05 |  | N | By email 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. |  |
| 1-26-07 |  | S | By email 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. |  |
| 5-26-09 |  | S | By email this date LS Power submitted study results previously provided to the PRG for entry into the Phase II Rating Log. |  |
| 8-24-09 |  | S | By email this date results for non-simultaneous studies were distributed to the PRG for their review. |  |
| 8-27-09 |  | S | By email this date initial power flow results and base cases for the SWIP-South/EOR Simultaneous Analysis were distributed to the PRG for their review. |  |
| 9-4-09 |  | C | By email this date NVEnergy provided a list of 6 questions/comments regarding the initial power flow results provided by LS Power. |  |
| 11-30-09 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed pre- and post-project SWIPS-Centennial simultaneous power flow base cases and dyd files for review. |  |
| 12-3-09 |  | C | By email this date the CAISO requested the addition of two items into the SWIP-South Phase II studies. |  |
| 6-30-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided notice that in January 2010, Great Basin Transmission (GBT) and NV Energy announced a MOU for joint development of a single Robinson Summit-Harry Allen 500 kV transmission line. SWIP-South Phase II rating studies have been resumed with GBT enlisting the services of USE Consulting to provide technical assistance. The SWIP-South Phase II rating study plan has been updated. |  |
| 6-30-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the most recent versions of the SWIP-South non-simultaneous cases. |  |
| 7-5-10 |  | C | By email this date the CAISO provided a list of seven comments to the Phase II study plan for this project. |  |
| 7-28-10 |  | C | By email this date NV Energy provided comments to the Phase II study plan for this project. |  |
| 8-3-10 |  | C | By email this date TransWest Express submitted a list of three comments to the SWIP-South Phase 2 study plan. |  |
| 8-25-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the most recent version of the SWIP-South 2013 LW non-simultaneous pre-project case and associated dynamics file. In a separate email, USE Consulting also distributed two post-project cases. |  |
| 9-9-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed a sensitivity variation of the SWIP-South 13 HS non-simultaneous cases. |  |
| 9-30-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting provided responses to the three comments from TransWest Express on 8-3-10. |  |
| 9-30-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the finalized SWIP-South Phase 2 study plan after incorporating comments that had been received. |  |
| 10-1-10 |  | C | By email this date PacifiCorp noted that no simultaneous analyses between the SWIP-South project and east side transmission paths were evaluated. PacifiCorp requested the addition of the following simultaneous analyses: Path C, TOT 2C/TOT 2B1/TOT 2B2, IPP DC line, Bridger West, and Borah West. |  |
| 10-1-10 |  | S | By email this date Great Basin Transmission indicated that they will be performing simultaneous analyses for the TOT 2C/TOT 2B!/TOT 2B@ and the IPP DC line, but that the remaining paths requested by PacifiCorp in their 10-1-10 email will be covered in the SWIP-North study plan. |  |
| 10-1-10 |  | C | By email this date SMUD provided a comment to the SWIP-South study plan. |  |
| 10-4-10 |  | C | By email this date PacifiCorp asked for information concerning the added generation in the IPC control area that was included in the case(s) being used for Phase 2 studies. |  |
| 10-4-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting responded to PacifiCorp’s question from the same date. |  |
| 10-4-10 |  | C | By email this date PacifiCorp asked about resources necessary to justify the SWIP project N-S rating and how this rating will be affected if these resources aren’t available when the SWIP project is built. |  |
| 10-4-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting indicated that three different scenarios are being studied to load the SWIP project N-S out of Midpoint in Idaho. |  |
| 10-6-10 |  | C | By email this date TransWest Express asked for additional details on the Idaho resources being used in the SWIP-South Phase 2 studies. |  |
| 10-6-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting responded to the TransWest Express comments from the same date. |  |
| 10-7-10 |  | C | By email this date PacifiCorp observed that each of the three configurations being considered to load the SWIP-North project would result in different ratings and asked if it would be a good idea to analyze SWIP-South in a similar manner. |  |
| 10-11-10 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting responded to PacifiCorp’s comments from 10-7-10. |  |
| 12-21-10 |  | S | Via 3 separate emails this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG (1) a draft report presenting initial results of the 2013 Heavy Summer N-S Non-Simultaneous case, (2) the base case used to produce these results, and (3) a sensitivity case including NVEnergy’s Sunrise 500/230 kV substation on the Harry Allen-Mead 500 kV line.  |  |
| 1-28-11 |  | S | By email this date LS Power provided notification of a SWIP South PRG meeting to be held 3-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
| 2-1-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP South PRG via two separate emails draft report material detailing non-simultaneous analyses for this project. |  |
| 2-10-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG the SWIP South/Path 26 simultaneous cases for their review. |  |
| 2-18-11 |  | C | By email this date PACE provided updates to their system as represented in the cases used to produce the non-simultaneous report from 2-1-11.  |  |
| 2-24-11 |  | S | By email this date LS Power provided notice that a loan guarantee for this project has been finalized. The project is scheduled to be in service before the end of 2012. |  |
| 2-24-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the PRG, via two separate emails, four base cases for simultaneous analysis of SWIP-South and Path 32 (Pavant/Intermountain-Gonder 230 kV). Comments to the cases are due by 3-14-11. |  |
| 3-1-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG draft non-simultaneous analyses to be discussed at the SWIPPRG meeting planned for 3-22-11 in Las Vegas. |  |
| 3-18-11 |  | S | By email this date USE Consulting distributed to the SWIP-South PRG meeting material for the 3-22-11 PRG meeting in Las Vegas. |  |
| 5-13-11 |  | S | By email this date NVEnergy submitted a letter indicating that the ON Line and SWIP-South projects are still separate projects and are still making progress through the 3-Phase rating process. |  |
| 11-10-11 |  | S | By three separate emails this date LSPower submitted to the PRG base cases for the SWIP South - TOT 2B-2C/IPP simultaneous studies. Review and comments were requested by 11-23-11. |  |
| 1-4-12 |  | S | By email this date LSPower submitted to the PRG base cases for the SWIP South–EOR/WOR simultaneous studies. Review and comments were requested by 1-18-12. |  |
| 6-14-12 |  | S | By email this date the PRG report was sent. |  |

# Projects Removed from Logbook due to Completion

Projects that were listed in the Path Rating process Logbook but have been completed.

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-13-17 | DesertLink LLC |  | Harry Allen‐Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project |  |
| 10-13-17 |  | S | By email this date Sandeep Arora of DesertLink LLC emailed the completed Project Phase 1 Comprehensive Progress report. |  |
| 2-20-17 |  | C | By email this date and in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination and Path Rating Processes guidelines, DesertLink has requested a change in the path rating status of the Harry Allen - Eldorado Transmission Project from Phase 1 to Phase 2A. The Harry Allen - Eldorado Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) was distributed to the Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC) and Studies Subcommittee (StS) members on October 20th, 2017 which started the 60-day review period.Following this review period, which ended on December 20, 2017, DesertLink indicated that they have not received any major comments on or objections to the Comprehensive Progress Report. Therefore, the Harry Allen-Eldorado project is now in Phase 2A of the WECC Path Rating Process.If there are any questions concerning the Harry Allen-Eldorado Project, please contact Sandeep Arora at SArora@LSPower.com .  |  |
| 2-7-20 |  | S | By email this date DesertLink, LLC requested that Phase 3 status be granted for the Harry Allen-Eldorado Transmission Project, a 500 kV line from Harry Allen to Eldorado to achieve a new accepted Path Rating of 3,443 MW north to south and -1,593 MW south to north.  Studies have shown that the Harry Allen - Eldorado Transmission Project will have an impact on Path 81.  With the addition of the Harry Allen - Eldorado Transmission Project, the Path Rating on Path 81 will change from 4,533 to 6,285 MW north to south and from -3,790 to   -4,843 MW south to north. DesertLink, LLC submitted the Phase 2 “Harry Allen - Eldorado 500 kV CPR” report.  |  |
| 2-7-20 |  | C | By email this date a clarification was sent out to the previous email to bring it into alignment with the Phase 2 report. The email included the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **North to South Rating MW** | **South to North Rating MW** |
| **Harry Allen\* –  Eldorado Path** | **3,496** | **1,390** |
| **SNTI-** A new Path, comprised of the combination of the HAE Project and the facilities in the Southern Nevada Transmission Interface | **6,257** | **4,681** |

**Path 81:** Upon HAE's completion, a new Path will be created comprised of the combination of HAE and SNTI. The HAE Phase 2 Rating Study also proposes to establish Accepted Ratings for a new Path comprised of the combination of the HAE Project and the SNTI facilities and the old SNTI path 81 will be retired. |  |
| 3-19-20 |  | N | By email this date it was posted that the 30-day review period for the Phase 3 request has passed, and all comments or objections that were received have been addressed. Therefore, the Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project is granted Phase 3 status. All components identified in the study report are scheduled to be in service by May 1, 2020. |  |
| 9-11-20 |  | N | By email this date Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project has completed Phase 3 of the WECC Path Rating Process.On January 29, 2020 DesertLink, LLC initiated the RAC 30-day review of the Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project and requested Phase 3 status and an Accepted Rating of 3,496 MW north to south and 1,390 MW south to north. In addition to the Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project Path, a new path will be created that comprises the Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project and the components of Path 81. This new path will have an Accepted Rating of 6,257 MW north to south and 4,681 MW south to north. Since all transmission facilities associated with the Harry Allen Eldorado 500 kV Transmission Project have been constructed and placed in-service, Phase 3 is now complete the paths noted above are now “Existing Paths”.  |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **12-16-09** | **Comision Federal de Electricidad (CFE)** | **N** | Path 45 Uprate Project |  |
| 7-30-09 |  | N | By email 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. |  |
| 10-21-09 |  | C | By email this date SDGE provided comments to the CPR for this project. |  |
| 10-21-09 |  | S | By email this date CFE provided answers to SDGE’s comments of the same date.  |  |
| 12-16-09 |  | S | By email 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. |  |
| 2-22-10 |  | S | By email this date CFE distributed notice of an initial PRG meeting to be held 3-2-10 at IID facilities in El Centro, CA. |  |
| 3-12-10 |  | S | By email this date CFE provided meeting minutes from the Phase II PRG meeting that was held 3-2-10 in El Centro, CA and asked for any comments. |  |
| 5-26-10 |  | S | By email this date CFE distributed a Phase II study plan to the PRG for their review and comment. |  |
| 9-28-10 |  | S | A Phase II PRG meeting was held at SDG&E facilities this date. |  |
| 12-21-10 |  | C | By email this date SCE provided comments to the Phase II study report of the Path 45 Uprate Project. |  |
| 2-18-11 |  | S | By email this date CFE distributed the Phase II Project Rating Report for 30-day review and requested Phase III status. |  |
| 3-30-11 |  | S | By email this date CFE indicated that they had not received any comments to their report that was distributed on 2-18-11 and asked about the next steps that need to be taken. |  |
| 4-26-11 |  | C | By email this date SCE submitted comments to CFE concerning the Path 45 Uprate Project. SCE indicated that simultaneous analyses with Path 46 have not been performed correctly and need to be completed. As a result, SCE requests that CFE complete these studies before Phase III status can be granted. |  |
| 4-26-11 |  | C | By email this date the CAISO requested that CFE perform a simultaneous evaluation of Path 45 (N-S) and Path 46 (E-W) both at their maximum flows. |  |
| 5-2-11 |  | C | By email this date SCE requested that CFE complete a Path 46 simultaneous analysis. |  |
| 5-11-11 |  | S | By email this date SCE distributed study results to the PRG with Paths 45 and 46 at their respective maximums and loss of the IV-La Rosita 230 kV line. SCE requested help from SDG&E in verifying its SOL’s in the base case used for the studies. |  |
| 5-17-11 |  | S | By email this date SDG&E indicated that none of their SOL’s are violated in the base case that SCE used for their studies from 5-11-11. |  |
| 8-18-11 |  | S | By email this date CFE distributed a draft Study Report to the PRG that includes a Path 46 simultaneous analysis. |  |
| 8-22-11 |  | C | By email this date SCE provided a list of four comments to the draft report of 8-18-11. |  |
| 8-22-11 |  | C | By email this date the CAISO provided a list of 3 comments to the draft report of 8-18-11. |  |
| 8-26-11 |  | C | By email this date SDG&E provided comments to the draft report of 8-18-11. |  |
| 3-26-19 |  | N | By email this date, Centro Nacional De Control De Energia (CENACE) is requested that the WECC Path Rating Process for Path 45 to increase the rating from 408 MW to 600 MW north-to-south be expedited. Comments were requested by May 27, 2019.  |  |
| 3-23-20 |  | N | By email this date Centro Nacional de Control de Energia (CENACE) is requesting a 60-day review as part of the Expedited Process for the Path 45 Uprate Project.  The Path 45 Uprate Project will uprate the rating of Path 45 from 400 MW to 600 MW North to South (only effective during the summer season).  As background for this request, a PRG was formed following the initial submittal of the CPR on March 26, 2019 and this PRG has approved the latest version of this CPR/PRG Report, but because the Path 45 Uprate Project never officially proceeded to Phase 2, a second 60 day review period is needed to complete the WECC Path Rating Process. |  |
| 7-23-20 |  | N | By email this date the Expedited Path Rating Process for Path 45 to increase the Path Rating from 400 MW to 600 MW N-S has completed the three Phase Path Rating Process. Centro Nacional de Control de Energia (CENACE) did not receive any comments during the 60-day review period. Additionally, all projects identified in the [study report](https://www.wecc.org/Reliability/NDA/Path%2045%20Uprate%20to%20600%20MW%20WECC%20Rating%20Process%20CPR%20Phase%202%20rev3.pdf?Web=1) are in service. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Process, Path 45 has an Accepted Rating of 600 MW N-S.  |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 09-17-13 | El Paso Electric (EPE) | N | Path 47 Verification of Accepted Rating Project | In-Service |
|  | 09-17-13 | N | 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. |  |
|  | 02-28-14 | N | By email this date the PCC Chair grants Phase 3 status to the Path 47 Redefinition Request (Changes, Update). |  |
|  | 08-24-16 | N | In TSS Gerry Pulido stated this project was complete as of 2013 |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-19-13 | Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc. (TSGT) | N | Keota Interconnection TOT 3 Definition Change | 12-2015 |
|  | 8-16-13 | N | 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 email.  |  |
|  | 11-12-13 | S | 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). |  |
|  | 08-24-2016 |  | Discussed in TSS this date. Project is in service |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-01-14 | Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) | N | Pacific DC Intertie (PDCI) Upgrade Project | 01-15-2016 |
|  | 09-30-14 | N | By email this date BPA announced their desire to initiate Phase 1 of the Path Rating Process for the PDCI Upgrade Project and invites interested members to submit a participate form by Oct 10, 2014.The existing rated capability of the PDCI is 3100 MW, at ±500 kV de, ±31 00 Amps de. Celilo will require extensive and costly refurbishment to maintain reliable operation at 3100 MW. BPA has determined the best approach is a complete rebuild of the Celilo system as a two-converter HVDC station, served directly by 500 kV AC. It is planned that the north to south rating will be increased from 3100 MW to 3220 MW in the north to south direction. The south to north rating will remain unchanged at 3100 MW. |  |
|  | 05-08-2015 | S | By email this date BPA’s PDCI Upgrade Project, Phase 1, Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) was provided for distribution to TSS and PCC members. BPA requests that WECC members and project stakeholders review the report within the 60-day review period and submit any questions or comments to Eric Heredia at emheredia@bpa.gov. |  |
|  | 05-05-2016 | N | By email this data project entered Phase 2B |  |
|  | 12-19-2016 | N | By email this date this project completed the steps to achieve Phase 3 status and, after review was granted Phase 3 status – close file as this is in service? |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-30-05 | SCE | N | Devers-Colorado River (DCR) Path 49 Rating |  |
|  |  | N | 12-30-05 By e-mail this date a Comprehensive Progress Report was distributed for a rating of 10500 MW on the combined projects of EOR 9300 MW upgrade and Devers-Palo Verde No.2 with Path 49 EOR.  Phase 2 status is requested once the 60-day comment period is completed. |  |
|  |  | S | 03-01-07 By e-mail this date the PCC Chair distributed a letter confirming that Path 49 (East of Colorado River) has achieved an accepted rating of 10,500 MW in the east to west direction pending completion of the identified upgrades. |  |
|  |  | S | 12-22-11 By e-mail this date SCE indicated that since this project achieved Phase III status, the proposed DPV2 Project has been modified and the Plan of Service accordingly updated. As a result, SCE plans to perform additional studies to determine a revised DPV2 Accepted Path 49 rating. In addition, the PRG for this project is reconvened and interest in participation on it is solicited. |  |
|  |  |  | 9-9-13 By this e-mail this date SCE invited the PRG to the DCR Path 49 (EOR) and Path 46 (WOR) Re-studies Project Review Group Meeting #4. In cooperation with NV Energy (NVE), this meeting will also include NVE's SNTI Expedited Path Rating Study in the interest of reducing your travel and time commitments. The meeting is scheduled on September 27, 2013 between 9:00 am - 5:00 pm at NV Energy Beltway Complex in Las Vegas, Nevada. |  |
|  |  | S | 10-11-13 By email this date SCE distributed the final reports for Path 46 and 49 restudy. SCE revised the DPV2 POS by replacing the Devers – San Bernardino 230 kV lines # 1 and # 2 and Devers – Vista 230 kV lines # 1 and # 2 upgrades with a new Devers – Valley 500 kV # 2 line. For the DPV2 rating studies, the Devers – San Bernardino 230 kV lines # 1 and # 2 and the Devers – Vista 230 kV lines # 1 and # 2 would be represented as originally constructed.The SCE PRG determined that the change to the plan of service did not require being moved back to phase 2 but did require studies to verify that the transfer limit for the path. |  |
|  |  | N | 11-21-13 By email this date the PCC chair distributed a letter describing this project retaining phase 3 status. The phase 3 rating is 9,600 MW for path 49 and 11,200 on path 46. |  |
|  | 08-24-2016 | N | In TSS this was updated to reflect that the California side is complete and in service, Colorado-Delany Project has not begun the Path Rating Process yet – Listed as in service and part of Path 49 in 2017 Path Rating Catalog |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12-12-13 | BPA | N | Central Ferry to Lower Monumental Project | Dec. 31, 2015 |
|  |  | N | 12-12-2013 By email this date Jeffrey Miller of ColumbiaGrid announced establishment of the Central Ferry to Lower Monumental Project Coordination Review Group. Bonneville Power Administration Transmission Services (BPA-TS) has requested that ColumbiaGrid initiate and facilitate the WECC Project Coordination Review Process for their Central Ferry to Lower Monumental 500 kV Transmission Line Project. BPA-TS has proposed this project to accommodate new generation additions in the Southeastern Washington area. |  |
|  |  | S | 12-5-2014 By email this date Charles E. Matthews of BPA Transmission Planning distributed the Project Coordination Review Group Report for the Central Ferry-Lower Monumental 500 kV Transmission Line ProjectAttached was the Project Coordination report that has been accepted by the Project Coordination Review Group (PCRG) titled “CF-LoMo PCR Report.pdf”. This report was provided for a 30-day comment period in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination Process.  |  |
|  |  |  | 8-1-17 By this date Projects appears to be in service and in cases |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 05-12-12 | Tri-State | N | Gladstone 230 kV phase shifting transformer project | Q4, 2014 |
|  |  | N | 05-12-2012 By email this date a waiver of the Project Coordination Process for the Gladstone 230 kV Phase Shifting Transformer Project was requested. Pursuant to the approved process, the attached Waiver Request was distributed to PCC, TEPPC, and TSS for 30-day review.  |  |
|  |  | C | August 24-2016 This project is complete and in the operations cases as of this date  |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCE | N | Path 46 Re-Definition and Rating |  |
|  |  | N | 10-11-2013 A Path 46 Re-Definition and Rating Re-Study Report (Report) was sent to the Planning Coordination Committee, Technical Studies Subcommittee, and Operating Committee that supports a revised West of Colorado River (Path 46) definition and rating. The Report identified a Plan of Service (POS) that includes a new Devers – Colorado River 500 kV Project (DCR) that would support lowering the WECC approved DPV2 Phase 3 Accepted Path 46 rating from 11,823 MW to 11,200 MW. |  |
|  |  | S | 7-18-14 by email this date notification was received that the Path 46 Project Review Group (PRG) approved the Report on September 27, 2013. During the subsequent 30-day posting review period of the Report, no comments were received. All phases of the DCR project POS have been completed. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC “Project Coordination and Path Rating Processes”, the Path 46 Accepted Rating is granted 11,200 MW East-to-West. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4-25-08** | **BC Transmission Corp. (BTC)** | **N** | Path 3 (Northwest-BC) S-N Rating Increase |  |
|  |  | N | 12-16-14 By email this date notification was received that The Path 3 S-N Rerating Project was granted Phase 3 status with an Accepted Rating of 3000 MW in December 2012. BC Hydro has since completed studies for Spring System Operating Limit in Mach 2013, Summer System Operating Limit in April 2013, and Winter System Operating Limit in September 2013. Results from these studies have been presented at the NWPP Operational Planning Study Group for peer review, comments, and acceptance. BC Hydro has also completed its operating order for operating Path 3 S-N at 3000 MW. On 15 December 2014, BC Hydro requested that the Path 3 S-N be granted an Accepted Rating status at 3000 MW. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Three Phase Project Rating Process, the Path 3 S-N is hereby granted an Accepted Rating status at 3000 MW. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **9-7-13** | **Alberta Electric System Operator** | **N** | Path 1 Definition Change Project |  |
|  |  | N | 5-30-14 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. This request would only change the name of the terminus. |  |
|  |  | C | 5-3014 By email this date AESO informed WECC that BC Hydro requested some changes to the original request documentation. These changes were made and the request was resent. |  |
|  |  | C | 8-12-14 By email this date the project was granted Phase 3 status |  |
|  |  | C | As of 8-24-16 This name change is reflected in the Path Rating Catalog |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-5-2015 | Public Service Company of New Mexico | N | Rio Puerco Expansion (Path 48) |  |
|  |  | N | Tom Duane of Public Service Company of New Mexico (PNM) requesting to expedite the Path Rating Process for revising the Path 48 Accepted Rating to account for the Rio Puerco Expansion Project which results in a redefinition of the path by looping in two existing 345 kV lines.   |  |
|  | 3-24-15 | N | By email this date the Rio Puerco Project achieved Phase 3 status and was granted an accepted rating of 2150 MW. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-18-09 | Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) | N | West of McNary Reinforcement Project (WOMR) | 02-2013 |
|  | 08-18-2009 | N | By email this date Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) initiated Phase 1 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 2 PRG due by October 16, 2009. |  |
|  | 05-28-2009 | C | By email this date Puget Sound Energy requested participation on the Project Review Group for the West of McNary Project |  |
|  | 09-10-2009 | S | By email this date the original notification letter of 08-18-09 was re-distributed due to an error in the contact information for this project. |  |
|  | 02-06-2013 | N | By email this date the TSS Chair distributed a letter indicating the completion of Phase 1 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). |  |
|  | 07-29-2013 | S | By email this date a draft study plan was distributed to the PRG. |  |
|  | 08-01-2013 | C | By email this date the presentation was sent out for the PRG kick-off meeting. |  |
|  | 08-06-2013 | C | By email this date a proposal on how to stress the study cases was distributed.  |  |
|  | 08-09-2013 | C | By an email chain between the project sponsor and BPA a discussion of the proper study plan and what it should include for cases.  |  |
|  | 09-16-2013 | S | By email this date a draft Study Plan and 3 preliminary foundational base cases are posted. Feedback is requested by 10/31/2013. |  |
|  | 11-19-2013 | S | By email this date reminder about an upcoming meeting was distributed. The meeting is scheduled to be held 11-21-13. The meeting information was also distributed. |  |
|  | 11-27-2013 | S | By email this date a draft study plan was distributed to the PRG. The base cases and associated dynamic data are posted on the ColumbiaGrid website. |  |
|  | 03-09-2015 | S | By email this date BPA formally requests Phase 3 Rating Status for WOMR and its associated paths (West of McNary (WOM), West of Slatt (WOS) and West of John Day (WOJ)). BPA is submitting the attached WOMR Phase 2 Rating Technical Report to WECC PCC, TSS and OC for the required 30-day comment period in accordance with the WECC Project Rating Process. |  |
|  | 06-30-2015 |  | By email this data the PCC chair grants WOMR and its associated paths (West of McNary (WOM), West of Slatt (WOS) and West of John Day (WOJ)) Phase 3 status. |  |
|  | 08-24-2016 | C | In TSS this project was discussed. It is still in Phase 3. |  |
|  | 12-22-2017 | C | By email this date WECC was notified that this project is complete |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-28-18 | SCE | N | Path 26 Rating Confirmation |  |
|  |  | N | 08-28-18 By e-mail this date, SCE requested to expedite the WECC Path Rating Process for Path 26 to demonstrate that its 4,000 MW rating due to the rerouting of the Midway – Vincent # 3 500 kV line through the Whirlwind 500 kV substation is unchanged. |  |
| 11-7-18 |  | S | By email this date, the Path 26 re-validation study of 4,000 MW North to South rating has completed the steps necessary to enter and complete Phase 3 of the WECC Path Rating Process.All comments received on the combined Comprehensive Progress Report/Phase 2 Study Report have been addressed as a part of the Path 26 Path Rating Process, and SCE has requested the WECC Reliability Assessment Committee grant the Path 26 Re-Validation Phase 3 status.Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Processes, the Path 26 Re-Validation is hereby granted Phase 3, Accepted Rating status with a 4,000 MW North to South rating.  Because all of the facilities that are part of this re-validation study are currently in service, Path 26 has also completed Phase 3 of the WECC Path Rating Process. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 04-18-17 | LADWP, NVE, and PAC | N | WECC Rating “Expedited” Re-Study of Paths 29 and 32 |  |
|  | 04-18-17 | N | By email this date, LADWP, NVE, and PAC requested initiation of the “Expedited” rating process for re-study of WECC path ratings for Path 29 (Gonder – Intermountain, owned by LADWP) and Path 32 (Gonder –Intermountain & Pavant-Gonder, owned jointly by LADWP, PAC and NVE). The target path ratings for this re-study are:Path 29: 250 MW E-W (increase of 50 MW),Path 32: 440 MW E-W and 235 MW W-E (no change).The Expedited process will combine Phase 1 and 2, during which all simultaneous and non-simultaneous studies will be performed and will result in the PRG approval of the Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) for the project.  |  |
|  | 07-02-18 | S | By email this date, Nevada Energy submitted the Path 29 and 32 Phase 2 Project Review Group study report as a part of the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Processes.  The study report demonstrates reliable operation on Path 29 when increased from 200 MW to 250 MW east to west and Path 32 from 440 MW to 500 MW east to west.  All comments have been addressed and Nevada Energy has requested the WECC Reliability Assessment Committee (RAC) grant these paths Phase 3 status since all elements are in service.     |  |
|  | 09-07-18 | N | By email this date, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Processes, the Path 29 and 32 are hereby granted Phase 3, Accepted Rating status.  The Accepted Rating for Path 29 is 250 MW east to west and the Accepted Rating for Path 32 is 500 MW east to west.  |  |
|  | 12-11-18 | N | By email this Nevada Energy announced that all transmission facilities associated with Path 29 and 32 have been constructed and placed in-service, therefore Phase 3 is now complete and the path ratings noted above are now current. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-7-12 | NV Energy (NVE) | N | **Southern Nevada Transmission Interface Project (Path 81 Redefinition)** | 4-2013 |
| 3-7-12 |  | N | By email 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 |  |
| 5-7-12 |  | \*C | 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.  |  |
| 5-7-12 |  | \*C | By email a meeting was scheduled for May 14, 2012 to discuss the study plan and the comments received.  |  |
| 6-27-12 |  | \*C | By email the study plan was distributed for comments. Comments due 7-5-2012.  |  |
| 7-5-12 |  | \*C | By email Idaho Power submitted comments on the Study Plan. |  |
| 7-12-13 |  | \*S | By email to the project review group with an included zip file study results were sent to the PRG for review. A PRG meeting is scheduled to be held on 7/29/13. |  |
| 7-29-13 |  | S | SNTI meeting materials were sent out for the meeting being held on this date.  |  |
| 8-1-13 |  | S | 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. |  |
| 10-2-13 |  | \*S | By email this date NVEnergy distributed the final Comprehensive Progress Report for PCC review and 30-day comment.  |  |
| 11-4-13 |  | \*S | 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. |  |
| 8-24-16 |  |  | Discussed in TSS this date—this project as listed  |  |
| 2017 |  |  | Project Complete |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5-1-17 | Idaho Power | N | **Path 14 (Idaho to Northwest) West to East Rating Increase** |  |
| 5-1-17 |  | N | By email this date Idaho Power submitted the Path 14 Path Rating Increase Phase I Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) as a part of the WECC Expedited Rating Process. The change will be an upgrade of Path 14 West-to-East rating from a static -1200 MW to a rating that will range between -1200 MW and -1340 MW based on hydro generation output at Idaho Power’s Canyon Complex (Brownlee, Oxbow, and Hells Canyon). The CPR was drafted by Idaho Power to evaluate the impacts of adjusting the ratings to Path 14. |  |
| 7-26-17 |  | N | By email this date Idaho Power has completed the steps necessary to enter Phase 3 of the WECC Path Rating Process. After review, the PCC chair granted the Path 14 Path Rating Increase Project Phase III status.  |  |
| 2018 |  |  | Complete and updated in the 2018 Path Rating Catalog. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8-19-16 | Arizona Public Service |  | **Four Corners 345/500 kV Qualified Path (path 23) UPGRADE** | 12-1-17 |
| 8-19-16 |  | N | By email this date Mr. Mark Stoker initiated the Expedited Path Rating Process for Four Corners 345/500 kV Qualified Path (Path 23). The expected in-service date of the project is late December 2017. APS completed the [Path 23 Comprehensive Progress Report](https://www.wecc.biz/Reliability/NDA/Path23_CPR_071616.pdf) for this project and it is available for review on the WECC Website.  |  |
| 6-14-17 |  | S | By email this date Arizona Public Service (APS) submitted the Path 23 Path Rating Increase Phase I Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) as a part of the WECC Expedited Rating Process. This CPR was drafted by the Four Corners Technical Takes Force and the Four Corners 525/345 kV transformer participants, formed to evaluate the impacts of the addition of a second new 525/345 kV transformer at Four Corners switch yard near Farmington, New Mexico. |  |
| 7-24-17 |  | N | By email this date the upgrade of Path 23 bi-directional rating from 1000 MW to 1420 MW has completed the steps necessary to enter Phase 3 of the WECC Path Rating Process. All comments have been addressed as a part of the Path 23 Path Rating Increase Expedited Path Rating Process, APS has requested the WECC Panning Coordination Committee grant the Path 23 Path Rating Increase Project Phase III status. After review, the PCC chair granted Phase 3 status to the project.  |  |
| 2019 |  |  | This was completed, but Path was retired in 2019 |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-1-16 | PacifiCorp | N | **Path 78 TOT 2B1 Path Rating Increase** |  |
|  |  | N | PacifiCorp submitted the Path 78 (TOT 2B1) Path Rating Increase Phase I Comprehensive Progress Report (CPR) as a part of the WECC Expedited Rating Process. This CPR was drafted by the WECC Path 78 (TOT 2B1) Technical Study Group[[1]](#footnote-1) which was formed to evaluate the impacts of the addition of a third new 345 kV, 400 MVA phase shifter at Pinto on the Pinto-Four Corners 345 kV line. Adding a new phase shifter at Pinto increased the TOT 2B1 path rating in both directions. |  |
| 6-2-16 |  | N | By email this date All comments have been addressed as a part of the Path 78 (TOT 2B1) Path Rating Increase Expedited Path Rating Process, PacifiCorp has requested the WECC Panning Coordination Committee grant the Path 78 (TOT 2B1) Path Rating Increase Project Phase III status. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Three Phase Project Rating Process, the upgraded Path 78 (TOT 2B) transmission path is hereby granted Phase 3 status with a northbound Accepted Rating of 700 MW and southbound Accepted Rating of 647 MW. The previous rating on the Path 78 (TOT 2B) transmission path was 600 MW bi-directional. |  |
| 2021 |  |  | Project in service as of 2017 |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8-29-11 | Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) | N | **TOT 1A (Path 30) Limit Calculation Update Project** | 12-2013 |
| 8-29-11 |  | N | By email 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. |  |
| 6-12-13 |  | S | By email this date the comprehensive progress report was distributed for review. Interest in participation in the PRG is due June 26, 2013. |  |
| 1-7-14 |  |  | By email this date Path 30 is granted phase 3 status. The transfer capability remains 650 MW. |  |
| 8-24-16 |  | C | Projected discussed in TSS on this date. Project remains in Phase 3. |  |
| 5-24-21 |  | S | By email this date Ryne Davis with WAPA confirmed that the project was completed. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9-16-20 | Imperial Irrigation District (IID) |  | **Path 42 Uprate** |  |
| 9-16-20 |  | N | By email date Imperial irrigation District (IID), in Cooperation with the Southern California Edison Company (SCE) is initiating the Expedited Path Rating Process for Path 42 to (1) revise assumptions and (2) re-evaluate the established Path 42 rating with the intent of increasing the accepted rating from 600 MW to 750 MW.  Path 42 includes the 230 kV Coachella Valley – Mirage and the 230 kV Ramon – Mirage transmission lines and serves as the primary path for generation export within the IID Balancing Authority into SCE and the CAISO market. The existing Path 42 transfer limit is 600 MW east-to-west with the metered end at the SCE Mirage 230 kV substation.IID, in conjunction with SCE, reassessed the necessity for a Remedial Action Scheme (RAS) in order to reliably justify a rating increase proposal for Path 42. The RASRS voted to approve the findings and proposed design. IID and SCE are currently underway in the installation of the Path 42 RAS and expect it to be in service Q3 2021.The intent is to proceed through the expedited WECC path rating process as outlined in the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Process. Review and comments on initiating the expedited process for Path 42 are being sought. |  |
| 4-29-21 |  | N | By email this date Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) requested to expedite the WECC Path Rating Process for Path 42 to increase the rating from 600 MW to 750 MW on the Coachella Valley – Mirage 230kV and Ramon – Mirage 230kV transmission lines. The Comprehensive Progress Report was posted on the WECC website. This report contained Phase 1 (non-simultaneous) and Phase 2 (Simultaneous) study analyses and results. Comments on the report or conformance with the WECC Path Rating Process were due by June 29th, 2021. |  |
| 7-01-21 |  | N | By email this date Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) project to increase the Path 42 rating from 600 MW to 750 MW has completed the steps necessary to enter Phase 3 of the Expedited Path Rating Process. Imperial Irrigation District (IID) and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) did not receive any comments during the 60 day review period. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Process, Path 42 is hereby granted Phase 3 status, with an Accepted Rating of 750 MW on the Coachella Valley – Mirage 230kV and Ramon – Mirage 230kV transmission lines. All projects identified in the [study report](https://www.wecc.org/Reliability/NDA/Path%2042.zip) are scheduled to be in service by December 31, 2021. Should you have any question, or need additional information about this path rating increase, please contact Rudy Leal (rzleal@iid.com), and Kevin Brooks (kevin.brooks@sce.com). |  |
| 11-23-21 |  | S | By email this date notification was sent that the Path 42 rating increase from 600 MW to 750 MW had completed the Phase 3 requirements of the Expedited Path Rating Process. There were no major changes in the assumptions and conditions that were evaluated during the completion of Phase 2 when the Project was granted an “Accepted Rating”Since all transmission facilities associated with the Path 42 rating increase have been constructed and placed in-service on October 31, 2021 , Phase 3 is now complete.  |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-2013 | Tri-State G&T | N | **TOT3 Wayne Child Project** | 12-2019 |
|  |  | N | The TOT3 Wayne Child Project increases the rating of Path 36, aka TOT 3, which is on the border between Northeast Colorado and Southeast Wyoming TSGT plans to increase the TOT3 transfer capability by an additional 163 MW. The Wayne Child project includes sectionalizing the LRS‐Keota 345‐kV line near Archer, a new 345/230‐kV transformer known as Wayne Child, and a Wayne Child-Archer 230‐kV line. |  |
| 2021 |  |  | This project is expected to be completed 2021 |  |
| 07-19-22 |  | N | By email this date the TOT3 Wayne Child Project (Path 36) has completed the Three Phase Path Rating Process. All Projects identified in the study report are now in service as of July 5, 2022. Therefore, in accordance with the WECC Project Coordination, Path Rating and Progress Report Process, TOT3 Wayne Chile Project (Path 36) has completed Phase 3 of the Path Rating Process with an Accepted Rating of 1843 MW North to South. |  |

# Projects Removed from Logbook Due to Cancellation

Projects that were formerly listed in the Path Rating Progress Logbook but have been cancelled.

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-10-2014 | PG&E |  | Cascade Crossing Transmission Project (previously known as Southern Crossing Transmission Project) |  |
|  | 2-10-2014 | C | At the January TSS meeting there was some discussion concerning updates needed for many of the Projects listed to be in Phase 2 of the WECC Path Rating Process.  You may already know that PGE has elected to discontinue work on the Cascade Crossing Project and PGE will no longer be representing it in WECC planning cases.Please update the Project status to cancelled in the Phase 2 Project listing.   |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8-3-11 | Calpine Corp. | N | Sutter Energy Center Interconnection Relocation Project |  |
|  |  |  | 01-05-12 By e-mail this date Calpine initiated the Project Coordination Review Process for their Sutter Interconnection Relocation Project and solicited interest in formation of a Project Coordination Review Group. 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. |  |
|  |  | **C** | 01-05-12 By e-mail this date PG&E declared their interest in participating on the PCRG for this project. |  |
|  | **1-23-2014** | **N** | By this date Calpine submitted a notice to the CAISO withdrawing the request to relocate the Sutter plant.  The proposal was to remove the current 230 kV interconnection at O’Banion and build a new interconnection on PG&E’s Table-Tesla 500 kV line.  As a result of this withdrawal, the two review groups were disbanded.**Project Cancelled** |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02-06-09 | PG&E | N | Canada–Northern California Transmission Project S-N Rating (CNC Project) |  |
|  |  |  | 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. |  |
|  | **August 2016** |  | In the August 2016 TSS meeting it was reported that this project was cancelled. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3-3-15 | Sacramento Municipal Utility District |  | **Sacramento Area 500 kV Transmission Project (SAC500)** |  |
| 3-3-15 |  | N | By email this date Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD) and Western Area Power Administration (Western) hereby request initiation of a Project Coordination Review Process for a jointly developed project referred to as the SAC500 Project. The proposed project is an approximately 50-mile, 500-kV transmission line interconnecting the California Oregon Intertie Project (COTP) to Western’s Central Valley Project (CVP) transmission system. The SAC500 Project provides local and regional reliability benefits while providing additional access to low carbon resources. A draft report describing the preliminary study results is attached for your reference. SMUD and Western request that a group within the Sierra Subregional Planning Group of WestConnect host the Project Coordination Review Process. Interested parties should complete the form attached to the announcement letter, Project Coordination Review Group form, by March 16, 2015 and forward to Craig Cameron at Craig.Cameron@smud.org or fax to (916) 732-5688. |  |
| 8-24-16 |  |  | Discussed in TSS this date. This project is working through environmental review and should return to Phase 0 |  |

# Projects Removed from Logbook and Placed on Hold

Projects that were formerly listed in the Path Rating Progress Logbook but have been suspended or placed “on hold”

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 08-16-11 | Southern California Edison (SCE) | N | IID-SCE (Path 42 1500 MW Upgrade Project) | 12-2013 |
|  | 08-16-11 | N | By email this date, Southern California Edison (SCE) initiated Phase 1 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.  |  |
|  | 11-29-11 | C | 11-29-11 By e-mail this date, Southern California Edison distributed the Project Coordination Review Report for 30-day review. Due to upgraded transmission facilities in both SCE’s and IID’s systems and the implementation of an SPS associated with the Plan of Service for this project, the rating is expected to increase by 700 MW from 800 MW to 1500 MW E-W. |  |
|  | 04-03-12 | N | By email a letter from the TSS Vice-Chair indicated completion of Phase 1 requirements for the Path 42 1500 MW Project. This project has achieved Phase 2 status in the WECC Project Rating Review Process with a planned rating of 1,500 MW east-to-west. |  |
|  | 08-16-13 | S | By email this date SCE and IID are actively moving forward with securing this rating. The email also laid out the scope of the studies and development of a base case.  |  |
|  | 08-11-14 | S | By email this date notice of activities undertaken since the last notice of Aug 16, 2013 jointly by SCE, IID, and CAISO to perform the Path 42 - 1,500 MW Upgrade Study. SCE requests that PRG members review the base case to ensure systems are appropriately modeled and new projects are included.Additionally, notice of scheduling PRG conference call beginning in Sept 2014 was provided. |  |
|  | 8-11-14 | S | By email this date received study scope draft and update to plan |  |
|  | 8-24-16 |  | Discussed in TSS this date. Project is on hold per David Franklin |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **03-1-06** | Nevada Hydro Company, Inc. (TNHC) and The Lake Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EMVWD) | **N** | 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 its 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** | 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. |  |
|  | **August 2016** | **C** | In the August 2016 TSS meeting it was indicated that this project is on hold. |  |

# Projects Removed from Logbook Due to Lack of Communication

Projects that were formerly listed in the Path Rating Progress Logbook but have been removed due to a lack of communication.

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01-05-15 | Lassen Municipal Utility District (LMUD) | N | Viewland Interconnection Project | Late 2017-early 2018 |
|  |  |  | 01-05-15 By email this date LMUD initiated the WECC Project Coordination Review Process for the Viewland Interconnection Project (“Project”). The existing LMUD system consists of two 60 kV lines that originate at LMUD’s Westwood Substation which extend eastward the LMUD Honey Lake Substation. NVE’s existing Hilltop -Fort Safe 345 kV line is routed approximately 6 miles east of the Honey Lake Substation. The proposed Project would include a 345 kV interconnection with the NVE 345 kV line, and new Viewland 345/60 kV substation and approximately 6 miles of new 60 kV line between Viewland and Honey Lake substations. The in-service date is late 2017-early 2018.  |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 07-26-11 | Great Basin Energy Development LLC (GBHVDC) | N | Great Basin HVDC Project | 12/2016 |
|  |  |  | 07-26-11 By e-mail this date, Great Basin Energy Development, LLC initiated the Project Coordination Review Process for the Great Basin HVDC Project. This project is planned to consist of an underground 400 kV HVDC transmission line approximately 130 miles in length between NVEnergy’s Tracy switching station near Reno, NV and WAPA’s O’Banion switching station near Yuba City, CA. Great Basin also solicited participation in a Project Coordination Review Group and indicated that an initial PCRG meeting would be held in the September/October time frame. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1-23-09 | Sea Breeze Pacific (SBP-RTS) | N | Triton South |  |
|  |  |  | 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. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 10-30-06 | Sea Breeze Pacific | N | See 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. |  |

| **Date** | **Entity** | **Code** | **Project Name** | **Effective Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2-14-07 | Tri-State G&T, Inc. (TSGT) | N | **TOT3 Archer Interconnection Project**(previously known as TOT3 300 MW Upgrade Project) | 2013 |
| 2-27-07 |  | N | By email 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. |  |
| 11-16-12 |  | N | By email the PCC Chair provided a letter granting Phase III status with an Accepted Rating of 1843 MW north to south. |  |

| Date | Entity | Code | Project Name | Effective Date |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. PacifiCorp, Arizona Public Service Electric Company, NV Energy, Public Service Company of New Mexico, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, Western Area Power Administration – Rocky Mountain Region, Public Service Company of Colorado, Deseret Power, Tri–State Generation & Transmission Association, Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems [↑](#footnote-ref-1)